



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 24, 2016

Mr. Jonathan Kaplan  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
P.O. Box 839966  
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2016-04404

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

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# 599833 (ORR No. W014657-113015).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for vendor responses to RFCSP 15-081, 6100006463 City Grants Management Solution, except for the proposal submitted by Western States Arts Federation and REI Systems.<sup>1</sup> 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 Dulles Technology Partners, Information Strategies, Inc., MB3, Inc., and Microedge. Accordingly, you notified these 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.

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

---

<sup>1</sup>You note the city sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that 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 governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

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 city 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, which 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.”<sup>2</sup> 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 city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city 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 providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Britni Ramirez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BR/bhf

---

<sup>2</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).

Ref: ID# 599833

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr Tom Nyilasi  
Dulles Technology Partners  
817 Larch Valley Court  
Lessburg, Virginia 20176  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rich Nolm  
Information Strategies  
4301 Connecticut Avenue Northwest  
Washington, DC 20008  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Meghan Davey  
MB3  
7512 Dr. Phillips Boulevard, Suite 50-112  
Orlando, Florida 32819  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd Theilemann  
Microedge  
4108 Emory Avenue  
Houston, Texas 77005  
(w/o enclosures)