



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 12, 2006

Ms. Cynthia J. Kreider
Attorney
Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2006-11949

Dear Ms. Kreider:

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# 261821.

The Department of Information Resources (the "department") received two requests for information pertaining to RFO number DIR-SDD-TMP-077. You state that five companies submitted proposals in response to this RFO. You further state that the department has released a portion of the requested information. You claim that the remaining requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of four of the companies: Athens Consulting Group, Inc. ("Athens"), MCCR, Inc. ("MCCR"), SAP Public Services, Inc. ("SAP"), and TiBA Solutions, L.L.C. ("TiBA"). Accordingly, the department has notified the interested third parties of the department's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why information pertaining to their companies should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); 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 to disclosure in certain circumstances).* We have received comments from TiBA. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party

should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Athens, MCCR, and SAP have not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to them should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to Athens, MCCR, and SAP would implicate their proprietary interests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of Athens, MCCR, and SAP.

The department states that Athens, MCCR, SAP, and TiBA labeled some of their information confidential and indicates it should be treated as such. 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through a contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released.

Next, we note that TiBA has submitted comments arguing that a portion of its proposal should be withheld from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (2) commercial 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.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is the following:

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 single or ephemeral events 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). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.¹ *Id.* This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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). 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 requested information. *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).

Upon review, we find that TiBA has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990); *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business" rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business"). We also find that TiBA has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause its company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661

¹ The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are the following: (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. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

(1999) (must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of particular information at issue). Because TiBA has failed to meet its burden under section 552.110 for the information at issue, the department may not withhold any of this information on the basis of any proprietary interest that TiBA may have in the information. As TiBA raises no further exceptions to disclosure, the information at issue must be released.

The department also contends, however, that 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of materials that are subject to copyright protection 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). Accordingly, in releasing the submitted information the department must release copyrighted information only 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 departmented to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General 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,



Tamara L. Harswick
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TLH/sdk

Ref: ID# 261821

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steve Haddix
c/o Cynthia J. Kreider
Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Elizabeth Semmler
HR Manager
TiBA Solutions, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 933
Simpsonville, SC 29681
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Israel P. Martinez, Jr.
President and CEO
Athens Consulting Group, Inc.
P.O. Box 948
Roanoke, Texas 76362
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher Phender
Director of Contracts
SAP Public Services, Inc.
399 West Chester Pike
Newtown Square, Pennsylvania 19073
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David W. Lawson
MCCR, Inc.
1720 Regal Row, Suite 117
Dallas, Texas 75235
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenneth B. Brower
President and CEO
TiBA Solutions, L.L.C.
201 Brookfield Parkway, Suite 200
Greenville, South Carolina 29607
(w/o enclosures)