



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 7, 2007

Ms. Jacqueline Cullom Murphy  
Assistant Criminal District Attorney  
Civil Section  
300 Dolorosa, Ste. 4049  
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2007-07163

Dear Ms. Murphy:

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# 280508.

The Bexar County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") received two requests for the proposals and scoring information regarding RFP #2007-003. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108, 552.111, and 552.139 of the Government Code. You also state that the submitted information may contain proprietary information, and thus, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified Pro Tech Monitoring, Inc. (Pro Tech), BI Incorporated ("BI"), Secure Alert, Inc. ("Secure"), Satellite Tracking of People, LLC (Satellite), Advanced Public Safety, Inc. ("Advanced"), Omnilink Systems, Inc. ("Omnilink"), and iSECUREtrac of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information 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 under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Satellite, BI, and iSECUREtrac. We have considered all of the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that BI and iSECUREtrac submit arguments against the disclosure of portions of their proposals that were not submitted by the district attorney. BI argues that its financial statements are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the

You claim that portions of the submitted information are protected under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from public disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this exception is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 63 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions that reflect the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Furthermore, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state that the submitted score sheets, price tabulation form, and ranking forms should be withheld pursuant to section 552.111. You argue that this information was created by Bexar County personnel in a deliberative process aimed at providing advice, opinion and recommendations for executing an agreement for a Global Positioning System Tracking Equipment and Services. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude that the district attorney has established the applicability of the section 552.111 to some of the information at issue. However, we find that portions of the information you seek to withhold are purely factual. Accordingly, the district attorney may only withhold the information we have marked in the scoring matrix under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information in the scoring matrix and all of the information in the price tabulation form and ranking forms may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Satellite and iSECUREtrac claim that portions of each company's proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. 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. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 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

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue are 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 protected by copyright. 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 materials protected by copyright, 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 district attorney may only withhold the information we have marked in the scoring matrix under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district attorney must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The district attorney must withhold the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district attorney must release the remaining information, but any copyrighted information may only 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, 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).

Mr. Randy Olshen  
President  
Secure Alert, Inc.  
150 West Civil Center Drive, Suite 400  
Sandy, Utah 84070  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steven Logan  
CEO  
Satellite Tracking of People, LLC  
4801 Woodway Drive, Suite 110W  
Houston, Texas 77056-1828  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeff Rubenstein  
CEO  
Advanced Public Safety, Inc.  
500 Fairway Drive, Suite. 204  
Deerfield Beach, Florida 33441  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel Graff-Radford  
VP  
Omnilink Systems, Inc.  
6120 Windward Parkway Suite 100  
Alpharetta, Georgia 30005  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Trampe  
Proposal Coordinator  
iSECUREtrac  
5078 South 111<sup>th</sup> Street  
Omaha, Nebraska 68137  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Douglas Zbylut  
Government Relations Rep.  
iSECUREtrac  
5078 South 111<sup>th</sup> Street  
Omaha, Nebraska 68137  
(w/o enclosures)