



January 6, 2015

Ms. Courtney Wilkerson
Senior Buyer
Office of the Purchasing Agent
Collin County
2300 Bloomdale Road, Suite 3160
McKinney, Texas 75071

OR2015-00166

Dear Ms. Wilkerson:

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# 549644.

Collin County (the "county") received a request for all bids, except for the requestor's, submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. 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 the following third parties: CherryRoad Technologies; Dimension Systems, Inc. ("Dimension"); DLZP Group; ERP Analysis; Graviton Consulting Services; iLynx, Inc.; Net Star Systems; NTT Data ("NTT"); Sierra Systems; Smart ERP Solutions, Inc.; and Tunabear, Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information 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); *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 NTT and Dimension.¹ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure.

¹Although the requestor has also submitted arguments against the disclosure of his company's information, we need not address them as the requestor's company's information is not responsive to the request.

See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from NTT and Dimension explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. See *id.* § 552.110; 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 county may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in it.

Dimension argues its information may not be disclosed because it is labeled as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”); 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

NTT raises section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. See Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). NTT has not directed our attention to any law under which any of its information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, we conclude the county may not withhold any of the company's information under that section.

NTT contends some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). However, section 552.102 applies only to information in the personnel file of a governmental employee. See Gov't Code § 552.102(a). None of NTT's information consists of information in the personnel file of a governmental employee. Therefore, we find section 552.102 of the Government Code is not applicable, and the county may not withhold any of NTT's information on that basis.

NTT and Dimension assert some of their information is protected under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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.² 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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

² 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).

establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). Further, we note 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; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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 (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).

NTT and Dimension argue some of their information, including their customer information, constitutes trade secret information under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find both companies have established a *prima facie* case that their customer information constitutes trade secret information. Therefore, to the extent the companies’ customer information is not publicly available on their websites, the county must withhold NTT’s and Dimension’s customer information under section 552.110(a). However, we find NTT and Dimension have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information they seek to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, and have failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* Open Records Decision 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 (1982) (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). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

NTT argues some of its information constitutes commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find NTT has demonstrated its pricing information is commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find NTT has failed to demonstrate the release of its remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (for 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), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, 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). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

We note the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must withhold (1) NTT’s and Dimension’s customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, to the extent it is not publicly available on the companies’ websites; (2) the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code; and (3) the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/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,



Brian E. Berger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BB/ac

³The 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).

Ref: ID# 549644

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Paul
Dimension Systems, Inc.
28525 Orchard Lake Road
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sharif Almamun
iLynx, Inc.
12933 Centre Park Circle, Suite 302
Herndon, Virginia 20171
(w/o enclosures)

Mr Robert J. Coleman
NTT Data, Inc.
100 City Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02129
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Vineet Srivastava
Graviton Consulting Services
8950 Cal Center Drive, Suite 203
Sacramento, California 95826
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Doris Wong
Smart ERP Solutions, Inc.
4683 Chabot Drive, Suite 386
Pleasanton, California 94588
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeremy Gulban
CherryRoad Technologies
301 Gibraltar Drive, Suite 2C
Morris Plains, New Jersey 07950
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Popovici
Tunabear, Inc.
6420 Dykes Way
Dallas, Texas 75230-1816
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Landes
DLZP Group
2307 Thompson Crossing Drive
Richmond, Texas 77406
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Calvin Yonker
Sierra Systems
222 North Sepulveda Boulevard,
Suite 1310
El Segundo, California 90245
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jack Gao
Net Star Systems
1150 Philip Drive
Allen, Texas 75013
(w/o enclosures)