



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 1, 2005

Mr. Benjamin M. Hanson
Chief of Staff and General Counsel
Office of the Secretary of State
P. O. Box 12697
Austin, Texas 78711-2697

OR2005-01762

Dear Mr. Hanson:

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# 219571.

The Office of the Secretary of State (the "SOS") received a request for the contract awarded for the "Voter Registration/Election Management System" pertaining to Request for Offer number 649003. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you claim that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the SOS notified the two interested third parties of its receipt of the request and of their right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted information should not be released. *See Gov't Code §552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances).* The SOS has submitted the information at issue to this office. We have received written comments from both IBM and Hart InterCivic, Inc. ("Hart"). We have considered arguments received from these third parties and have reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that Hart does not object to the release of the License, Support and Maintenance Agreement or the Escrow Agreement. As to the remaining information, Hart raises no arguments on its own behalf, but "supports IBM with respect to any objections to disclosure that IBM may make[.]" Thus, we address IBM's arguments.

IBM raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by

judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information that other law makes confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). IBM has not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any portion of its proposal is confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Thus, we find IBM has not demonstrated that section 552.101 is applicable to any portion of the submitted information.

IBM also claims that its information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). Section 552.104 excepts information from disclosure if a governmental body demonstrates that the release of the information would cause potential specific harm to the governmental body’s interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). The SOS has not argued that the release of submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, no portion of IBM’s information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov’t Code § 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.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 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 this 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). 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. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Having reviewed the submitted arguments, we conclude that IBM has not demonstrated that its information qualifies as a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). We also find that IBM has

not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of its information would likely result in substantial competitive harm to the company. We note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *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). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision No. 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). Accordingly, the SOS may not withhold any of the information related to IBM pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. Therefore, we conclude that all of the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be

sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/krl

Ref: ID# 219571

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Bill Batcher
Unisys - Election Services
3199 Pilot Knob Road
Eagan, Minnesota 55121
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry Meadows
Hart InterCivic, Inc.
P. O. Box 80649
Austin, Texas 78708-0649
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Josh De Jong
IBM Business Consulting Services
400 West 15th, Suite 1200
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terry F. Kenyon
Attorney for Hart InterCivic, Inc.
Kenyon & Sproull, P.C.
711 San Antonio Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)