



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2019

Ms. D'layne Carter
Counsel for Potter-randall County Appraisal District
Perdue, Brandon, Fielder, Collins & Mott, L. L. P.
P.o. Box 9132
Amarillo, Texas 79105

OR2019-08776

Dear Ms. Carter:

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# 757497.

The Potter-Randall Appraisal District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a specified request for proposals.¹ We understand release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Government Software Assurance Corporation, True Prodigy Tech Solutions, L.L.C. ("True Prodigy"); Thomson Reuters; Tyler

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (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 when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed). Further, you state the district sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See id.* § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the district office received the required deposit on January 9, 2019. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

Technologies, Inc. ("Tyler"); and XSoft, Inc.² Accordingly, you were required to notify the interested third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 True Prodigy and Tyler. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note 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 the remaining third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude 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 district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in the information.

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). 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 840. True Prodigy states it has competitors. True Prodigy also states the information at issue, if released, would give a competitor an advantage in submitting future competitive bids. True Prodigy seeks to withhold the terms of a 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

²Although you raise section 552.110 of the Government Code, we note that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepting from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision" and "[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"). Thus, we do not address the district's assertion of section 552.110, but we will consider the third parties' assertions of that exception.

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, 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find True Prodigy has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold True Prodigy's information in its entirety under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.³

Tyler states portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets obtained from a person 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 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 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 Restatement's list

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

of six trade secret factors.⁴ 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, 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

Upon review, we find Tyler has established a *prima facie* case its customer information at issue constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent the customer information Tyler seeks to withhold is not publicly available on Tyler’s website, the district must withhold it under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, Tyler has failed to establish a *prima facie* case the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. Moreover, we find Tyler has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

⁴The 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).

Upon review of Tyler's arguments under section 552.110(b), we conclude Tyler has established the release of the information we have marked would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Tyler has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of Tyler's remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 319 at 3 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We therefore conclude the district may not withhold any of Tyler's remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code 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."⁵ Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers, bank account numbers, bank routing numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 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.

In summary, the district may withhold True Prodigy's information in its entirety under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. To the extent Tyler's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the district must withhold it under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers, bank account numbers, and bank routing numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

⁵The 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).

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, 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,



Jahna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/jxd

Ref: ID# 757497

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

5 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)