



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 2, 2006

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

OR2006-04471

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# 247685.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "LCRA") received a request for a copy of the winning proposal and resulting contract related to the Employee Prepaid Legal Services project. You indicate that release of the requested proposal at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified interested third party Texas Legal Protection Plan, Inc. ("TLPP") of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See Gov't Code § 552.305* (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 in certain circumstances). We have received comments from TLPP. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that while TLPP claims an exception to the disclosure of a roster of member attorneys, the LCRA did not submit these documents to this office. This ruling does not address the applicability of TLPP's claimed exception for information that has not been submitted for our review by the LCRA. *See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D)* (governmental body seeking attorney general's opinion under the Act must submit a copy or representative samples of the specific information requested).

Next, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the part of the request pertaining to the relevant contract and a roster of member attorneys. We therefore assume that, to the extent it existed on the date the LCRA received the request for information, any information maintained by the LCRA that is responsive to that portion of the request has been released to the requestor. If not, the LCRA must release such information immediately. See Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (concluding that Gov't Code § 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be released as soon as possible under circumstances). We now address the arguments with respect to the submitted information.

TLPP contends that the submitted information 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 exempted 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).

After reviewing the submitted information and the arguments of TLPP, we find that TLPP has made a *prima facie* case that some of the information it seeks to withhold is protected as trade secret information. We have marked the customer list information in the submitted documents that the LCRA must withhold pursuant to section 552.110(e) of the Government Code. However, we determine that TLPP has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has this company demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We therefore determine that no portion of the remaining information is exempted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

We further find that TLCC has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of the remaining information would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. We also note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not exempted under section 552.110(b). *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). Accordingly, we determine that none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue).

TLPP also argues that the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 31.05 of the Penal Code.¹ Section 31.05 provides in pertinent part:

(b) A person commits an offense if, without the owner's effective consent, he knowingly:

- (1) steals a trade secret;
- (2) makes a copy of an article representing a trade secret; or
- (3) communicates or transmits a trade secret.

(c) An offense under this section is a felony of the third degree.

Penal Code § 31.05(b), (c). We have already determined that the remaining information at issue does not constitute a trade secret. We also note that section 31.05 does not expressly make information confidential. In order for section 552.101 to apply, a statute must contain language expressly making certain information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998), 478 at 2 (1987), 465 at 4-5 (1987). Confidentiality cannot be implied from the structure of a statute or rule. *See* Open Records Decision No. 465 at 4-5 (1987). Accordingly, the LCRA may not withhold any portion of the submitted information from disclosure pursuant to section 31.05 of the Penal Code.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information 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

¹Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes.

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 have marked the information that the LCRA must withhold under section 552.110(a). The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the LCRA 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,



James Forrest
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JF/sdk

Ref: ID# 247685

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Onvia
Attn: FOIA Request Coordinator
1260 Mercer Street
Seattle, Washington 98109
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bruce McCandless III
Long, Burner, Parks & DeLargy
P.O. Box 2212
Austin, Texas 78768-2212
(w/o enclosures)