



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 3, 2020

Mr. Miguel Salinas
Staff Attorney
Brownsville Independent School District
1900 Price Road, Suite 302
Brownsville, Texas 78521-2417

OR2020-27607

Dear Mr. Salinas:

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# 851875 (Brownsville ISD No. 9673).

The Brownsville Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the following categories of information: (1) bids, proposals, or contracts sought by a named individual or named business and (2) the bid proposal submitted by a second named business. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.110 and 552.153 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Lone Star National Bank ("Lone Star"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Lone Star of the request for information and of its 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 have received comments from Lone Star. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note in a letter dated September 3, 2020, you state the district wishes to withdraw its request for an open records decision with regard to the first category of the request for information, as the district will release this information upon payment of costs. This ruling does not address the public availability of this information.

Lone Star 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 Lone Star’s arguments under section 552.104.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See id.* § 552.110(b)-(c). Although the district argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the district’s argument under section 552.110.

Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “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[.]” *Id.* § 552.110(c). Lone Star argues some of its information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find Lone Star has demonstrated its financial statements constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the district must withhold Lone Star’s financial statements under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.¹

Section 552.153 of the Government Code protects proprietary records and trade secrets involved in certain partnerships under chapter 2267 of the Government Code and provides, in part, the following:

- (a) In this section, “affected jurisdiction,” “comprehensive agreement,” “contracting person,” “interim agreement,” “qualifying project,” and “responsible governmental entity” have the meanings assigned those terms by [s]ection 2267.001.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(b) Information in the custody of a responsible government entity that relates to a proposal for a qualifying project authorized under [c]hapter 2267 is excepted from the requirements of [the Act] if:

(1) the information consists of memoranda, staff evaluations, or other records prepared by the responsible governmental entity, its staff, outside advisors, or consultants exclusively for the evaluation and negotiation of proposals filed under [c]hapter 2267 for which:

(A) disclosure to the public before or after the execution of an interim or comprehensive agreement would adversely affect the financial interest or bargaining position of the responsible governmental entity; and

(B) the basis for the determination under Paragraph (A) is documented in writing by the responsible governmental entity; or

(2) the records are provided by a proposer to a responsible governmental entity or affected jurisdiction under [c]hapter 2267 and contain:

(A) trade secrets of the proposer;

(B) financial records of the proposer, including balance sheets and financial statements, that are not generally available to the public through regulatory disclosure or other means; or

(C) work product related to a competitive bid or proposal submitted by the proposer that, if made public before the execution of an interim or comprehensive agreement, would provide a competing proposer an unjust advantage or adversely affect the financial interest or bargaining position of the responsible government entity or the proposer.

Id. § 552.153(a)-(b). Section 2267.001(10) of the Government Code provides “qualifying project” means the following:

(A) any ferry, mass transit facility, vehicle parking facility, port facility, power generation facility, fuel supply facility, oil or gas pipeline, water supply facility, public work, waste treatment facility, hospital, school, medical or nursing care facility, recreational facility, public building, technological facility, or other similar facility currently available or to be made available to a governmental entity for public use, including any structure, parking area, appurtenance, and other property required to operate the structure or facility and any technology infrastructure installed in the structure or facility that is essential to the project’s purpose; or

(B) any improvements necessary or desirable to real property owned by a governmental entity.

Id. § 2267.001(10). Further, section 2267.001(11) provides “responsible governmental entity” means “a governmental entity that has the power to develop or operate an applicable qualifying project.” *Id.* § 2267.001(11). Although the district raises section 552.153 for the remaining information, the district does not inform us either that the district is a

responsible governmental entity as defined by section 2267.001(11) of the Government Code, or that the information at issue relates to a proposal for a qualifying project that is authorized under chapter 2267 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.153 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”² *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Thus, the district must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136(b) 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). The remaining information contains bank account and bank routing numbers. However, we are unable to determine if this information is fictitious. Accordingly, to the extent the bank account and bank routing numbers in the remaining information constitute actual bank account and bank routing numbers, the district must withhold them under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent these numbers are fictitious, the district may not withhold them under section 552.136.

In summary, the district must withhold Lone Star’s financial statements under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the bank account and bank routing numbers in the remaining information constitute actual account and routing numbers, the district must withhold them under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining 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.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/be

Ref: ID# 851875

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

1 Third Party
(w/o enclosures)