




ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT



September 15, 2014

Ms. Lysia H. Bowling  
City Attorney  
City of San Angelo  
72 West College Avenue  
San Angelo, Texas 76903

OR2014-16254

Dear Ms. Bowling:

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# 536458.

The City of San Angelo (the "city") received a request for a copy of a specified proposal submitted in response to request for proposals No: OP-01-14. Although you take no position as to whether the requested information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interest of Republic Services of Texas LTD ("Republic"). Accordingly, you state you notified Republic of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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.

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 Republic explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the 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, 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Republic may have in the information.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[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.”<sup>1</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Upon review, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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 insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, 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.


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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kenny Moreland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KJM/ds

Ref: ID# 536458

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Kenneth Ramzinski  
Republic Waste Services of Texas, LTD  
1422 Hughes Street  
San Angelo, Texas 76903  
(w/o enclosures)

D7S



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT  
POST OFFICE BOX 12548  
AUSTIN TEXAS 78711-2548

*Return Service Requested*  
MC-014

OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
STATE OF TEXAS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE

RYAN HOBBS  
PO BOX 17126  
AUSTIN TX 78610

neopost  
09/15/2014  
FIRST-CLASS MAIL  
US POSTAGE \$000.48



ZIP 78701  
041L12200075

7876087126 B002

