



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 17, 2016

Ms. Ann-Marie Sheely  
Assistant County Attorney  
Travis County  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767-1748

OR2016-06142

Dear Ms. Sheely:

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# 601902.

The Travis County Purchasing Office (the "county") received a request for specified contracts.<sup>1</sup> 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 the Austin Independent School District; Easy Access, Inc. ("EAI"); Future Comm Ltd.; Hitachi Data Systems Corporation; Mark III Systems, Inc.; NTT Data, Inc. ("NTT"); Oracle America, Inc.; Presidio Networked Solutions, Inc.; SAP Public Services, Inc.; SHI Government Solutions; Sirius Computer Solutions, Inc.; Titus Systems; and ZVS Media LLC. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.304, .305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the county sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

comments from EAI and NTT. We have considered the submitted arguments and have 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) 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 only received comments from EAI and NTT explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 county may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in the information.

NTT claims some of its information should be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party's property interest, a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. NTT indicates it has competitors. In addition, NTT asserts release of the information at issue would harm NTT's competitive position in the market. We note NTT was the winning bidder for one of the contracts at issue and that it seeks to withhold some of the terms of the

contract. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). *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). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 831, 842. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find NTT has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the county may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code 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, 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 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>3</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note 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 the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

EAI claims some of its information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we conclude EAI has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has EAI demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; 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). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of EAI's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note some 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 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.

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

In summary, the county may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 601902

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Kohlmorgan  
Austin Independent School District  
1111 West 6th Street, Suite A380  
Austin, Texas 78703  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William C. Hamer  
Easy Access, Inc.  
4200-A North Bicentennial Drive  
McAllen, Texas 78504  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Misty Muniga  
Future Comm Ltd.  
807 Forest Ridge, Suite 105  
Bedford, Texas 76022  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Noelle Kuehn  
Mark III Systems, Inc.  
Suite 3600  
3600 South Gessner Road  
Houston, Texas 77063  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jason Haydel  
Oracle America, Inc.  
500 Oracle Parkway  
Redwood Shores, California 94065  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Roach  
SAP Public Services, Inc.  
Suite 260  
4343 North Scottsdale Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Herzog  
Sirius Computer Solutions, Inc.  
10100 Reunion Place, Suite 500  
San Antonio, Texas 78216  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Zeiner  
ZVS Media LLC  
2201 Denton Drive, Suite 108  
Austin, Texas 78758  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ron Roberts  
Hitachi Data Systems Corporation  
9606 North MoPac Expressway, Suite 510  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James E. Devlin  
Corporate Counsel  
NTT Data, Inc.  
8100 Boone Boulevard, Suite 400  
Vienna, Virginia 22182  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brent Blaha  
Presidio Networked Solutions, Inc.  
Suite 130  
7600B North Capital of Texas Highway  
Austin, Texas 78731  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Darren Gross  
SHI Government Solutions  
1301 South MoPac Expressway, Suite 100  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph Begey, Jr.  
Titus Systems  
1821 Central Commerce Court, Suite 100  
Round Rock, Texas 78664  
(w/o enclosures)