



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 11, 2015

Mr. David N. Brown  
Assistant County Attorney  
Williamson County  
405 Martin Luther King Street, Box 7  
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2015-18975

Dear Mr. Brown:

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# 580271 (Ref. No. PIA-2015-129).

Williamson County (the "county") received a request for all proposals submitted in response to, and the scoring results for, a specified request for proposals. You state the county has released some responsive information. 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 Active Network, L.L.C. ("Active"); Maximum Solutions, Inc.; PerfectMIND Technology, Inc.; R.C. Systems, Inc.; and Vermont Systems, Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights 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 Active. 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from Active explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore,

we have no basis to conclude any of the other third parties have 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 information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the other third parties may have in it.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, No. 12-1007, 2015 WL 3854264, at \*7 (Tex. June 19, 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at \*9. Active states it has competitors. In addition, Active states that portions of its information, “if revealed to a competitor, would provide that competitor with advantage in a bidding process against Active.” After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Active has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the county may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

Active asserts its remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) 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, 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address Active’s other arguments to withhold this information.

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.<sup>2</sup> 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 establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Upon review, we find Active has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Active has failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for any of its remaining information. *See* ORDs 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 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Consequently, the county may not withhold any of Active's remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.136 of the Government Code states "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has

---

<sup>2</sup>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).

<sup>3</sup>The 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).

determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Upon review, we find the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the county may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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](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/akg

Ref: ID# 580271

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph R. Anderson  
Active Network  
717 North Harwood Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Chapley  
Maximum Solutions  
4570 West 77<sup>th</sup> Street #365  
Edina, Minnesota 55435  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dale Geiger  
R.C. Systems  
35807 Moravian Drive  
Clinton Township, Michigan 48035  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Willey  
Vermont Systems  
12 Market Place  
Essex Junction, Vermont 05452  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Saeid Safarmehdi  
Perfect Mind  
110-980 West 1 Street  
North Vancouver, British Columbia V7P 3N4  
Canada  
(w/o enclosures)