



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 18, 2016

Ms. Dena DeNooyer Stroh  
General Counsel  
North Texas Tollway Authority  
P.O. Box 260729  
Plano, Texas 75026

OR2016-08660

Dear Ms. Stroh:

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# 606272 (NTTA File No. 2016-00115).

The North Texas Tollway Authority (the "authority") received a request for the current contracts between the authority and Electronic Transaction Consultants ("ETC").<sup>1</sup> You state the authority will release some of the requested information and redact certain information pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.139 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of ETC. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the authority sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

ETC of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from ETC. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Section 552.104(a) 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). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at 841. ETC states it has competitors. In addition, ETC states release of the information at issue would give its competitors an advantage by, among other things, allowing them to estimate ETC’s costs and margins on similar procurements in the future, and ETC seeks to withhold the terms of the contract. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 832. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find ETC has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the authority may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> The authority must release the remaining information.

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.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider the remaining arguments against disclosure.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/bw

Ref: ID# 606272

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)