



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 8, 2008

Ms. Sue M. Lee
Henslee & Schwartz, L.L.P.
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 800
Austin, Texas 78701-2443

OR2008-06287

Dear Ms. Lee:

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# 313821.

The Blanco Independent School District (the "district") received a request for eight categories of information related to a proposed Architectural Planning Service Agreement and specified meetings of the district's Board. You state that some responsive information will be released to the requestor, but explain that the district does not have any documents responsive to a portion of the request.¹ You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.104 of the Government Code. You also believe that a portion of the submitted information implicates the proprietary interests of an interested third party, and you have notified this company of the request for information and its opportunity to submit comments to this office. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App. – San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code, which provides that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)." *Id.* § 551.104(c). Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (1988). Accordingly, the district must withhold any responsive certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting of the district Board of Trustees under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.

You claim that the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). The protections afforded by section 552.104 serve two purposes. One purpose is to protect the interests of a governmental body by preventing one competitor or bidder from gaining an unfair advantage over others in the context of a pending competitive bidding process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 (1990). The other purpose is to protect the legitimate marketplace interests of a governmental body when acting as a competitor in the marketplace. *See* Open Records Decision No. 593 (1991). In both cases, the governmental body must demonstrate the existence of actual or potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See id.* at 2; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). A general allegation of a remote possibility of harm is not sufficient to invoke section 552.104. *See* ORD 593 at 2.

Having considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we find that the district has sufficiently demonstrated that section 552.104 is applicable in this instance. Therefore, the district may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

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

²We note that the district is not required to submit a certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting to this office for review. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (attorney general lacks authority to review certified agendas or tapes of executive sessions to determine whether a governmental body may withhold such information from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.101 of the Government Code).

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 313821

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ricky Simmons
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 1406
Blanco, Texas 78606
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Randy Fromberg
Fromberg Associates, Ltd.
2406 Lake Austin Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78703
(w/o enclosures)