



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 26, 2008

Mr. Christopher Taylor
Assistant City Attorney
City of Waco - Legal Services
P.O. Box 2570
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2008-08670

Dear Mr. Taylor:

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# 314061.

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for the bid evaluations, tabulations, scoring information, and submitted responses pertaining to a request for proposals to provide the city with copier services. You take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information. However, you believe that release of this information could implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Ikon Office Solutions, Inc.; DOCUmentation, Inc.; Johnnie's Office Solutions, Inc.; PCPC Direct, Ltd.; Digital Plus; and Peters and Bauer, Inc. of this request 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); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

We 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from any of the third parties that were notified. Thus, because none of the third parties have demonstrated that any of the information at issue is proprietary for the purposes of the Act, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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).

We note that the submitted information includes insurance policy numbers, which are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.136(b) 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. Thus, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers that we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note that some of the submitted information appears to 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. 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).

In summary, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released, but only in accordance 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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).

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 challenge 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 314061

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. David L. Willie
3730 Franklin Avenue
Waco, Texas 76710
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Debbie Howard
IKON
510 North Valley Mills Drive
Waco, Texas 76710
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Barbieri
DOCUvation, Inc.
1020 North Valley Mills Drive
Waco, Texas 76710
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Adam Guillen
Johnnie's Office Solutions, Inc.
1618 West Avenue M, Suite D
Temple, Texas 76504
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Deborah Newman
PCPC Direct, Ltd.
10690 Shadow Wood Drive, Suite 132
Houston, Texas 77043
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Melva Wiley
Digital Plus
108 East Pine
West, Texas 76691
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Travis Fagg
Peters and Bauer, Inc.
2516 West Waco Drive
Wacos, Texas 76710
(w/o enclosures)