ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 4, 2004

Ms. Zandra L. Narvaez
Legal Services Division
City Public Service of San Antonio
P.O. Box 1771
San Antonio, Texas 78296-1771

OR2004-1641

Dear Ms. Narvaez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197125.

City Public Service of San Antonio ("CPS") received a request for "a complete copy of the top three proposals for EAP services, with the exception of Workers Assistance Program's proposal [and] a listing of all bidders, the prices submitted and evaluation criteria scores." You inform us that CPS is releasing two of the top three proposals and a list of all bidders and their evaluation scores. You have submitted for our review the prices submitted by the bidders and a copy of the third requested proposal. You take no position and make no arguments regarding the submitted information but have notified third parties Minter & Associates, Logical Management Solutions, and Horizon Behavioral Services of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office in accordance with section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed 10 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, none of the notified third parties has

submitted to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information protected under section 552.110, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; 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).

We note, however, 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 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, because we have received no arguments and the information is not otherwise confidential by law, the submitted information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal 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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be

provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 appeal 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Denis C. McElroy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DCM/lmt

Ref: ID# 197125

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rick Dielman
Workers Assistance Program
2525 Wallingwood Drive, Bldg. 5
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Judy Millspaugh
Logical Management Solutions, Inc.
P.O. Box 6746
San Antonio, Texas 78209
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Laurel Peterson
Horizon Behavioral Services
410 17th Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John A. Minter
Minter & Associates, P.A.
7272 Wurzbach, Suite 501
San Antonio, Texas 78240
(w/o enclosures)