



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

June 12, 2009

Mr. Miles J. LeBlanc
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Independent School District
4400 West 18th Street
Houston, Texas 77092-8501

OR2009-08156

Dear Mr. LeBlanc:

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# 345816.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for 1) all audio and minutes of the non-instructional consultation meetings held during this school year, and 2) all documents related to the Deloitte Consulting, LLP ("Deloitte") compensation study for non-instructional employees. You state that the district is releasing some information responsive to category 1 of the request. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ You also indicate that the release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Deloitte. Accordingly, you have notified Deloitte of the district's receipt of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from a

¹Although you raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, that provision is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are expressly confidential under other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022.

representative of Deloitte. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.²

Initially, we note that Exhibit 11 contains an official agenda and meeting notice for a meeting of the district's school board. Notices of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under provisions of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 551.041 (governmental body shall give written notice of date, hour, place, and subject of each meeting), 551.043 (notice of meeting of governmental body must be posted in place readily accessible to general public for at least 72 hours before scheduled time of meeting). The district claims this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. As a general rule, however, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, the district must release the meeting notice in Exhibit 11, which we have marked, in accordance with the Open Meetings Act.

Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." *Id.* § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the

²We assume that the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach and, therefore, does not authorize the withholding of any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office also has concluded that a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third-party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9.

You explain that the district has retained Deloitte, a third party consultant, to assist the district with regard to an employee compensation project. You also state that the documents at issue were created by Deloitte and constitute draft policymaking documents pertaining to employee compensation, which you explain constitutes a personnel matter of broad scope that affects the district's policy mission. After reviewing your arguments and Exhibit B, we agree that some of the submitted documents consist of draft of a policymaking documents. We understand that the compensation project has not been completed and district intends to release the information to the public in its final form. Therefore, the district may withhold

the draft documents we have marked in the submitted information under section 552.111.³ Additionally, upon review, we have marked additional information which we find consists of advice, opinion, or recommendations on policy matter of the district that may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information consists of draft documents or reflects advice, opinion, or recommendation pertaining to the policymaking processes of the district. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, we will address Deloitte's arguments under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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 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. 1957); *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); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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

³As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the remaining arguments against the disclosure of this information.

secret factors.⁴ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. See ORD 552 at 5. 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. *Id.*; see also Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999) at 5-6.

Deloitte contends that portions of its proposal are trade secrets excepted under section 552.110(a). Having considered Deloitte’s arguments, we find that Deloitte has established a *prima facie* case that some of its information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, Deloitte has failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Deloitte demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that information, including pricing information, pertaining to a particular proposal or contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

⁴The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other 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).

Upon review of Deloitte's arguments and the information at issue, we find that Deloitte has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to their competitive position. Thus, Deloitte has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of the remaining information. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 661* (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), 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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Furthermore, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Deloitte, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *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, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Finally, we note that some of the remaining information appears to 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. 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 district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and

responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Laura E. Ream
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LER/dls

Ref: ID# 345816

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jennifer Keane
Baker Botts L.L.P.
1500 San Jacinto Center
Austin, Texas 78701-4078
(w/o enclosures)