



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 25, 2022

Ms. Erika Orr
Public Information Lead
Dallas Independent School District
9400 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75231

OR2022-05886

Dear Ms. Orr:

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# 932272 (Ref. Nos. R021078-111621 and R021134-120621).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received two requests for information related to a specified bid proposal. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Carter Energy, Douglas Distributing, Mansfield Oil Company, Martin Eagle Oil Company, Northwest Propane, Southern Counties Oil Company, and Truman Arnold Company. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the requests for information and of their 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 considered your claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

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 info relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from any of the notified third parties. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the notified third parties have a protected proprietary

interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the notified third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that a governmental body demonstrates, if released, would “harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future.” *Id.* § 552.104(a). 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.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.104 to the submitted information. Thus, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[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 government body is confidential.”¹ 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 number for purposes of this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the district must withhold all insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the district must release the remaining information.²

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

¹ 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).

² We note the information to be released contains social security numbers of living individuals. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision under the Act. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Chase D. Young
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDY/mo

Ref: ID# 932272

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)