



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 23, 2008

Mr. W. Lee Auvenshine
Assistant County and District Attorney
Ellis County and District Attorney's Office
1201 North Highway 77 Suite 104
Waxahachie, Texas 75165-7832

OR2008-07130

Dear Mr. Auvenshine:

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# 312233.

The Ellis County Judge (the "county") received a request for information relating to a request for qualifications for technology design and engineering services, including the responses of two prospective vendors, the amount of the award, "how the rates were determined to be the most competitive rates available to the county," and the date of the commissioners' court session and agenda on which the contract is scheduled to be approved. You take no position on the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the submitted information may implicate the interests of Acuity, Inc. ("Acuity") and Stravis Technologies, Inc. ("Stravis"). You notified Acuity and Stravis of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.¹ We received correspondence from Acuity. We have considered all of the submitted arguments and have reviewed the submitted information. We assume that the county has released any other information that is responsive to this request, to the extent that such information existed when the county received the request. If not, then

¹See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

any such information must be released immediately.² See Gov't Code §§ 552.221, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from Stravis. Therefore, because Stravis has not demonstrated that any of the submitted information is proprietary for the purposes of the Act, the county may not withhold any of the information on the basis of any interest that Stravis may claim. See Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990); 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Next, we address Acuity's assertion that its proposal is marked as containing proprietary and confidential information. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless Acuity's information comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Acuity claims exceptions under sections 552.101 and 552.110 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 exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Acuity appears to raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 51.914 of the Education Code, which provides as follows:

²We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App. - San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to any responsive information that is within its possession or control. See Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990).

In order to protect the actual or potential value, the following information shall be confidential and shall not be subject to disclosure under [the Act], or otherwise:

(1) all information relating to a product, device, or process, the application or use of such a product, device, or process, and all technological and scientific information (including computer programs) developed in whole or in part at a state institution of higher education, regardless of whether patentable or capable of being registered under copyright or trademark laws, that have a potential for being sold, traded, or licensed for a fee;

(2) any information relating to a product, device, or process, the application or use of such product, device, or process, and any technological and scientific information (including computer programs) that is the proprietary information of a person, partnership, corporation, or federal agency that has been disclosed to an institution of higher education solely for the purposes of a written research contract or grant that contains a provision prohibiting the institution of higher education from disclosing such proprietary information to third persons or parties; or

(3) the plans, specifications, blueprints, and designs, including related proprietary information, of a scientific research and development facility that is jointly financed by the federal government and a local government or state agency, including an institution of higher education, if the facility is designed and built for the purposes of promoting scientific research and development and increasing the economic development and diversification of this state.

Educ. Code § 51.914. Acuity has not explained how or why any of its information would be confidential under section 51.914. Likewise, Acuity has not directed our attention to any other law under which any of its information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “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).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a "trade secret" to be

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 a single or ephemeral event 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.³ *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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

³The 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).

Section 552.110(b) 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Acuity contends that portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Acuity also asserts, under section 552.110(b), that release of some of its information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Additionally, Acuity appears to assert that information is protected by section 552.110(b) if its release would be likely to impair the government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future. In advancing this argument, Acuity relies on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). *See also Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held that *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App. – Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of Gov't Code § 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Acuity's interests in withholding its information under section 552.110.

Having considered all of Acuity's arguments and reviewed the information that it contends should be withheld, we have marked information relating to some of Acuity's customers that the county must withhold under section 552.110(a). Although Acuity also seeks to have information relating to other customers withheld, we note that those customers also are identified on Acuity's internet website. We are unable to find that information relating to customers that are identified on Acuity's website is a trade secret or that the release of such information would cause Acuity substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the remaining customer information under section 552.110. With respect to Acuity's other claims, we conclude that the company has not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We also conclude that Acuity has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would cause Acuity substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the remaining

information under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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).

In summary, the county must withhold the customer information that we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.W. Morris, III", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/ma

Ref: ID# 312233

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lanelle Prettyman
Prettyman & Associates, Inc.
600 Highland Park Place
4514 Cole Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75205
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Randy Shaw
Acuity, Inc.
5055 Keller Springs Road Suite 250
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dana Shorter
Stravis Technologies, Inc.
1111 South Main Street Suite 128
Grapevine, Texas 76051
(w/o enclosures)