



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 6, 2008

Mr. Hyattye O. Simmons
General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2008-15316

Dear Mr. Simmons:

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# 328521.

The Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for several categories of information pertaining to DART's policies and standards for promotions. You state that you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You also state that DART does not maintain some of the requested information.¹ You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.122 of the Government Code. Furthermore, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you state that you have notified Waters Consulting Group, Inc. ("Waters") 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 Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Initially, 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) of the Government Code 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, Waters has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, Waters has not provided us with any basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the requested 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*. Accordingly, we conclude that DART may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Waters may have in the information.

You assert that Attachment D is excepted under section 552.122 of the Government Code. Section 552.122(b) excepts from disclosure test items developed by a licensing agency or governmental body. In *Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994)*, this office determined that the term "test item" in section 552.122 includes any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated, but does not encompass evaluations of an employee's overall job performance or suitability. Whether information falls within the section 552.122 exception must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Open Records Decision No. 626 at 6 (1994)*. Upon review, we find that Attachment D, which generally consists of employee evaluations of DART officers, does not contain test items for purposes of section 552.122(b); therefore, you may not withhold this information under section 552.122 of the Government Code.

We note that some 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)*. Accordingly, the submitted information must be released to the requestor 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,



Bill Dobie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WJD/jh

Ref: ID# 328521

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Jimmie R. Graves
3209 Hamlett Lane
Garland, Texas 75053
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chuck Rohre
Assessment Center Facilitator
The Waters Consulting Group, Inc.
5050 Quorum Drive, Suite 625
Dallas, Texas 75245
(w/o enclosures)