



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 22, 2016

Mr. Robert Davis  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Austin  
P.O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2016-04185

Dear Mr. Davis:

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# 599162.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for a specified proposal submitted for a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is exempted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Clear Channel Airports ("Clear Channel").<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Clear Channel of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Clear Channel. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, because the interests of third parties can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the submitted arguments for the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1990).

Clear Channel argues some of its information consists of commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note Clear Channel was the winning bidder in this instance. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). In addition, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990). Upon review, we find Clear Channel has not established any of its information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, none of Clear Channel’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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. As no other exceptions against disclosure have been made, the submitted information must be released; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 599162

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ade B. Galloway  
Airport Operations Counsel  
Clear Channel Airports  
7450 Tilghman Street, Suite 104  
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18106  
(w/o enclosures)