



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2004

Mr. Vic Ramirez  
Associate General Counsel  
Lower Colorado River Authority  
P.O. Box 220  
Austin, Texas 78767-0220

OR2004-3294

Dear Mr. Ramirez:

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# 199996.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "LCRA") received a request for "the winning bids for the recent copier and printer lease and maintenance agreements." You indicate that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you provide documentation showing that you notified the interested parties, Automation Plus Systems, Inc. ("APS"), Xerox Corporation ("Xerox"), and Canon Business Solutions ("Canon") of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.304 (allowing interested party to submit comments indicating why requested information should or should not be released), .305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* 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 to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We received arguments from APS and Canon. We have reviewed the information you submitted and considered all of the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note that section 552.305 of the Government Code allows an interested third party ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to

submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). However, as of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments for withholding the requested information from Xerox. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any of the submitted information would harm its proprietary interests. *See* Gov't Code § 551.110(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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). Accordingly, we conclude that LCRA may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that Xerox may have in the information.

APS asserts that the majority of the submitted information regarding its proposal is not responsive to the present request. However, as LCRA has submitted APS's entire proposal as responsive to the request, we will consider the public availability of the submitted information.

APS and Canon both contend that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (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). 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. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939).<sup>1</sup> 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 will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (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) of the Government Code 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). 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* Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Having considered all of the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that LCRA must withhold portions of the information related to Canon and APS under section 552.110(a) and (b). We have marked the information accordingly. We otherwise find that Canon and APS have not established that any of their remaining information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a) or that release of any of this information would cause them substantial competitive injury, as required by section 552.110(b). Therefore, none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (general terms of contract with governmental body are usually not excepted from disclosure), 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); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999), 319 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor).

---

<sup>1</sup> The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: (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).

Canon contends that portions of its remaining submitted proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Although Canon claims that “information in the Government’s position that relates to the person’s home address, direct telephone number, social security number, or whether the person has family members” is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.024, we note that section 552.117 of the Government Code is the applicable exception to disclosure to claim for this type of information. Accordingly, we address Canon’s claim regarding section 552.024 under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. We note, however, that the protection of section 552.117 only applies to information that the governmental body holds in its capacity as an employer. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117 (providing that employees of governmental entities may protect certain personal information in the hands of their employer); *see also* Gov’t Code § 552.024 (establishing election process for Gov’t Code § 552.117). Because Canon, the employer, is not a governmental entity, section 552.117 is not applicable in this instance.

Canon also asserts that a handwritten signature should be excepted from disclosure 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.” This section encompasses the common-law right to privacy, which protects information if it is highly intimate or embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and the public has no legitimate interest in it. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* include information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Based on our review of the remaining submitted information in Canon’s proposal, we conclude that it does not contain information that is highly intimate or embarrassing for purposes of common-law privacy and may not be withheld on this basis.

Finally, Canon claims that its proposal contains an e-mail address that is excepted from disclosure pursuant to 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.

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. Upon review, we find that none of the e-mail addresses contained within Canon's proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137. Accordingly, we conclude that LCRA may not withhold any remaining portion of Canon's bid proposal under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

We note that the submitted information pertaining to APS contains information that is confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> This section provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state;
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state; or
- (3) a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or a local agency authorized to issue an identification document.

Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, we conclude that LCRA must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

The submitted information pertaining to APS also contains a social security number that may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law. Section 552.101 encompasses amendments to the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), that make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). We have no basis for concluding that the social security number is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Government Code imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing the social security number, you should ensure that such information is not obtained or maintained by LCRA pursuant to any provision of law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

We note that portions of the remaining submitted information are copyrighted. 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

---

<sup>2</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions like sections 552.101 and 552.130 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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, LCRA must withhold the information we have marked in the submitted documents pertaining to Canon and APS pursuant to sections 552.110 and 552.130 of the Government Code. The social security number located in APS's proposal may be confidential under federal law. The remainder of the submitted information must be released to the requestor. However, in doing so, LCRA must comply with the applicable copyright law with respect to those portions of the remaining submitted documents that are copyrighted.

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,



Debbie K. Lee  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 199996

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kevin Walkup  
Austin Connect  
10435 Burnet Road  
Austin, Texas 78758  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Samuel L. West  
Automation Plus Systems, Inc.  
1779 Wells Branch Parkway, Suite 110B, PMB 345  
Austin, Texas 78728  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kimberly Fuhrman  
Dorsey & Whitney, L.L.P.  
50 South 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1500  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-1498  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eddie Sanchez  
Xerox Corporation  
6826 Austin Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Austin, Texas 78731  
(w/o enclosures)