



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

June 5, 2003

Ms. Ruth H. Soucy  
Deputy General Counsel  
Comptroller of Public Accounts  
P.O. Box 13528  
Austin, Texas 78711-3528

OR2003-3864

Dear Ms. Soucy:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 182290.

The Comptroller of Public Accounts (the "comptroller") received a request for information related to RFP 149e, digital imaging services for the State Council on Competitive Government. You state that the requestor "verbally modified the request to exclude social security numbers, private e-mail addresses and other personal information" and does not seek the proposals that were disqualified. Therefore, our ruling does not address such information. You indicate that you have released some responsive information to the requestor. You claim that certain responsive information submitted is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Although you take no position on whether the requested proposals are excepted from disclosure, you indicate, and provide documentation showing that, pursuant to section 552.305, you have notified interested third parties DocuData Solutions ("DocuData"), Precision Micrographics & Imaging ("Precision"), and Neubus, Inc. ("Neubus") of the request for their information and invited them to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *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 Gov't Code § 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). We have considered the arguments presented and reviewed the submitted information.

We note at the outset that the submitted proposals have been designated as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Public Information Act (the "Act") simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

Next, we note 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 letter, only Neubus has submitted to this office reasons explaining why the comptroller should not release its information. Therefore, DocuData and Precision provide us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information.

Neubus argues that its information is protected under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 which 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 information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary 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
- (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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted 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. *See* 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. *See* 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 Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

To establish the applicability of sections 552.110(a) and (b), Neubus merely makes conclusory and generalized allegations. Therefore, we find Neubus has not met its burden of making a prima facie case as required by section 552.110(a). See Gov't Code § 552.110(a). Further, Neubus has not made a factual or evidentiary showing that release of the information would result in substantial competitive injury. See Gov't Code § 552.110(b); see also *Nat'l Parks*, 498 F.2d. 765; ORD 661. Consequently, we conclude the comptroller may not withhold Neubus' information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We also note that certain types of personal financial information are protected by common-law privacy under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Information must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy when the information is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. See *Industrial Found. v. Texas Ind. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Prior decisions of this office have determined that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common-law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from disclosure by common-law privacy to be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common-law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis).

In this instance, we find certain financial information in the submitted documents that may be confidential under section 552.101. If the insured in the documents at issue is an individual or a sole proprietorship, then the information that we have marked must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Otherwise, the marked information is not private under section 552.101 and must be released. See generally Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); see also *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy).

Additionally, we note the submitted documents contain information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. This provision excepts from public disclosure information relating to a driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. In this case, the submitted information contains a vehicle identification number. Therefore, the comptroller must withhold the vehicle identification number, which we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We also note that the submitted information contains an account number. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states 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. The controller must, therefore, withhold the marked account number under section 552.136.

Finally, the comptroller argues that copies of the RFP evaluation score sheets are excepted from required disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intra-agency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6 (1993). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the advice, opinion, or recommendations. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 4-5 (1993).

Upon careful review of the submitted documents, we find that the submitted evaluation score sheets reflect the policymaking process of the comptroller and thus, may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the comptroller must release the submitted proposals of DocuData, Precision, and Neubus, but must redact the information which we have marked under sections 552.101,<sup>1</sup> 553.130, and 552.136. The evaluation score sheets may be withheld under section 552.111.

---

<sup>1</sup> As applicable. *See* discussion *infra*.

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,



Robert F. Maier  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RFM/seg

Ref: ID# 182290

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Richard S. Griffith, Jr.  
Chairman  
Image API, Inc.  
2670 Executive Center West  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Nicole Callis  
Business Development  
Image API, Inc.  
8107 Springdale Road, Suite 108  
Austin, Texas 78724  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dwight Alford  
Account Manager  
DocuData Solutions  
8130 John Carpenter Freeway  
Dallas, Texas 75247  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eric Kennedy  
Vice President  
Neubus, Inc.  
4201 Parmer Lane, Building A, Suite 275  
Austin, Texas 78727  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Peggy Gerstenberg  
Precision Micrographics and Imaging  
8204 North Lamar Boulevard, Suite C20  
Austin, Texas 78753  
(w/o enclosures)