



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 16, 2011

Ms. Susan Camp-Lee
Sheets & Crossfield, P.C.
309 East Main Street
Round Rock, Texas 78664

OR2011-02361

Dear Ms. Camp-Lee:

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# 409379.

The City of Round Rock (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for tab sheet and proposals, except for one specified proposal, pertaining to request for proposal number 10-018- Land Management Software.¹ Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified ACCELA Government Software; Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.; CRW Systems, Inc.; Computer Software, Inc. ("CSI"); CyberDefense, Inc.; DavenPort Group; EnerGov Solutions; Information Access Systems, Inc.; and Municipal Software Corporation of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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 comments from CSI. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure.

¹We note that the city asked for and received clarification regarding this request. *See Gov't Code* § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from ACCELA Government Software; Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.; CRW Systems, Inc.; CyberDefense, Inc.; DavenPort Group; EnerGov Solutions; Information Access Systems, Inc.; or Municipal Software Corporation explaining why each third party's submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of ACCELA Government Software; Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.; CRW Systems, Inc.; CyberDefense, Inc.; DavenPort Group; EnerGov Solutions; Information Access Systems, Inc.; or Municipal Software Corporation.

Next, we consider CSI's arguments against disclosure of its information 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary 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 the 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* ORD 232. 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. ORD 552 at 2. 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.* § 552.110(b); ORD 661.

Having considered CSI’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that CSI has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3

(1982). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of CSI's submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of CSI's arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that CSI has established that its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that CSI has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to the company's competitive position. Thus, CSI has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. *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). Accordingly, none of CSI's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding 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. Accordingly, we find that the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.³

Finally, we note some of the remaining information is 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(b) and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only be released 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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 409379

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Julian D. Munoz
Vice President
ACCELA Government Software
Suite 120, Bishop Ranch 3
2633 Camino Ramon
San Ramon, California 94583
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dennis Giordano
President
Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc.
1800 Eller Drive, Suite 600
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph Chirumbolo
Operations Manager
Computer Software, Inc.
100 Highpoint Drive, Suite 104
Chalfont, Pennsylvania 18914
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Harry Sundbert
Chief Operating Officer
CyberDefenses, Inc.
1205 Sam Bass Road, Suite 300
Round Rock, Texas 78681
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ryan Hountz
Vice President
EnerGov Solutions
Suite 300
2126 Satellite Boulevard
Duluth, Georgia 30097
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sean Higgins
Regional Sales Manager
Municipal Software
Suite 1108
4464 Markham Street
Victoria, BC Canada V8Z 7X8
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Nathan Hershkowitz
Vice President of Business Development
CRW Systems
16980 Via Tazon, Suite 320
San Diego, California 92127
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry P. Davenport
Managing Partner
DavenPort Group
651 West Terra Cotta Avenue, Suite 110
Crystal Lake, Illinois 60014
(w/o enclosures)

Contract & Legal Services Manager
EnerGov Solutions
Suite 300
2126 Satellite Boulevard
Duluth, Georgia 30097
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Voss
Vice President of Project Management
Information Access Systems, Inc.
900 South Goldenrod Road, Suite C
Orlando, Florida 32822
(w/o enclosures)