



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 23, 2006

Mr. David M. Swope  
Assistant County Attorney  
Harris County Attorney  
1019 Congress, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2006-05401

Dear Mr. Swope:

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# 249810.

The Harris County Purchasing Agent (the "county") received two requests for all information relating to the proposals, including the winning vendor response, pertaining to the Emergency Recall Notification System for Harris County Public Health and Environmental Services Department. You claim that the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act, but make no arguments and take no position as to whether the information is so excepted. Pursuant to section 552.305, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the interested third parties Global Secure Systems ("Global"), MessageOne Incorporated ("MessageOne"), First Call Interactive Network, Incorporated ("First Call"), Voice 4 Net, and Pulse Voice Incorporated ("Pulse Voice") of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information 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 under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the arguments submitted to our office by MessageOne and reviewed the submitted information.

MessageOne raises section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information that other law makes confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-

law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). However, MessageOne has not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any portion of its proposal is confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Thus, we find MessageOne has not demonstrated that section 552.101 is applicable to any portion of its proposal.

MessageOne also raises 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 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 Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review of the comments submitted by MessageOne and the submitted information, we find that MessageOne has established the applicability of section 552.110(b) to a portion of the submitted information in Exhibit B-1. Thus, the county must withhold the information related to MessageOne’s client list and pricing information that we have marked. However, we find that MessageOne has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990); *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if 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”). Furthermore, MessageOne has failed to demonstrate that any other portion of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause its company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from the 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 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to

section 552.110). Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information pertaining to MessageOne may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110.

Next, we 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, Global, First Call, Voice 4 Net, and Pulse Voice have not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect their proprietary interests. Therefore, Global, First Call, Voice 4 Net, and Pulse Voice have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information 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. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

We note, however, that the submitted documents contain information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.136 provides in relevant part:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. The county must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that a portion of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 information in Exhibit B-1 we have marked must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but 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,



Margaret Cecere  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MC/eb

Ref: ID# 249810

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael Rodriguez  
Ms. Kristin Holt  
Global Secure Systems  
8601 Ranch Road 2222, Bldg. 1 Suite 290  
Austin, Texas 78730  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kim Bannasch  
US Netcom Sr. Health Specialist  
P.O. Box 1926  
Joplin, Missouri 64802  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Howard Nirken  
Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.  
401 Congress Avenue  
Suite 2500  
Austin, Texas 78701-3799  
(w/o enclosures)

Ref: ID# 249810

c: First Call Interactive Network, Inc.  
Attn: C.J. Delatte  
5423 Galeria Drive  
Baton Rouge, LA 70816  
(w/o enclosures)

Voice 4 Net  
Attn: Richard McFarland  
2516 Sire Percival Lane  
Lewisville, Texas 75056  
(w/o enclosures)

Pulse Voice Inc.  
Attn: Norry Satov  
90 Nolan Court, Suite 1A  
Markham Ontario L3R 4L9, Canada  
(w/o enclosures)