



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 21, 2019

Mr. Kyle Dickson  
Counsel for the Austin County Appraisal District  
Perdue Brandon Fielder Collins & Mott LLP  
3301 Northland Drive, Suite 505  
Austin, Texas 78731

OR2019-17062

Dear Mr. Dickson:

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# 771620.

The Austin County Appraisal District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Esri Canada Limited ("Esri"); Harris Govern; Prichard and Abbott, Inc.; and XSoft, Inc. ("XSoft"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these 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 Esri and

XSoft. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We understand you to contend the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). We note section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the district's claim under section 552.110 of the Government Code. An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have only received comments from Esri and XSoft. Thus, we have no basis to conclude either of the remaining interested third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest either of the remaining interested 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 841. Esri and XSoft state they have competitors and state release of the information at issue would give their competitors an advantage in future bids. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Esri and XSoft have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold Exhibit C in its entirety and the information we have marked in Exhibit B under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> While we understand you to argue the release of the remaining information could give an advantage to a competitor or bidder of the remaining third parties, such an interest in protecting the information belongs to the third parties and not the district. Therefore, we find the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

We understand Esri to also argue portions of its remaining information are protected 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. We note an individual’s name, address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person’s name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy). Upon review, we find Esri has failed to demonstrate any portion of its remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, Esri argues portions of its remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. As noted above, 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. *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 of six trade secret factors.<sup>2</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).

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 (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).

We understand Esri to assert portions of its remaining information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Esri has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Esri has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of Esri’s remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We understand Esri to argue portions of its remaining information consist of commercial or financial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Esri has failed to demonstrate the release of any of the remaining information at issue would result in substantial harm to their competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for

---

<sup>2</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).

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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of Esri's remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “[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.”<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to copyright law. 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 Exhibit C in its entirety and the information we have marked in Exhibit B under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; 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/>

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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).

[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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Neal". The signature is stylized with a large initial "T" and a cursive "Neal".

Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/gw

Ref: ID# 771620

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: 4 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)