



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 26, 2006

Mr. Scott A. Kelly
Deputy General Counsel
Texas A&M University System
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2006-06735

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 252422.

The Texas Cooperative Extension (the "TCE"), a member of the Texas A&M University System ("university"), received a request for proposals submitted by five companies in response to TCE's request for proposals for document imaging services. You claim that portions of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.110, and 552.136 of the Government Code, but take no position as to whether this information is excepted under these exceptions. However, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Laserfiche, CIBER, Documation, CGI-AMS, and Xerox, the named companies, of the request and of their 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); 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 Laserfiche. The university has submitted the requested information. We have considered Laserfiche's comments and reviewed the submitted information.

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, CIBER, Documation, CGI-AMS, and Xerox have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, none of these interested third parties have provided us with any 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). Accordingly, we conclude that the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of CIBER, Documation, CGI-AMS, and Xerox.

Next, we note that some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined that certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. Based on the reasoning in that decision and our review of the information at issue, we determine that the portions of the submitted information that include source codes, account user names, passwords, and internet protocol addresses do not constitute public information under section 552.002. Accordingly, this information is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

Laserfiche argues that release of some of its personnel information would be a violation of common-law privacy. Section 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 the doctrine of common-law privacy. See Gov't Code § 552.101. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). This office has frequently stated that a mere expectation of privacy on the part of the individual who provides information to a governmental body does not permit that information to be withheld under section 552.101. See Open Records Decision Nos. 479 at 1 (1987) (information is not confidential simply because the party that submitted the information anticipated or requested confidentiality), 180 at 2 (1977) (information is not excepted from disclosure solely because the individual furnished it with the expectation that access to it would be restricted), 169 at 6 (special circumstances required to protect information must be more than mere desire for privacy or generalized fear of harassment or retribution). This office has also stated on several occasions that certain information regarding individuals, including such information as their home addresses and telephone numbers, is generally not protected by common-law privacy under section 552.101. See Open Records Decision Nos. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure

of a person's home address and telephone number is not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers do not qualify as "intimate aspects of human affairs"). Accordingly, we conclude that none of Laserfiche's submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Laserfiche contends that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 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 id.* § 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 id.* § 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. *See id.*; *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Having considered Laserfiche’s arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we find that the information we have marked must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(a). However, Laserfiche has not established by specific factual evidence that any of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure as either trade secret information under section 552.110(a) or commercial or financial information the release of which would cause Laserfiche substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business”); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110(b), business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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 is too speculative). Specifically, we note that some of the information Laserfiche seeks to withhold includes pricing information. We 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). We also note that some of the client information Laserfiche seeks

to withhold has been made publicly available by Laserfiche on its website. Thus, the university may only withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We note that some of the materials at issue 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, we have marked information that is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. We have also marked information that must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor. However, any copyrighted material may only be released in accordance 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, 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,



Jaime L. Flores
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLF/krl

Ref: ID# 252422

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Adrienne O'Keefe
Bates Investigations, Inc.
4131 Spicewood Springs Road, Suite J2
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William J. Adams
General Counsel
Laserfiche
3545 Long Beach Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90807
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Hudson
Vice President/Area Director
CIBER
4515 Seton Center Parkway, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Justin Espinosa
Imaging Director
Documation
2112 Rutland Drive, Suite 140
Austin, Texas 78758
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Wendland
Vice President, Consulting Services
CGI-AMS
100 Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dee Moody
Business Development Manager
Xerox Global Services
185 West Oakridge Parkway
Metairie, Louisiana 70005
(w/o enclosures)