



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 21, 2012

Mr. Larry J. McClenny
Superintendent
Patton Springs Independent School District
P.O. Box 32
Afton, Texas 79220

OR2012-18745A

Dear Mr. McClenny:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2012-18745 (2012) on November 20, 2012. Since that time, we have received new information that affects the facts on which this ruling was based. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on November 20, 2012. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of the Attorney General may issue a decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of the Public Information Act (the "Act")). This ruling was assigned ID# 478967.

The Patton Springs Independent School District (the "district") received a request for "the last electricity contract that has been signed and accepted," and the district's electric bill for all meters for the billing period ending in July 2012. Although the district takes no position on the release of the submitted information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you notified Energy for Schools of this request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). Further, you also notified the Texas General Land Office (the "GLO") of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). The GLO has submitted comments to this office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge the district did not comply with its fifteen-business-day deadline under section 552.301(e) of the Government Code for portions of the requested information. *See id.* § 552.301(a)-(b). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *Id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider whether the information at issue is excepted under the Act.

The GLO raises section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. This exception protects a governmental body's interests in connection with competitive bidding and in certain other competitive situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 593 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has held that a governmental body may seek protection as a competitor in the marketplace under section 552.104 and avail itself of the "competitive advantage" aspect of this exception if it can satisfy two criteria. *See id.* First, the governmental body must demonstrate that it has specific marketplace interests. *See id.* at 3. Second, the governmental body must demonstrate a specific threat of actual or potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See id.* at 5. Thus, the question of whether the release of particular information will harm a governmental body's legitimate interests as a competitor in a marketplace depends on the sufficiency of the governmental body's demonstration of the prospect of specific harm to its marketplace interests in a particular competitive situation. *See id.* at 10. A general allegation of a remote possibility of harm is not sufficient. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 at 2 (1988).

The GLO asserts it has specific marketplace interests in the information at issue because the GLO is authorized by statute to sell or otherwise convey power generated from royalties taken in kind. Util. Code § 35.102. The GLO advises that under that authority, it has created the State Power Program, through which it bids on contracts for the right to sell electrical energy to public retail customers. The GLO states it competes with other private companies for the awards of these contracts. Based on these representations, we find the GLO has demonstrated it has specific marketplace interests and may be considered a "competitor" for purposes of section 552.104. *See* ORD 593.

The GLO contends the release of the submitted information would harm its marketplace interests because this information details the services and the prices the GLO charges for such services in order to provide the district with its electrical needs. The GLO further

asserts that, if its competitors had access to this information, they would “be able to use the GLO’s methods of delivery of electrical services and its pricing formula for such services as their own.” Thus, the GLO contends that allowing competitors access to the documents at issue will undermine its ability to compete in this marketplace. Based on the GLO’s representations and arguments, we conclude the GLO has shown that release of the submitted information would cause specific harm to the GLO’s marketplace interests. *See id.* We therefore conclude the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the GLO’s remaining argument against disclosure.

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.

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 http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cynthia G. Tynan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CGT/akg

Ref: ID# 478967

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)