



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 10, 2008

Ms. Chelsea Thornton
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2008-00554

Dear M:s. Thornton

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# 300560.

The Office of the Governor (the "governor") received a request for information pertaining to "any private sale or lease of the Texas Lottery since January 1, 2003." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.106, 552.110, and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also indicate that the release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you inform us that "each company has been notified of this request." *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). Merrill Lynch asserts that its information is excepted under sections 552.110 and 552.131 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.¹

You assert that Exhibit E is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give

¹We note that the Texas Lottery Commission (the "commission") also has a copy of the information in Exhibit E. The commission received a request for this information under the Act, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2007-16884 (2007).

advantage to a competitor or bidder.” The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body’s interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Moreover, section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). Section 552.104 does not except information relating to competitive bidding situations once a contract has been awarded. Open Records Decision Nos. 306 (1982), 184 (1978).

You inform us that the documents in Exhibit E “were submitted to the [governor] from outside companies who are interested in the sale or lease of the Texas Lottery” and that there has not been an agreement made with any of these companies. You do not inform us, however, that the sale or lease of the Texas Lottery is in progress or otherwise part of an ongoing competitive bidding situation. *See* Open Records Decision No. 170 at 2 (1977) (release of bids while negotiation of proposed contract is in progress would necessarily result in an advantage to certain bidders at the expense of others and could be detrimental to the public interest in the contract under negotiation). We also find your assertion that release of these offers to negotiate “will damage the companies’ ability to complete in the process and would give a clear advantage to competitors by revealing a company’s strategy” is entirely too speculative. *See* Open Records Decision No. 509 at 5 (1988) (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 to withhold information under predecessor statute). Additionally, we find you have not established that the governor has a competitive interest that would be harmed by release of the submitted offers to negotiate. Therefore, we conclude you have not demonstrated that public release of Exhibit E would cause specific harm to the governor’s interests in a competitive bidding situation. Accordingly, the governor may not withhold Exhibit E under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

You assert that Exhibit B is excepted under section 552.106 of the Government Code. Section 552.106(b) excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal bill analysis or working paper prepared by the governor’s office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.106(b). You state that Exhibit B is a printed bill relating to the lottery with handwritten notes that “reflect the [governor]’s unofficial, preliminary determination of the [governor]’s position on the bill.” You also inform us that “[t]he notes were by the Governor’s staff for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation.” Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we agree that the governor may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.106 of the Government Code.²

You assert that Exhibits C and D are excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum

²As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other arguments to withhold Exhibit B under the Act.

or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 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*, 630 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, 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, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 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. 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* ORD 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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third-party consultant. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (1995) (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body’s request and performing task that is within governmental body’s authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body’s consultants). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9.

You inform us that Exhibit C “is a series of notes, created by several employees with the [governor]’s Budget Planning and Policy division [that] were drafted to memorialize

meetings held with outside individuals in exploring the concept of selling or leasing the Texas Lottery.” You also state that the governor “received proposals from outside companies regarding the sale or lease of the lottery” and that employees of the governor “met with these outside companies as part of the policy deliberative process.” You acknowledge that these notes contain factual information, but assert that “[a]ny facts reflected in the notes are facts that the drafter thought particularly important to memorialize, and as such, [are] clearly opinion[.]” After review of your representations and the information at issue, we agree that the governor may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111. However, we find you have not established that section 552.111 is applicable to the remaining information and the governor may not withhold the remaining information on that ground.

This office has also concluded that a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You inform us that Exhibit D “is a draft memo relating to the sale or lease of the lottery” and indicate that it will be released to the public in its final form. Based on this representation, we agree that the governor may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We next note that 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Merrill Lynch is the only interested third party to submit to this office reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of any other interested third party, and the governor may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

The governor and Merrill Lynch assert that the information at issue in Exhibit E is excepted 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: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” 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

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); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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.³ Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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. ORD 552 at 5-6. 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).

³The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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).

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.” 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Having considered the arguments of the governor and Merrill Lynch and reviewed the information at issue, we find that none of the submitted information has been shown to meet the definition of a trade secret and necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim have not been demonstrated. We also find that the governor and Merrill Lynch have made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Thus, none of the information at issue may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110.

Merrill Lynch also raises section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Section 552.131(a) relates to economic development information and provides the following:

Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (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.

Gov’t Code § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” and “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.” *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Merrill Lynch has failed to explain how any of the remaining submitted information consists of economic development negotiations that relate to a trade secret or commercial or financial information involving it and the governor. *See id.* §552.131.

Accordingly, the governor may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.131 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue may be 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 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).

To conclude, the governor may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.106 of the Government Code. The governor may also withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C, as well as Exhibit D in its entirety, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The governor must release the remaining information to the requestor, 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 300560

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lauren Reinlie
Texans for Public Justice
609 West 19th Street, Suite E
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christine Walsh
Merrill Lynch
4 World Financial Center
North Tower, 9th Floor
New York, New York 10080
(w/o enclosures)