



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 1, 2017

Mr. Andrew Devine
Senior Associate Attorney
Dallas County Hospital District
d/b/a Parkland Health & Hospital System
5201 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75235

OR2017-02282

Dear Mr. Devine:

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# 644515 (DCHD# 16-75).

The Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health & Hospital System (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals.¹ You state the district released some information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

implicate the proprietary interests of multiple third parties.² Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights 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 any of the third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties may have in the information.

We note some of the submitted 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. As no exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the district must release the submitted 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.

²The district notified: Admiral Communications, Inc.; AppliedTech Group LLC; EDI, Ltd; Elert & Associates; EMC² Corporation; Gene Burton & Associates; Honeywell Building Solutions; Kroll Security Group; Megahertz Technology, Inc.; Mazetti and Associates; RTKL Associates, Inc.; Shen Milsom & Wilke; Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.; Stantec f/k/a Sparling; Syska Hennessy Group; TechKnowledge Consulting Corporation; TEECOM; Verizon Business; WAI-WIZE I, LP; and The Wulk Engineering Group.

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,



Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 644515

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

20 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)