



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 18, 2008

Mr. William C. Bennett, Jr.  
Criminal District Attorney  
Madison County  
101 West Main, Room 207  
Madisonville, Texas 77864

OR2008-03613

Dear Mr. Bennett:

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# 304931.

The Madison County Commissioners Court (the "court") received a request for a specific letter regarding water well applications and all communications regarding a proposed electric power generating plant. Although the court takes no position on the release of the submitted information, you indicate that it may contain confidential and proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the court notified Navasota Energy ("Navasota") of this 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 § 552.305(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). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Navasota claims that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial

competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Navasota states that releasing the information at issue would cause substantial competitive harm to the company and its affiliates by making available to the public information about staffing, costs, and operations. However, we find that Navasota has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of its information would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the court may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Navasota also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a), (b). Navasota has failed to explain how the information consists of economic development negotiations that relate to a trade secret or commercial or financial information involving it and the court. *See id.* § 552.131. Accordingly, we conclude that the court may not withhold any portion of the requested information pursuant to section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we note that section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the court does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude that no portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.301(b) of the Government Code. As there are no other arguments against the disclosure of the requested information, it 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 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,



Chris Schulz  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CS/jb

Ref: ID# 304931

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeff A. Farris  
P.O. Box 1742  
Madisonville, Texas 77864  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Hudson  
Navasota Energy  
403 Corporate Woods  
Magnolia, Texas 77354  
(w/o enclosures)