



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 15, 2006

Mr. Vic Ramirez
Associate General Counsel
Lower Colorado River Authority
P. O. Box 220
Austin, Texas 78767-0220

OR2006-04969

Dear Mr. Ramirez:

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# 248989.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "authority") received a request for all of the proposals received for the Red Bud Center project. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure. You, instead, indicate that the submitted information may be subject to third party proprietary interests. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified Thos. S. Byrne, Ltd. ("Thos"), Constructors & Associates, Inc. ("Constructors"), Mitchell Enterprise, Ltd. ("Mitchell"), Spawglass Contractors, Inc. ("Spawglass"), and Zapalac/Reed Construction Company, LP ("Zapalac") of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d); *see also* 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 under Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Constructors. We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from Thos, Mitchell, Spawglass, or Zapalac explaining how the

release of the submitted information will affect their proprietary interests. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of either Thos, Mitchell, Spawglass, or Zapalac. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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). Accordingly, we conclude that the authority may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis the proprietary interests of Thos, Mitchell, Spawglass, or Zapalac.

Constructors claims that its Section B financial information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) protects “[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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Constructors states that the release of its Section B financial information would result in significant competitive harm to the company. Upon review, we find that Constructors has demonstrated that the release of its financial information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Thus, the authority must withhold the financial information in Section B of Constructors’ proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that portions of the submitted proposals are subject to section 552.136, which provides:

(a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. We have marked the insurance policy numbers that must be withheld pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the authority must withhold the financial information in Section B of Constructors' proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The authority must withhold the insurance policy numbers, which we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining 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*, 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,



Jaclyn N. Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JNT/krl

Ref: ID# 248989

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Todd Winnerman
MW Builders of Texas, Inc.
1701 North General Bruce
Drive/ 76501
P. O. Box 220
Temple, Texas 76504-2474
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt Allen
THOMAS S. BYRNE, LTD.
3 Cielo, Suite 395
1250 South Capitol of Texas Highway
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ruben Rodriguez
Vice President
CONSTRUCTORS
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2740
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

S. Shane Mitchell
MITCHELL ENTERPRISE, LTD.
112 East Cottage Street
Sherman Texas 75090
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joel D. Stone
SPAWGLASS CONTRACTORS,
INC.
1111 Smith Road
Austin, Texas 78721
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Zapalac
ZAPALAC/REED CONSTRUCTION
COMPANY, LP
1001 Capital of Texas Highway South,
Suite M222
Austin, T 78746-6423
(w/o enclosures)