



September 25, 2002

Mr. Michael J. Consentino
City Attorney
City of Bryan
P.O. Box 1000
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2002-5412

Dear Mr. Consentino:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 169461.

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for "all correspondence to and from" a named law firm and any city staff member. You assert that the requested information is excepted from required public disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.104 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect the government's interests when it is involved in certain commercial transactions. For example, section 552.104 is generally invoked to except information submitted to a governmental body as part of a bid or similar proposal. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 463 (1987). In these situations, the exception protects

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

the government's interests in obtaining the most favorable proposal terms possible by denying access to proposals prior to the award of a contract. When a governmental body seeks protection as a competitor, however, we have stated that it must be afforded the right to claim the "competitive advantage" aspect of section 552.104 if it meets two criteria. The governmental body must first demonstrate that it has specific marketplace interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 593 at 4 (1991) (governmental body that has been granted specific authority to compete in the private marketplace may demonstrate marketplace interests analogous to those of a private entity). Second, the governmental body must demonstrate actual or potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. A general allegation of a remote possibility of harm is not sufficient to invoke section 552.104. *Id.* at 2. Whether release of particular information would harm the legitimate marketplace interests of a governmental body requires a showing of the possibility of some specific harm in a particular competitive situation. *Id.* at 5, 10.

With regard to whether the city has specific marketplace interests, you inform us that in 1999, the city entered into a series of executory development agreements with corporate partners for the Traditions project. You state that when completed, this project will include a Jack Nicklaus-designed golf course, pro shop, first-rate hotel, and a high-end residential development. You further state that over time, the city has invested over \$20 million in this project. Additionally, you state that, as a home rule municipality, the city has the authority to enter into these agreements and that the Brazos County District Attorney has determined that there is no illegality regarding these contracts. We understand that a similar golf course and residential project is being constructed in the city that would compete with the Traditions project. Based on these representations, we find that the city can be considered a "competitor" in the private marketplace in this case for purposes of section 552.104. Thus, the city may avail itself of section 552.104 protection for its information, provided the city demonstrates actual or potential harm to its competitive interests were the information at issue to be released to the public. However, based on our review of your arguments and the facts surrounding the city's current competitive situation, we find that the city has failed to demonstrate that the release of the submitted information would result in actual or potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold the information from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

You also argue that the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

the government's interests in obtaining the most favorable proposal terms possible by denying access to proposals prior to the award of a contract. When a governmental body seeks protection as a competitor, however, we have stated that it must be afforded the right to claim the "competitive advantage" aspect of section 552.104 if it meets two criteria. The governmental body must first demonstrate that it has specific marketplace interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 593 at 4 (1991) (governmental body that has been granted specific authority to compete in the private marketplace may demonstrate marketplace interests analogous to those of a private entity). Second, the governmental body must demonstrate actual or potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. A general allegation of a remote possibility of harm is not sufficient to invoke section 552.104. *Id.* at 2. Whether release of particular information would harm the legitimate marketplace interests of a governmental body requires a showing of the possibility of some specific harm in a particular competitive situation. *Id.* at 5, 10.

With regard to whether the city has specific marketplace interests, you inform us that in 1999, the city entered into a series of executory development agreements with corporate partners for the Traditions project. You state that when completed, this project will include a Jack Nicklaus-designed golf course, pro shop, first-rate hotel, and a high-end residential development. You further state that over time, the city has invested over \$20 million in this project. Additionally, you state that, as a home rule municipality, the city has the authority to enter into these agreements and that the Brazos County District Attorney has determined that there is no illegality regarding these contracts. We understand that a similar golf course and residential project is being constructed in the city that would compete with the Traditions project. Based on these representations, we find that the city can be considered a "competitor" in the private marketplace in this case for purposes of section 552.104. Thus, the city may avail itself of section 552.104 protection for its information, provided the city demonstrates actual or potential harm to its competitive interests were the information at issue to be released to the public. However, based on our review of your arguments and the facts surrounding the city's current competitive situation, we find that the city has failed to demonstrate that the release of the submitted information would result in actual or potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold the information from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

You also argue that the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the request for information was received, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

We further note that, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed.

In this case, we need not reach the question of whether litigation was reasonably anticipated by the city because the city obtained the information at issue from, or provided it to, counsel for the party with whom the city claims to anticipate litigation. Therefore, even if litigation was anticipated in this case, which we do not decide here, the requested information would not be excepted under section 552.103. *Id.* Accordingly, we find that, as the submitted information is not excepted under sections 552.103 or 552.104, it must be released to the requestor in its entirety, with the following exception.

We note that the submitted information contains an e-mail address that is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides that "[a]n e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Public Information Act]." Therefore, unless the relevant individual has affirmatively consented to the release of his e-mail address, the city must withhold the e-mail address in the submitted information that we have marked under section 552.137.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Michael A. Pearle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAP/jh

Ref: ID# 169461

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Laura Hipp
c/o The Bryan-College Station Eagle
P.O. Box 3000
Bryan, Texas 77802-3000
(w/o enclosures)