



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 18, 2004

Ms. Mary Ross
Executive Director
West Central Texas Workforce Development Board
400 Oak Street
Abilene, Texas 79602

OR2004-7015

Dear Ms. Ross:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 207413.

The West Central Texas Workforce Development Board (the "board") received a request for information concerning the proposal submitted by Policy Studies, Inc. ("PSI") for operation and management of the board's workforce center system. While you do not raise any exceptions to disclosure on behalf of the board, you indicate that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of PSI. Thus, you seek to withhold information marked "confidential" by PSI pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state that you have notified PSI of the request and of its 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 Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and the comments submitted by PSI.

As a preliminary matter, we note that PSI seeks to withhold sections of its proposal that the board has not submitted for review. We do not reach PSI's arguments with respect to information that has not been submitted for our review by the board. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body seeking attorney general's opinion under the Act must submit a copy or representative samples of the specific information requested). With respect to the information the board has submitted for our review, we address PSI's comments.

In its comments to this office, PSI identifies specific sections of the proposal as information the company considers to be "proprietary and confidential." PSI has not, however, provided

any arguments explaining why such information is excepted from required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Therefore, PSI has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Because PSI has not established that the submitted information falls within an exception to disclosure, we determine that the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under the Act and may not be withheld.

We note that a portion of the submitted information is 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 protected by copyright. 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 materials protected by copyright, 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).

In summary, the board must release the submitted information to the requestor. Information protected by copyright must be released in compliance with copyright law.

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 thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten 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 ten 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 ten 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); *Tex. 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 ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 207413

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lani Walters
FOIA Group, Inc.
101 South Whiting Street, 16th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22304
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Cameron Horan
Policy Studies, Inc.
1899 Wynkoop Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80202
(w/o enclosures)