



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 25, 2003

Mr. Brad Norton  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Austin - Law Department  
P.O. Box 1546  
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR2003-8556

Dear Mr. Norton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191808.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for a copy of the city's contract with Kinder Morgan South Pipeline, L.P. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.110 and 552.133 of the Government Code. You also indicate that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Kinder Morgan South Texas Pipeline, L.P. and Kinder Morgan Texas Pipeline, L.P. (collectively, "Kinder Morgan"). Thus, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Kinder Morgan of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by Kinder Morgan. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305.

Section 552.133 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure a public power utility's information related to a competitive matter. Section 552.133(b) provides:

Information or records are excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the information or records are reasonably related to a competitive matter, as defined in this section. Excepted information or

records include the text of any resolution of the public power utility governing body determining which issues, activities, or matters constitute competitive matters. Information or records of a municipally owned utility that are reasonably related to a competitive matter are not subject to disclosure under this chapter, whether or not, under the Utilities Code, the municipally owned utility has adopted customer choice or serves in a multiply certificated service area. This section does not limit the right of a public power utility governing body to withhold from disclosure information deemed to be within the scope of any other exception provided for in this chapter, subject to the provisions of this chapter.

Section 552.133(a)(3) defines a "competitive matter" as a matter the public power utility governing body in good faith determines by vote to be related to the public power utility's competitive activity, and the release of which would give an advantage to competitors or prospective competitors. However, section 552.133(a)(3) also provides thirteen categories of information that may not be deemed competitive matters. The attorney general may conclude that section 552.133 is inapplicable to the requested information only if, based on the information provided, the attorney general determines the public power utility governing body has not acted in good faith in determining that the issue, matter, or activity is a competitive matter or that the information requested is not reasonably related to a competitive matter. Gov't Code § 552.133(c).

You inform us that the city council passed a resolution by vote pursuant to section 552.133 in which it defined the information at issue to be within the scope of the term "competitive matter," and you have provided a copy of the resolution for our review. The submitted gas pipeline contract is not clearly among the thirteen categories of information expressly exempted from the definition of competitive matter, and we have no evidence that the city council failed to act in good faith. Consequently, we conclude that the submitted gas pipeline contract constitutes competitive information in accordance with the city's resolution and is therefore excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.133 of the Government Code. Based on this finding, we do not reach the arguments against disclosure submitted by Kinder Morgan.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,



David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 191808

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Susan Lichtenwalter  
Clark, Thomas & Winters, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1148  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sheila R. Tweed  
Assistant General Counsel  
Kinder Morgan  
500 Dallas, Suite 1000  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)