



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 13, 2016

Ms. Lisa Biediger
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2016-01048

Dear Ms. Biediger:

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# 593930 (File No. W100385-101915).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the city's request for proposals for Marketing Services for the city's Tricentennial Celebration. You state the city has provided the requestor with some of the responsive information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of GDC Marketing and Ideation; KGBTexas Communications; and The Mighty Group. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of their rights 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 reviewed the submitted information.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received any comments from the third parties explaining why any of

the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the third parties have any protected proprietary interests in the information. *See id.* § 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. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the third parties may have in the information.

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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.”¹ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note that some of the remaining information 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *See id.*; *see also* 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.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, but any information protected by 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.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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, 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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 593930

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Katie Harvey
KGBTexas Communications
200 East Grayson, Suite 210
San Antonio, Texas 78215
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dona Kotzur
GDC Marketing and Ideation
219 East Houston, Suite 350
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Shokare Nakpodia
The Mighty Group
1160 East Commerce, Suite 200
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(w/o enclosures)