



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 15, 2020

Mr. Brandon Dyson
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Angelo
72 West College Avenue
San Angelo, Texas 76903

OR2020-11020

Dear Mr. Dyson:

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# 819664 (City File No. R002621-011020).

The City of San Angelo (the "city") received a request for records pertaining to a specified address. Although you take no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of ALJ Lindsey Civil Engineers ("ALJ") and HKS, Inc. ("HKS").¹ Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these interested third parties of the request and their 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 received comments from HKS. We have considered the submitted arguments and 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

¹ 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 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). Pursuant to that correspondence, the city has informed this office it does not wish to make arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

this ruling, we have not received comments from ALJ. Thus, we have no basis to conclude ALJ 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest ALJ may have in the information.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states “information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

- (1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and
- (2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). HKS argues its information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). However, upon review, we find HKS has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating the information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the submitted information is 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. The city must release the submitted information; however, any information that is subject to 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 <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 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,

D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMC/jxd

Ref: ID# 819664

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)