



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 21, 2016

Mr. Mark E. Dempsey  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Garland  
P.O. Box 469002  
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2016-01588

Dear Mr. Dempsey:

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# 593194 (GCA15-0690 and GCA15-0704).

The City of Garland (the "city") received two requests for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of two third parties. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their 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 Motorola Solutions, Inc. ("Motorola"). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>We note we asked the city to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines that information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice).

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 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, we have not received comments from the remaining third party explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third party may have in the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"). Section 418.181 provides, "[t]hose documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism." *Id.* § 418.181. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a claim under one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must be accompanied by an adequate explanation of how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

Motorola and the city inform us some of the submitted information relates to the public safety communications system to be used by the city's first responders. Motorola and the city argue, and we agree, the communications system is critical infrastructure because it will be used by first responders, and its proper functioning is vital during a public safety emergency, including a terrorist attack. *See id.* § 421.001 (defining "critical infrastructure" to include "all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, economy, or morale of the state or the nation"). Motorola states release of the information at issue "could expose vulnerabilities of the communications system and many similar systems throughout the State of Texas and put all Texans at risk." Based on the submitted arguments and our review of the information at issue, we find portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, identify technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city's communication systems to an act of terrorism. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101

of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue reveals technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city's critical infrastructure, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Motorola argues its itemized pricing information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, which 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[.]" *Id.* § 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* ORD 661 at 5.

Motorola claims its itemized pricing information constitutes commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause the company substantial competitive harm. However, we note the contract at issue was awarded to Motorola. 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); *see generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of Motorola's pricing information under section 552.110(b).

We note 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. 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.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only 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](#), 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 'Cristian Rosas-Grillet', written in a cursive style.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CRG/akg

Ref: ID# 593194

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)