



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 21, 2015

Mr. Ray Rodriguez
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2015-19698

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

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# 579803 (San Antonio file #W087983).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for bids submitted by Centerplate for catering services to the city convention center. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Centerplate. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Centerplate of the request for information and of its 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Centerplate. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We understand Centerplate to assert its submitted information is confidential because Centerplate marked it as confidential. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See Attorney General Opinion JM-672* (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Centerplate argues its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.128 of the Government Code. Section 552.128 is applicable to “[i]nformation submitted by a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business under a local, state, or federal certification program[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.128. Section 552.128(c) provides:

[i]nformation submitted by a vendor or contractor or a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship, a specific contract, or an application to be placed on a bidders list, including information that may also have been submitted in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business, is subject to required disclosure, excepted from required disclosure, or confidential in accordance with other law.

Id. § 552.128(c). In this instance, Centerplate submitted its proposal to the city in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship with the city. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any portion of Centerplate’s information under section 552.128 of the Government Code.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, No. 12-1007, 2015 WL 3854264. at *7 (Tex. June 19, 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at *9. Centerplate states it has competitors. In addition, Centerplate states disclosure of the information it has indicated could cause substantial injury to Centerplate because its competitors would use such knowledge to underbid Centerplate in the future, causing Centerplate to lose business and revenue. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Centerplate

has established the release of the information Centerplate seeks to withhold, which we have marked, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a).¹

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding 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. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, however any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Centerplate’s remaining argument against disclosure.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jennifer Luttrall".

Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 579803

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Alexander F. Powell
Centerplate
2187 Atlantic Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06902
(w/o enclosures)