



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 28, 2020

Ms. Dawn Roberts
Assistant City Attorney
City of Arlington
P.O. Box 90231
Arlington, Texas 76004-3231

OR2020-06493

Dear Ms. Roberts:

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# 814206 (ORR# 92512).

The City of Arlington (the "city") received a request for responses to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of the following third parties: AMPCUS; Berry Dunn; Experis Finance; Moss Adams, LLP; and RSI Systems d/b/a RSI Security. Accordingly, you inform us you notified these third parties of the request and the right to submit arguments to this office. *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 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 ruling, we have not received comments from any third party. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any third party may have in the information.

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.136 states, “Notwithstanding 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold all insurance policy numbers, bank account numbers, and bank routing numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information appears to 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 all insurance policy numbers, bank account numbers, and bank routing numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

¹This office will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sean McCormick
Attorney
Open Records Division

SMC/mo

Ref: ID# 814206

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

5 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)