



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 21, 2007

Ms. Kristen Klein
County Auditor
Guadalupe County
307 West Court Street, Suite 205
Seguin, Texas 78155

OR2007-03105

Dear Ms. Klein:

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# 273877.

Guadalupe County (the "county") received three requests for proposals related to the county's selection of financial management software. You do not raise any exception to disclosure of the submitted information on behalf of the county. However, you assert that the release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Mitchell Humphrey & Co. ("Mitchell Humphrey"); Net Data Corp. ("Net Data"); New World Systems Corp. ("New World"); SunGuard Bi-Tech, L.L.C. ("SunGuard"); and Tyler Technologies of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted 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); *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 in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and arguments.

We note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See*

Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received correspondence from Mitchell Humphrey and New World. Net Data, SunGuard, and Tyler Technologies have not submitted comments to this office in response to the section 552.305 notice. Because NetData, SunGuard, and Tyler Technologies have failed to submit any arguments to this office, we have no basis to conclude that their responsive information is excepted from disclosure based on their proprietary interests. *See, e.g.*, Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that Net Data, SunGuard, and Tyler Technologies may have in the information.

Mitchell Humphrey and New World assert that their proposals contain proprietary information. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Gov't Code § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2. Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: (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. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Based on our review of the arguments submitted by Mitchell Humphrey and New World, we find that Mitchell Humphrey and New World have established a *prima facie* case that their customer information is protected under trade secret. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut these claims as a matter of law. Thus, we have marked the portions of the submitted Mitchell Humphrey and New World proposals that the county must withhold pursuant to section 552.110(a). However, we find that New World has failed to demonstrate that any of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5-6; 319 at 3 (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Further, we note that some of the information New World seeks to withhold consists of pricing information related to its proposal. 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 (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Pricing information of a winning bidder, such as New World in this instance, 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). Therefore, we conclude that none of the remaining information New World seeks to withhold is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

In summary, you must withhold the customer information we have marked in Mitchell Humphrey's and New World's proposals. The remaining information must be released to the requestors.

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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Justin D. Gordon
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JDG/sdk

Ref: ID# 237877

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kim A. Schaefer
President and CEO
Mitchell Humphrey Software
11720 Borman Drive
St. Louis, Missouri 63146-4192
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kirk Cunningham
Territorial Sales Manager
Tyler Technologies, Inc.
5808 4th Street
Lubbock, Texas 79416
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt Chavez
Regional Sales Manager
SunGuard Bi-Tech, LLC
890 Fortress Street
Chico, California 95973
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. S. Bret Cate
Executive Vice President
Tyler Technologies
5808 4th Street
Lubbock, Texas 79416
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kathleen C. Fant
RFP Manager
New World Systems, Corp.
888 West Big Beaver Road, Suite 600
Troy, Michigan 48084
(w/o enclosures)