



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 30, 2011

Mr. Ken Bass
Director of Purchasing
McLennan County
214 North 5th Street
Waco, Texas 76701

OR2011-19252

Dear Mr. Bass:

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# 440807.

The McLennan County Purchasing Office (the "county") received a request for the proposals submitted in response to request for proposals 11-020, except the requesting company's proposal. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Block Vision, Inc. ("Block Vision"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Block Vision of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information 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 Block Vision. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have only submitted Block Vision's proposal for our review. Thus, to the extent any other proposals existed when the present request was received, we assume they have been released. If such information has not been released, then it must be released at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000)

(if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Block Vision claims portions of its proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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

¹The 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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. *See* 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) (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).

Upon review of the submitted arguments and the information at issue, we agree Block Vision’s customer information constitutes trade secret information under section 552.110(a); therefore, the county must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a). However, we find Block Vision has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its remaining information constitutes a trade secret. *See* ORD Nos. 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(a).

Block Vision also contends, in part, that portions of its remaining information are excepted under section 552.110(b) because release of the information at issue would harm the county’s ability and the ability of other governmental entities to obtain information in response to future requests for proposals. In advancing its arguments, Block Vision appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. However, section 552.110(b) has been amended since the issuance of *National Parks*. Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard for excepting from disclosure confidential information. The current statute does not incorporate this aspect of the *National Parks* test; it now requires only a specific factual demonstration that release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of

section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). Thus, the ability of a governmental body to obtain information from private parties is no longer a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Block Vision's interests in its own information.

Upon review of Block Vision's arguments under section 552.110(b) and the information at issue, we conclude Block Vision has established that release of its pricing information would cause it substantial competitive injury; therefore, the county must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). However, Block Vision has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information would cause it substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Accordingly, we determine none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because bid specifications and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative).

In summary, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 440807

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Audrey M. Weinstein
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Block Vision, Inc.
7700 Congress Avenue, Suite 3108
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
(w/o enclosures)