



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 6, 2013

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2013-19382

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 504925.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for copies of the winning proposals for four specified requests for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Gartner, Inc.; Loblolly Consulting, L.L.C.; and Neos Consulting Group, L.L.C. Accordingly, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of each company's 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 Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us the department asked the requestor to clarify his request regarding two of the specified requests for proposals. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (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) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified). We understand

the department has not received a response to the request for clarification. Therefore, the department is not required to release any responsive information for which it sought clarification. But if the requestor responds to the clarification request, the department must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387.

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from any of the third parties. Thus, the third parties have not demonstrated the companies have protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests any of the third parties may have in the information.

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.136 states "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. As no exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the department 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.

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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/som

Ref: ID# 504925

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rob Cohan  
Senior Managing Partner  
State and Local Government  
Garter, Inc.  
106 East Sixth Street, Suite 900  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Loblolly Consulting, LLC  
506 Carolyn Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78705  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karon Irby  
NEOS Consulting Group, LLC  
106 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 900  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)