



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 25, 2004

Mr. James R. Raup
McGinnis, Lochridge & Kilgore, L.L.P.
919 Congress Avenue, Suite 1300
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2004-7261

Dear Mr. Raup:

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# 207710.

The Round Rock Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information, including proposals submitted, related to RFP #P03-081. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you claim that portions of the requested information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the district notified the interested third parties of the district's receipt of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted information related to that company should not be released.¹ See Gov't Code §552.305(d); 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 have considered all arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we address the district's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. This section prescribes procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking

¹The third parties that were notified pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: 4GL School Solutions ("4GL"); GG Consulting, L.L.C. ("GG"); SunGard Pentamation Inc. ("SunGard"); Goalview; Welligent, and Computer Automation Systems Inc. We note that Computer Automation Systems Inc. is the requestor, and therefore has a right to its own information.

this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires the governmental body to ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions to disclosure that it claims not later than the tenth business day after the date of its receipt of the written request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). If a governmental body does not request an attorney general decision as prescribed by section 552.301, the information requested in writing is presumed to be subject to required public disclosure and must be released, unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ).

You indicate that the district received the present request for information on May 27, 2004. The district requested this decision on June 23, 2004. Thus, the district did not request this decision within the ten-business-day period prescribed by section 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Therefore, the submitted information is presumed to be public and must be released under section 552.302, unless there is a compelling reason to withhold any of the information from the public. *See also Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome when the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982).

We next 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, SunGard, Goalview, and Welligent have not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect their proprietary interests. Thus, none of these parties has demonstrated that any of the submitted information is confidential or proprietary for purposes of chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.101, .110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999). Therefore, we have no reason to conclude that there is any compelling reason to withhold any of the submitted information pertaining to these companies from public disclosure.

We note, however, that 4GL and GG have each submitted comments contending that some of the information in their proposals is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. 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. 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); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review of the submitted information and the arguments submitted by 4GL, we find that 4GL has made a *prima facie* case that the portions of its proposal that 4GL seeks to withhold, including its pricing methodology, are protected as trade secrets. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut these claims as a matter of law. Thus, the district must withhold the information at issue in the proposal of 4GL pursuant to section 552.110(a). We have marked this information for your convenience.

We find, however, that GG has not shown that any of the information that it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret or that its release would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, none of the information pertaining to this company may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110.

Lastly, we note that some of the submitted information that is not excepted from disclosure is protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information must comply with the copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, he or she 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 at 8-9 (1990).

Accordingly, we have marked the information that the district must withhold under section 552.110. The remaining information must be released to the requestor. In releasing information that is protected by copyright, the district must comply 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 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 207710
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Darren D. Johnson
Computer Automation Systems Inc.
P.O. Box 590
Mountain Home, Arizona 72654
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Allison Duquette
4GL School Solutions
901 Dulaney Valley Road, Suite 800
Towson, Maryland 21204
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Guber
GG Consulting, L.L.C.
175 Pawnee Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bronne Bruzgo
SunGard Pentamation Inc.
3555 Veterans Memorial Hwy., Suite F
Ronkonkoma, New York 11779
(w/o enclosures)

c: Ms. Cathy Zier
Goalview
2391 Circadian Way
Santa Rosa, California 95407
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Glenn Webb
Welligent
345 West Freemason Street, Suite 200
Norfolk, Virginia 23510
(w/o enclosures)