



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2006

Ms. Helen Valkavich  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
Office of the City Attorney  
P. O. Box 839966  
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2006-04517

Dear Ms. Valkavich:

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# 247890.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for the winning proposal, and subsequent contract, for Facilitation Services for the city's 2004 City Council Goals and Objectives Setting Process project. You state the city will provide the majority of the responsive information to the requestor, but claim that the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you state you have notified Management and Business Advisors ("MBA"), through Mr. Ben Rodriguez, of the request and of 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 reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code*

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, MBA has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. You inform us that MBA advised the city that "it wishes to assert that some of the requested records are exempt from disclosure." However, MBA has made no arguments against release of the submitted information. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See, e.g.*, Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, the submitted information 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 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 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); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 342 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/krl

Ref: ID# 247890

Enc. Submitted documents

c: FOIA Request Coordinator  
Onvia, Inc.  
1260 Mercer  
Seattle, Washington 98109  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ben Rodriguez  
MBA  
P. O. Box 12717  
San Antonio, Texas 78212  
(w/o enclosures)