



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2007

Mr. David Kemp  
Assistant County Attorney  
Potter County  
500 South Fillmore Street, Room 303  
Amarillo, Texas 79101

OR2007-05233

Dear Mr. Kemp:

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# 277640.

The Potter County Clerk (the "county clerk") received a request for information relating to the November 2006 general election, including the electronic ballot audit log file, a precinct-tabulated results file, and copies of the ballot screens. You claim that the requested information is not subject to the Act. You also state that the county clerk is unable to access a portion of the requested information.<sup>1</sup> In the alternative, you claim that this request for information implicates the proprietary interests of Election Systems & Software, Inc. ("ES&S") under section 552.110 of the Government Code. You state that you have notified ES&S of this request.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the submitted arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>The county clerk states that it has been unable to open the requested computer files. However, to the extent that such responsive information existed upon the county clerk's receipt of the request for information, the county clerk must release this information to the requestor. See Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; see also Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

<sup>2</sup>See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

We first address your contention that the requested audit log and precinct-tabulated results files are not subject to the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 581, this office determined that certain computer information such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information that is made public under section 552.021 of the Act. Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990) (construing predecessor statute). In reaching this decision, we reasoned that “the legislature could [not] have intended that the Open Records Act compromise the physical security of information management systems or other government property.” *Id.* at 6. Upon review, we find that the instant request is seeking information which has significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property. Accordingly, we conclude that the requested information is public information as defined by section 552.002, and is subject to disclosure under the Act.

We turn next to the arguments raised by ES&S. ES&S claims that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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. 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 (1990). 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 (1990). 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).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[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.” Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

After considering the arguments submitted by ES&S, we conclude that ES&S has failed to establish that any of the requested information meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. We also find that ES&S has made only conclusory allegations that release of any of the requested information would cause the company substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Thus, none of the requested information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110. As no additional exceptions are claimed, the requested information must be released to the requestor.

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,



L. Joseph James  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LJJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 277640

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Seth Hill  
Department of Political Science  
University of California, Los Angeles  
P.O. Box 951472  
Los Angeles, California 90095  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Timothy J. Hallett  
Associate General Counsel  
Election Systems & Software  
11208 John Galt Boulevard  
Omaha, Nebraska 68137  
(w/o enclosures)