



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2008

Mr. Christopher D. Taylor  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Waco Legal Services  
P.O. Box 2570  
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2008-11765

Dear Mr. Taylor:

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# 322226.

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for the proposals, evaluation documents, and contracts awarded for RFP No. 2006-056 (collection of delinquent property taxes). You indicate that some of the requested information is being released. You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the following law firms of the city's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor: Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson, L.L.P.; McCreary, Veselka, Bragg & Allen, P.C., in conjunction with Beard, Kultgen, Brophy, Bostwick & Dickson, L.L.P.; and Perdue, Brandon, Fielder Collins, & Mott, L.L.P. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (199) (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 reviewed the submitted information.

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, none of the interested third parties has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these law firms, and the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *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.

The submitted information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides 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.” The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue may 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. 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).

To conclude, the city must withhold the information marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information to the requestor, 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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/ma

Ref: ID# 322226

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Pierce M. Adkins  
Ledger Adkins LLP  
6161 Savoy Drive, Suite 801  
Houston, Texas 77036  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Glen Lewis  
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson, LLP  
P.O. Box 1422  
Waco, Texas 76703  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert L Meyers  
McCreary, Veselka, Bragg & Allen, P.C.  
100 North 6<sup>th</sup>, Suite 704  
Waco, Texas 76701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John T. Banks  
Perdue Brandon Fielder Collins & Mott LLP  
6300 La Calma #450  
Austin, Texas 78752  
(w/o enclosures)