ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

December 1, 2005

Ms. Lona Chastain
Open Records Coordinator
Texas Workforce Commission
101 East 15th Street
Austin, Texas 78778-0001

OR2005-10777

Dear Ms. Chastain:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code, the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Your request was assigned ID# 237252.

The Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission") received a request for a copy of the proposals submitted in response to RFO 2005-3142 for Terminal Emulation Software. You claim that the requested information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.110, 552.113, and 552.131 of the Government Code. You make no arguments in support of these exceptions, but state that releasing the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Data Interface Systems ("Data Interface"), Hummingbird USA ("Hummingbird"), Open Connect Systems, Inc. ("Open Connect"), Seagull Software Systems ("Seagull"), and WRQ, Inc. ("WRQ"). You inform us that you have notified these interested third parties of the commission's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *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 in certain circumstances). Open Connect and Seagull have responded to the notice and argue that their information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the commission failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301. A governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of this section results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *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 section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason for overcoming the presumption of openness, we will consider whether any of the submitted information must be withheld to protect third party interests.

Next, 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, Data Interface, Hummingbird and WRQ have not submitted to this office reasons explaining why the commission should not release their information. Therefore, these entities have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the information at issue, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* 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).

Next, we consider Open Connect and Seagull's arguments that their information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of 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). 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).

In this instance, we find that Open Connect and Seagull have not demonstrated how any of their information meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). Accordingly, this information may not be withheld under section 552.110(a).

We note that the information Seagull seeks to withhold under section 552.110(b) includes a customer list. We find that release of the customer list would cause substantial competitive harm and have marked the information that the commission must withhold under section 552.110(b). We find that Seagull has not made the showing required by section 552.110(b) that the release of any of its remaining information would be likely to cause the company substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that none of Seagull's remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 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), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We also note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). The commission must also withhold some of Open Connect's information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b); however, none of Open Connect's remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

Finally, we note that portions of the submitted information not excepted from disclosure may be 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, the commission must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the commission 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Tamara L. Harswick
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TLH/sdk

Ref: ID# 237252

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim Tefft
Attachmate Corporation
4265 San Felipe, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Open Connect Systems, Inc.
Attn: Charles D. Brockenbush
2711 LBJ Freeway, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75234-7315
(w/out enclosures)

Seagull Software Systems
Attn: Gwen Barton
3340 Peachtree Road, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(w/o enclosures)

Data Interface Systems
11824 Jollyville Road, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Hummingbird USA
13601 Preston #900E
Dallas, Texas 75240
(w/o enclosures)

WRQ, Inc.
1500 Dexter Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109
(w/o enclosures)