



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 19, 2020

Ms. Kendra Walters
Counsel for Beaumont Independent School District
Karczewski Bradshaw Spalding Nichols Lamp Langlois
3700 Buffalo Speedway, Suite 560
Houston, Texas 77098

OR2020-20800

Dear Ms. Walters:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 839685.

The Beaumont Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to specified invoices and a specified bid tabulation.¹ Although the district takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the district states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Midtex Oil, LP ("Midtex"), and Sun Coast Resources, Inc. ("Sun Coast"). Accordingly, the district states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Midtex and Sun Coast of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We received comments from Sun Coast. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and the submitted information.

¹ The district states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Midtex explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Midtex has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Midtex may have in the information.

Sun Coast raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for a portion of its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information "if a governmental body demonstrates that release of the information would harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future." Gov't Code § 552.104(a) (emphasis added). In *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015), the Texas Supreme Court held section 552.104 does not preclude third parties from raising section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. *See Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 842. However, the Eighty-sixth Legislature has amended section 552.104 since the issuance of *Boeing*. *See* Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3. Section 552.104 now expressly limits the protections of section 552.104 to governmental bodies. Gov't Code § 552.104(a). Therefore, we do not address Sun Coast's arguments under section 552.104.

Sun Coast also raises section 552.110(c) of the Government Code for its information.² Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

(c) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained is [excepted from required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). Sun Coast argues its information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find some of the information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(c). Additionally, we find Sun Coast has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial

² Although Sun Coast cites to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, we note the Eighty-sixth Legislature amended section 552.110 effective January 1, 2020. *See* Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3. Accordingly, we understand Sun Coast to raise section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

competitive harm. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”³ *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the district must release the submitted information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Sean McCormick
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SMC/be

Ref: ID# 839685

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).