



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 1, 2008

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204-5491

OR2008-08838

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 314790.

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for winning proposals and final contracts pertaining to Calence, L.L.C. ("Calence") and HP. You state that the district has released the contract information to the requestor.¹ You claim that the release of some of the remaining requested information may affect the proprietary interests of third parties Calence and HP. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you state that you notified these third parties of the request and of their 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 Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note that third party Calence objects to disclosure of the contract; however, the district has not submitted the contract at issue to this office for review. We also note that the district has not submitted HP's proposal for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the district and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the district. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Calence seeks to withhold portions of its proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, which protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*

Upon review of Calence’s arguments and the information at issue, we find that Calence has made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that the release of its customer information, which we have marked, would cause it substantial competitive harm. Thus, this marked information must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b). We conclude, however, that Calence has failed to demonstrate that any other portion of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Furthermore, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110(b), the district must withhold only those portions of the submitted information that we have marked.

We note that the remaining submitted information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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.”² Gov’t Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

²This office will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue appear 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 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 district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information at issue must be released, but any copyrighted information may only be released 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).

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 314790

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Pansy Narendorf
Bates Investigations, Inc.
4131 Spicewood Springs, Suite J-2
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Fong
Mr. Joe Hamilton
Calence Headquarters
1560 West Fountainhead Parkway,
2nd Floor
Tempe, Arizona 85282
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. J. Scott Sheehan
Mr. Chris Payne
Greenberg Traurig, L.L.P.
1000 Louisiana, Suite 1800
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

HP
c/o Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204-5491
(w/o enclosures)