



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

May 30, 2003

Mr. Mark E. Dempsey
Assistant City Attorney
City of Garland
P.O. Box 469002
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2003-3679

Dear Mr. Dempsey:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 181875.

The City of Garland (the "city") received a written request for "Public Bid Documents relating to Intergraph Public Safety" ("Intergraph").¹ In accordance with section 552.305(d), the city notified representatives of Intergraph of the records request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why portions of their proposal should not be released to the public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act in certain circumstances). 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).

Intergraph responded to your section 552.305 notice and contends that a specific portion of the submitted proposal is excepted from required public disclosure. However, Intergraph has not raised any specific exception to disclosure that would protect the information they seek

¹We note that although you have submitted to this office, in addition to the requested information, the executed contract between the city and Intergraph, we do not address here the extent to which the submitted contract is subject to public disclosure as that information is not responsive to the records request.

to withhold, nor have they otherwise provided any legal basis for withholding that information. Accordingly, we conclude that this office has no basis on which to conclude that Intergraph has met its burden of establishing that any portion of its proposal is excepted from required public disclosure. Accordingly, we conclude that the proposal must be released to the requestor in its entirety, with the following exception.

We note that the proposal contains a private e-mail address. Section 552.137 of the Government Code makes certain e-mail addresses confidential and provides in relevant part:

(a) An e-mail address *of a member of the public* that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release. [Emphasis added.]

We have marked the e-mail address that consists of a private e-mail address that must be withheld pursuant to section 552.137 unless the city receives an affirmative consent to release from the person to whom the e-mail address belongs.

Finally, we note that portions of the submitted proposal are copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/RWP/seg

Ref: ID# 181875

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steven Geiszler
9145 Seagrove Drive
Dallas, Texas 75243
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Deborah Fabacher
Senior Contract Administrator
Intergraph Public Safety
P.O. Box 6418
Huntsville, Alabama 35824
(w/o enclosures)