



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 8, 2003

Ms. Julie Joe
Assistant County Attorney
County of Travis
P. O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2003-7122

Dear Ms. Joe:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 188959.

The Travis County Purchasing Office (the "purchasing office") received a request for "a copy of Statement of qualifications from the short listed companies" for RFQ# Q030020JJ and RFQ# Q030024JJ. You claim that a small portion of the responsive information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Although you do not assert any exception to disclosure on behalf of the purchasing office, you have notified the nine interested third parties of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code.¹ 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 section 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). The purchasing office has submitted the documents at issue to this office. We have received correspondence from Carter Burgess, Inc. ("Carter") and Klotz Associates, Inc. ("Klotz"). We have considered their arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The purchasing office notified the following third parties: Carter and Burgess, Inc., Klotz Associates, Inc., Halff Associates, Doucet & Associates, Land Design Studio, URS Corporation, Richardson Verdoorn, TBG Partners, and T&T Engineering, Inc.

Both Carter and Klotz assert that portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110. This section 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(a), (b).* 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.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 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 Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Public Information Act (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. 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. 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).

Carter argues that portions of its information are excepted under section 552.110(b). Having reviewed the submitted brief, we conclude that Carter has made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of portions of its information would likely result in substantial competitive harm to the company. We have marked the information related to Carter that the purchasing office must withhold pursuant to this exception. We also conclude, however, that Carter has not demonstrated how the release of the remaining information it seeks to withhold would result in substantial competitive harm to the company.² *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that 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), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing).

Klotz argues that portions of its information are excepted under section 552.110(a) and (b). Upon review of Klotz’s arguments and the submitted information, we determine that Klotz has demonstrated the applicability of section 552.110(a) to portions of the information at

²Carter does not assert section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

issue. Specifically, we find that Klotz has demonstrated that its client information constitutes trade secrets. Thus, we determine that Klotz has made a prima facie case under section 552.110(a) for that information and we have received no arguments to rebut this claim. The purchasing office must withhold the client information pertaining to Klotz, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find that Klotz has not adequately demonstrated that the remaining submitted information consists of either trade secret information or commercial or financial information the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm to Klotz. Therefore, we determine that Klotz has not shown that the remainder of its information is excepted under section 552.110.

Additionally, we 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 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 decision, the seven remaining third parties have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, the seven remaining third parties have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See, e.g.,* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

The purchasing office claims that a small portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides:

- (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.
- (b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.
- (c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:
 - (1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Act of June 2, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1089, § 1, 2003 Tex. Sess. Law. Serv. 3124 (to be codified as amendment to Gov't Code § 552.137). Section 552.137 requires a governmental body to withhold certain e-mail addresses of members of the public that are provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with the governmental body, unless the members of the public with whom the e-mail addresses are associated have affirmatively consented to their release. Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address or a business's general e-mail address or web address. E-mail addresses that are encompassed by subsection 552.137(c) are also not excepted from disclosure under section 552.137. Based on our review of the submitted information, we find that the e-mail addresses contained within this information are not excepted from disclosure under section 552.137. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(c)(3). Accordingly, we conclude that the purchasing office may not withhold the e-mail addresses, a representative sample of which it has marked, pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted 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 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, we conclude that the purchasing office must withhold the portions of the submitted information related to Carter and Klotz that we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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,



Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 188989

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jon N. Strange
President
JNS Inc.
17171 Park Row, Suite 160
Houston, Texas 77084
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rafael Cruz-Rodriguez
Mr. F. Clifton Davis
Carter and Burgess, Inc.
2705 Bee Cave Road, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Leslie W. Pittman
Vice President
Klotz Associates, Inc.
1515 S. Capital of Texas Highway
Westlake Place, Suite 302
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Carrillo
Vice President, Project Manager
Halff Associates
1421 Wells Branch Parkway, Suite 104
Austin, Texas 78660
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John D. Doucet
Doucet & Associates
7401 B Hwy. 71 W., Suite 160
Austin, Texas 78735
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Bellomy
Land Design Studio
3901 Spicewood Springs Road, Suite 201
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brent R. Kyler, PE
Senior Project Manager
URS Corporation
P.O. Box 201088
Austin, Texas 78720-1088
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Earl P. Broussard, Jr.
President
TBG Partners
901 S. Mopac, Bldg II, Ste 350
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. J. Cary Gray
Attorney for Klotz Associates
Looper Reed & McGraw
1300 Post Oak Blvd. Ste 2000
Houston, Texas 77056
(w/enclosures)

Mr. Bob Richardson
Richardson Verdoorn
712 Congress Avenue, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Taylor
Vice President
T&T Engineering, Inc.
1806 W. Stassney Lane, Suite 105
Austin, Texas 78745
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Michelle Simpkins
Winstead Sechrest & Minick
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 800
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/enclosures)