



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 6, 2008

Mr. Brett Norbraten
Open Records Attorney
Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services
P.O. Box 149030
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2008-13654

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 323887.

The Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services (the "department") received a request for all proposals submitted to the department regarding a specified project, as well as the contract that was awarded to the winning bidder. You indicate that you are releasing the winning proposal and the contract to the requestor. You raise no exception to disclosure of the submitted proposals on behalf of the department. However, you indicate that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties who submitted these proposals to the department. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified RFD & Associates ("RFD"), CAI Texas ("CAI"), and COMSYS-Austin ("COMSYS") of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why its proposal 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 reviewed the submitted proposals.

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 letter, RFD, CAI, and COMSYS have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the submitted information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of these companies' proposals constitutes proprietary information. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, 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), 542 at 3 (1990). As the department makes no arguments regarding the submitted proposals, they must generally be released to the requestor.

We note, however, that some of the submitted proposals are 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). Therefore, the submitted proposals must be released to the requestor. However, any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with applicable 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,



Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/jb

Ref: ID# 323887

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Mariann H. Morelock
Director of Information Services
Strategic Partnerships, Inc.
6034 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78730-5066
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Anne Davison
President
RFD & Associates, Inc.
401 Camp Craft Road
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph F. Hessmiller
Director, CAI Texas
Computer Aid, Inc.
4111 Medical Parkway, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78756
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregory P. Stevens
Managing Director
COMSYS-Austin
4400 Post Oak Parkway, Suite 1800
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)