



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 30, 2003

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2003-6916

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 188643.

The City of Lubbock (the "City") received a request for "a copy of the proposal submitted by Oldani." You assert the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. Additionally, you provide supporting documentation showing that the City notified The Oldani Group, Inc. ("Oldani") of the request for information to afford it an opportunity to supply objections to release of the submitted proposal. *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 the Act in certain circumstances). In response to your notification, we have received comments from Oldani. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305; ORD 542. We reviewed the information you submitted and considered the exceptions claimed by the City and Oldani.

Initially, we address the City's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body that requests an attorney general decision under section 552.301(a) must, within a reasonable time, but not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of receiving the written request, submit to the attorney general: (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld; (2) a copy of the written request for information; (3)

a signed statement as to the date on which the written request for information was received by the governmental body or evidence sufficient to establish that date; and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples of it, if a voluminous amount of the information was requested, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e).

You state that the City received the written request for information on July 14, 2003. Thus, the City should have submitted its written comments and a copy of the specific information requested, or a representative sample, no later than August 4, 2003. However, the required documentation you submitted to this office has a postmark date of August 5, 2003. Consequently, we conclude that the City failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision.

According to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. A governmental body must release information presumed public under section 552.302, unless it demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling interest exists when some other source of law makes the information confidential or third party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Section 552.104, a discretionary exception under the Act, does not constitute a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). However, sections 552.101 and 552.110, which protect the interests of third parties, can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of these exceptions.

First, we address whether section 552.110 of the Government Code, as asserted by Oldani, excerpts portions of the submitted information.¹ Section 552.110 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

¹ We note the City's deference to Oldani as to the relevance of section 552.110 of the Government Code.

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 excepted 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) 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) 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 National 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 section 552.110, we find Oldani merely makes conclusory and generalized allegations. Therefore, we find Oldani 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, we determine that Oldani has not made a sufficient specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of the information it seeks to withhold 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 City may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Next, we address the City's arguments under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." The City asserts section 252.049 of the Local Government Code governs the submitted information until a contract is awarded. Section 252.049 provides as follows:

- (a) Trade secrets and confidential information in competitive sealed bids are not open for public inspection.
- (b) If provided in a request for proposals, proposals shall be opened in a manner that avoids disclosure of the contents to competing offerors and keeps the proposals secret during negotiations. All proposals are open for public inspection after the contract is awarded, but trade secrets and confidential information in the proposals are not open for public inspection.

Local Gov't Code § 252.049. This provision merely duplicates the protection section 552.110 of the Government Code provides to trade secret and commercial or financial information. Neither the City nor Oldani demonstrates that any of the requested information qualifies as either trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information under section 552.110. Thus, the City may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 252.049 of the Local Government Code.

Last, we note that the submitted information contains copyrighted materials. 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).

In summary, neither the City nor Oldani has established the applicability of their claimed exceptions to required public disclosure. Accordingly, the City must release the submitted information to the requestor; however, in doing so, the City must comply with applicable 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, 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,



Christen Sorrell
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CHS/seg

Ref: ID# 188643

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Stacy V. Layton
Director of Business Operations and Development
The Waters Consulting Group, Inc.
2695 Villa Creek Drive, Suite 104
Dallas, Texas 75234-7328
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerrold Oldani
President
The Oldani Group
10900 Northeast 4th Street, Suite 2030
Bellevue, Washington 98004
(w/o enclosures)