



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 24, 2006

Ms. Veronica Ocañas
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P. O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2006-04062

Dear Ms. Ocañas:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code, the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Your request was assigned ID# 247058.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received three requests for information relating to the city's RFP regarding Memorial Coliseum. You state the city will release some of the requested information. Although you state that the requested information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.105, 552.110, 552.111, 552.113, and 552.131 of the Government Code, you only make arguments regarding sections 552.104 and 552.111. However, you claim that the requested information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the city notified the interested third parties, The NRP Group, LLC ("NRP"), TRT Development Company ("TRT"), Wisznia Associates ("Wisznia"), and Landlord Resources ("Landlord"), of the city's receipt of the requests and of their right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted 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

the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." The purpose of this exception is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). Section 552.104 does not protect information relating to competitive bidding situations once a contract has been awarded. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 306 (1982), 184 (1978).

You inform this office that the submitted information relates to "proposals for a project for which no contract has yet been awarded." However, you have not demonstrated some actual or specific harm that would result from the release of the information in this particular competitive situation. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104.

We next address the city's arguments under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. This exception applies not only to internal memoranda, but also to memoranda prepared by consultants of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 462 at 14 (1987), 298 at 2 (1981). Section 552.111 does not, however, except from

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.

disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. ORD 615 at 4-5. The preliminary draft of a policymaking document that has been released or is intended for release in final form is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.111 because such a draft necessarily represents the advice, recommendations, or opinions of the drafter as to the form and content of the final document. Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990).

You state that the submitted information consists of “intra-agency communications generated and shared internally only, by and between city staff, consisting of advice, opinion, or recommendations on policymaking matters of the City.” Based on this statement and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that some of the submitted information falls within the exception of section 552.111. However, the city has failed to demonstrate that the remainder of the submitted information consists of intraagency communications consisting of advice, opinion, or recommendations on a city policymaking matter. Consequently, none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, none of the interested third parties have submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the information at issue would affect their proprietary interests. Therefore, NRP, TRT, Wisznia, and Landlord have not provided us with a basis to conclude that any of them has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See Id.* § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that NRP, TRT, Wisznia, and Landlord may have in the information.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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*, 342 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Amanda Crawford
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AEC/krl

Ref: ID# 247058

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sarah Viren
Corpus Christi Caller-Times
P. O. Box 9136
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9136
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Clower
The Clower Company
415 Starr Street
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John C. Holmgreen, Jr.
P. O. Box 2888
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Leon S. Loeb
Landlord Resources
921 North Chaparral, Suite 100
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Markson
The NRP Group, Inc.
111 Soledad, Suite 1220
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael G. Smith
TRT Development Company
420 Decker Drive
Irving, Texas 75062
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marcel G. Smith
Wisznia Associates
615 North Upper Broadway, Suite 1740
Corpus Christi, Texas 78477
(w/o enclosures)