



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 20, 2005

Ms. Anne Constantine
Legal Counsel
Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport
Legal Department
P.O. Box 619428
DFW Airport, Texas 75261-9428

OR2005-04398

Dear Ms. Constantine:

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# 224671.

The Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport Board (the "board") received a request for copies of the bid packages for the Airport Curbside Canopy Addition project (the "project"). You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state that the requested information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you have notified the interested third parties, Span Systems, Inc. and Taiyo Birdair Corporation of the request and of their 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 submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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(a). The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Moreover, 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). Generally, section 552.104 does not except

information relating to competitive bidding situations once a bid has been awarded and a contract has been executed. *See id.*

You inform us that the board requested a pricing proposal from DFWIA-Integrated Partners (“Integrated”) for design and construction of the project. You state that “without the benefit of an actual contract with the [b]oard,” Integrated sought bid proposals from several subcontractors. You further state that Integrated provided the subcontractors’ proposals to the board “to ensure that there had been adequate competition and to ensure that there was appropriate opportunity for small, minority, and woman-owned business participation.” You note that Integrated’s proposal to the board “for the management of the [p]roject will be based, in part if not in total, on the bids it receives from its subcontractors.” Accordingly, you argue that if the information at issue is released prior to a contract being executed between Integrated and the successful bidder, or between Integrated and the board, the board’s ability to obtain the most favorable price for management of the project will be affected. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we find that the board has demonstrated that the release of this information would harm the interests of the board in a particular competitive situation. We therefore conclude that board may withhold the information at issue in its entirety at this time pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.¹ However, we note that the board may no longer withhold the submitted information under this exception to disclosure once a contract has been executed and is in effect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 at 5 (1990).

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

¹ Because we base our ruling on section 552.104 of the Government Code, we need not address any of the remaining submitted arguments.

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); *Tex. 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 224671

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sarah Van Wezel
FabriTec Structures
350 Kalmus Drive
Costa Mesa, California 92626
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew Kolozsvary
Span Systems, Inc.
90 Pine Street
Manchester, New Hampshire 03103
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Capezutto
Taiyo Birdair Corporation
65 Lawrence Bell Drive, Suite 200
Amherst, New York 14221
(w/o enclosures)