



October 1, 2001

Ms. Sarajane Milligan
Assistant County Attorney
County of Harris
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002-1700

OR2001-4388

Dear Ms. Milligan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 152647.

The County of Harris (the "county") received a request for the proposals submitted by G.E. Medical Systems Information Technologies ("G.E.") and Premier, Inc. ("Premier") for Job No. 01/0102. You claim that the requested information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The county has taken no position with regard to release of the information regarding G.E. and Premier. However, you have notified G.E. and Premier of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.305* (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances).

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, G.E. has not submitted to this office its reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the submitted information relating to G.E. is excepted from disclosure. *See Gov't Code § 552.110(b)* (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Therefore, the submitted information relating to G.E. may not be withheld from disclosure under section 552.110.

On the other hand, Premier has submitted arguments for withholding a portion of its information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) 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[.]” Gov’t Code § 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Premier argues that release of information regarding how and where it targets its customers, the unique features and specific capabilities of its Operations Outlook system, how it implements its programs, and the database architecture of its Operations Outlook software would cause it to suffer competitive injury. Based on Premier’s arguments and our review of the submitted information, we believe that Premier has demonstrated that release of most of the information it seeks to withhold would cause it substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we have marked in Premier’s proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that, although Premier states that disclosure of its pricing information “speaks directly to how competitive they are in the industry,” we do not believe that pricing information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative); *see also* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public funds by a governmental body is public information); Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 319 (1982) (finding information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not ordinarily excepted under section 552.110), 306 (1982) (finding that pricing proposals may only be withheld during bid submission process), 184 (1978), 175 (1977). Therefore, Premier’s Software Delivery, Maintenance and Implementation Pricing Information must be released.

We further note that a portion of Premier’s proposal is copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

Finally, we note that the submitted information regarding both G.E. and Premier contains e-mail addresses obtained from the public that are excepted from public disclosure. The Seventy-seventh Legislature recently added section 552.137 to chapter 552 of the Government Code. This new exception makes certain e-mail addresses confidential.¹ Senate Bill 694, as passed May 14, 2001, signed by the Governor May 26, 2001, and made effective immediately, provides in relevant part:

Sec. 552.137. CONFIDENTIALITY OF CERTAIN E-MAIL ADDRESSES.

(a) An e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Act of May 14, 2001, 77th Leg., R.S., S.B. 694, § 1 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.137). Section 552.137 requires the department to withhold an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body, unless the member of the public has affirmatively consented to its release. As there is no indication that either G.E. or Premier has consented to their release, the county must withhold the e-mail addresses in the submitted documents, which we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

To summarize, we conclude that: (1) the county must withhold the information we have marked in Premier's proposal under section 552.110; (2) while the county must allow inspection of the copyrighted information in Premier's proposal, the county need not furnish copies of such information to the requestor; (3) the county must withhold the e-mail addresses in both proposals under section 552.137; and (4) the remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must

¹House Bill 2589, which also makes certain e-mail addresses confidential, took effect on September 1, 2001. See Act of May 22, 2001, 77th Leg., R.S., H.B. 2589, § 5 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.136). The language of section 552.136, as added by House Bill 2589, is identical to that of section 552.137.

appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dept. of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Karen A. Eckerle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAE/sdk

Ref: ID# 152771

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim Long
MEDCO
35 North York Road
Willow Grove, Pennsylvania 19090-3490
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Marna M. Albanese
Smith, Helms, Mulliss, & Morre, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 28202
Charlotte, North Carolina 28231
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Davis
GE Medical Information Systems Technologies, Healthcare Solutions
1225 North Loop West, Suite 1055
Houston, Texas 77008
(w/o enclosures)