ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 18, 2007

Mr. John Danner
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2007-00603

Dear Mr. Danner:

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# 269270.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified financial statement and certain vendor payments, a proposal received in December, 2005, from Time Warner, and bids related to "PEG channels[.]" You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. You also indicate that release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of certain third parties. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the interested third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released.[1] *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions claimed and reviewed the submitted information.[2]

---

[1]The third parties that were notified pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: Technovations; RUSHWORKS; Long's Electronics; Video Services of America; Aves Audio Visual Systems, Inc.; Video Marketing Systems; Industrial Audio/Video, Inc.; and Time Warner Cable.

[2] We assume that the sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note that you did not submit information responsive to items three and four of the request. We assume the city has released this information to the requestor. If it has not, it must do so at this time to the extent that such information exists. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances). We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information.

We next 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 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, only Technovations has submitted to this office reasons explaining why its information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the remaining third parties' 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).

Technovations raises section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104(a) excepts from public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as Technovations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). Thus, because the city does not claim this exception, the city may not withhold any information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

You generally raise section 552.136 of the Government Code, which provides as follows:

> (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 type of information that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/eb

Ref: ID# 269270

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Charles L. Robinson
222 East Magnolia Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Johnson
Mr. Lee Eubanks
Technovations
4868 Research Drive
San Antonio, Texas 78240-5005
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rush Beesley
RUSHWORKS
2970 Hillside Drive
Highland Village, Texas 75077
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dennis Wood
Long's Electronics
2630 Fifth Avenue
Irondale, Alabama 35210-11240
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cyndi Anderson
Video Services of America
5417 Bandera, Suite 612
San Antonio, Texas 78238
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sandra Ramos
Aves Audio Visual Systems, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Sugar Land, Texas 77487
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steven Bodner
Video Marketing Systems
240 South Main Street, Unit J
South Hackensack, New Jersey 07606
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Lopez
Industrial Audio/Video, Inc.
P.O. Box 25127
Houston, Texas 77265-5127
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jon Gary Herrera
Time Warner Cable
P.O. Box 460849
San Antonio, Texas 78246
(w/o enclosures)