



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

July 31, 2003

Mr. James R Lindley
General Counsel
Central Texas College
P.O. Box 1800
Killeen, Texas 76540-1800

OR2003-5278

Dear Mr. Lindley:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 185188.

Central Texas College (the "college") received a request for "[a]ll vendor pricing and responses for Replacement Telephone System." You state that the requested information may be confidential under section 552.110 of the Government Code, but make no arguments and take no position as to whether the information is so excepted from disclosure. You inform this office and provide documentation showing that you have notified five interested third parties (Affiliated Telephone, Mercury Communication Services ("Mercury"), Siemens Information and Communication ("Siemens"), SourceOne, and Sprint), whose proprietary interests may be implicated by the request, of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act (the "Act") in certain circumstances). As of the date of this ruling, this office has received responses from Siemens and SourceOne. We have considered the exceptions claimed and 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, none of the remaining third parties has submitted to this office its reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, Affiliated Telephone, Mercury, and Sprint have provided us no basis to conclude that their information is excepted from disclosure. *See, e.g.,* 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). Consequently, the information of these parties must be released, except as noted below.

In response to Siemens' arguments, we note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."). See also Open Records Decision No. 203 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by individual supplying information does not properly invoke section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement specifying otherwise.

SourceOne claims that its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 because release would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Section 552.104 states that information is excepted from required public disclosure if release of the information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. However, the purpose of this exception is to protect the interests of a governmental body usually in competitive bidding situations. See Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). Therefore, we do not consider SourceOne's claim under section 552.104, and because the college does not contend that the requested information is excepted under section 552.104, none of it may be withheld on this basis.

Both of the responding parties claim that their information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This exception protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision," and (2) "[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[.]" See Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a "trade secret" to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. *It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business* [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (emphasis added); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that component if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm); *National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). Upon review of the submitted arguments and the relevant information,

¹ The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS, § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

we find that neither Siemens nor SourceOne has demonstrated that any of its information constitutes either trade secret information under section 552.110(a) or commercial or financial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). Therefore, none of Siemens' or SourceOne's information may be withheld under section 552.110.

However, some of the submitted documents contain personal e-mail addresses of private individuals that must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 requires a governmental body 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a), (b). Section 552.137 does not apply to a general e-mail address or website address of a business, or to a government employee's work e-mail address. None of the parties inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any of the personal e-mail addresses contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, these e-mail addresses must be withheld under section 552.137. We have marked the types of e-mail addresses that must be withheld.

Finally, we note that portions of the submitted proposals are 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).

In summary, the college must withhold the types of e-mail addresses that we have marked under section 552.137. The remaining submitted information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Texas Building and Procurement 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/lmt

Ref: ID# 185188

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sherri Johnson McDonald
Technology Solutions, Inc.
1412 S. Robinson Dr.
Waco, Texas 76706
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Springfield
Affiliated Telephone
10109 McKalla Place, Suite F
Austin, Texas 78758
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Henry Tijerina
Siemens Information and
Communication Networks, Inc.
613 NW Loop 410
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Patty Harper
Sprint
1214 Dogwood
Killeen, Texas 76540-1150
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Talbert
Mercury Communication Services
8127 Mesa Drive, #C-304
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Erik Cline
SourceOne
800 West Idaho Street, Suite 308
Boise, ID 83702
(w/o enclosures)