



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 18, 2012

Ms. Sarah Orman
Counsel for the Region XIII Educational Service Center
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green and Treviño, P.C.
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2012-16690

Dear Ms. Orman:

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# 469343.

The Region XIII Educational Service Center ("ESC"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the three top bidders in relation to the SES Program Software Solution request for proposals. You state some information is being released to the requestor. Although ESC takes no position on whether the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of ThomasKelly Software Associates, LP ("TKSA") and Cayen Systems, LLC ("Cayen"). Accordingly, you notified both TKSA and Cayen of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from Cayen. We have considered the submitted arguments 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) of the Government Code 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 letter, we have not received comments from TKSA explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude TKSA has protected proprietary interests in the 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. Consequently, ESC may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests TKSA may have in this information.

Cayen claims portions of its proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure 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).

Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). 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). This office will accept a private person's claim for exception

as valid under section 552.110(a) if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim.¹ Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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 requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of Cayen’s arguments and the submitted information, we find Cayen has established a *prima facie* case its customer information at issue, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, ESC must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a). However, Cayen has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim). Thus, ESC may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(a).

Cayen also asserts some of its remaining information is excepted under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Cayen has established its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, ESC must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, we find Cayen has made only conclusory allegations the release of the remaining information it seeks to withhold would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, Cayen failed to demonstrate substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of

¹The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 [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).

its remaining information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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). Consequently, ESC may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b).

We note the remaining information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 provides “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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.”² Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device number”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, ESC must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

We note 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. 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.

In summary, ESC must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. ESC must also withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 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,

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

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,



Ana Carolina Vieira
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACV/ag

Ref: ID# 469343

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Angie Weidemann
Cayen Systems, LLC
7100 West Center Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53210
(w/o enclosures)

Felix Thomas
ThomasKelly Software Associates, LP
1 Sugar Creek Center Boulevard, Suite 410
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(w/o enclosures)