ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 31, 2008

Ms. Anne M. Constantine
Legal Counsel
Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport
P.O. Box 619428
DFW Airport, Texas 75261-9428

OR2008-14913

Dear Ms. Constantine:

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# 326713.

The Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport Board (the "board") received a request for the scoring matrix related to the requestor's company, as well as three winning bidders' proposals submitted in response to a particular request for solicitation. You state the board has released some information. We understand you to raise section 552.136 of the Government Code for a portion of the submitted information. You also state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Hitachi Consulting ("Hitachi") and ObjectWin Technology, Inc. ("ObjectWin") of the board's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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). We have received comments from Hitachi. We have considered the submitted arguments and 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 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, ObjectWin has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the submitted information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary

information of this company, and the board 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).

Hitachi raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of its information. 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Among other things, Hitachi argues that the release of its information could deter vendors such as Hitachi from competing for government contracts, so as to lessen competition for such contracts and deprive governmental entities in future procurements. In advancing this argument, Hitachi relies on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton,* 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). *See also Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held that *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of Gov't Code § 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Hitachi's interests in the information at issue.

Upon review of Hitachi's arguments and the submitted information, we find that release of some of Hitachi's customer list, which we have marked, would cause it substantial competitive harm. However, we note that Hitachi has made some of its customer information publicly available on its website. Because Hitachi has published this information, we find Hitachi has failed to demonstrate that it treats this information as confidential proprietary information. Accordingly, the board may not withhold any customer

information that has been published on Hiatchi's website under section 552.110(b). Further, we determine Hitachi has not demonstrated that any portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (business entity must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Hitachi in this instance, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). We therefore conclude that the board must only withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that you have marked a tax identification number under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136(b) provides that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. A tax identification number is not an access device number for purposes of section 552.136; therefore, the board may not withhold this information under section 552.136.

Finally, we note that a portion of the remaining 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 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 board must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright 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 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Jordan Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JH/jb

Ref: ID# 326713

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Marty Small
AST Corporation
1755 Park Street, Suite 100
Naperville, Illinois 60563
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Uma Chidambaram
ObjectWin Technology, Inc.
2650 Fountain View Drive, Suite 405
Houston, Texas 77050
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Pete Gekas
Oracle Practice
Hitachi Consulting
2001 Bryan Street, Suite 3600
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)