



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 22, 2003

Ms. Sandi Jowers  
Senior Purchaser  
Texas State Library and Archives Commission  
P.O. Box 12927  
Austin, Texas 78711-2927

OR2003-6635

Dear Ms. Powers:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 188160.

The Texas State Library and Archives Commission (the "commission") received a request for all documents submitted to the commission in response to a specified request for proposals.<sup>1</sup> The commission takes no position with regard to the release of the requested information. However, you state that you have notified the eight interested third parties 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 section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act in certain circumstances). The commission has submitted the documents at issue to this office. We also received correspondence from Blue Angel Technologies, Inc. ("Blue Angel"), Ex Libris (USA), Inc. ("Libris"), Fretwell-Downing, Inc. ("Fretwell"), and Innovative Interfaces ("Innovative"). We have considered their arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Blue Angel, Libris, Fretwell, and Innovative assert section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the

---

<sup>1</sup>The commission sought a clarification of the request for information. *See Gov't Code § 552.222* (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (stating that when governmental bodies are presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed).

information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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 single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and

(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 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Public Information Act (the “Act”) is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (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) 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).

Having reviewed the submitted briefs, we conclude that Blue Angel has established that portions of its proposal are excepted under section 552.110. We have marked the information that the commission must withhold. However, we conclude that Fretwell, Innovative, and Libris have not demonstrated that their information qualifies as trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We also find that Blue Angel has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of the remainder of their information would likely result in substantial competitive harm to them, nor have Fretwell, Innovative, or Libris made such a representation in regard to their information. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 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). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, the commission must withhold only the Blue Angel information we have marked.

Additionally, 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 decision, none of the remaining

---

<sup>2</sup>Blue Angel does not assert section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

interested third parties have submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, these parties have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *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). Therefore, the submitted information relating to the remaining interested third parties is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted proposals contain information that 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).

In summary, we conclude that the commission must withhold the information we have marked in Blue Angel's proposal under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 188160

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Sergio Uribe  
Western Regional Sales  
Auto-Graphics, Inc.  
3201 Temple Avenue  
Pomona, California 91768-3279  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jon S. Riewe  
Executive Vice President  
Blue Angel Technologies, Inc.  
P.O. Box 987  
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0987  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Goldner  
Executive Vice President  
Fretwell-Downing, Inc.  
7400 West 132nd Street, Suite 140  
Overland Park, Kansas 66213  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marc Roberson  
South Eastern Regional  
Accounts Manager  
Dynix  
400 West 5050 North  
Provo, Utah 84604  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick C. Sommers  
Chief Executive Officer  
SIRSI Corporation  
101 Washington St. SE  
Huntsville, Alabama 35801-4827  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sean O'Doherty  
National Accounts Manager  
Ex Libris (USA), Inc.  
627 San Fernando Avenue  
Berkeley, California 94707  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Heidi Wallace  
Contracts Manager  
Innovative Interfaces  
5850 Shellmound Way  
Emeryville, California 94608  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sebastian Hammer  
Director  
Index Data Aps  
Kobmagergade 43  
DK-1150 Kobenhavn K  
Denmark  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Phyllis B. Spies  
Vice President  
Worldwide Library Services  
OCLC Online Computer Library Ctr, Inc.  
6565 Frantz Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395  
(w/o enclosures)