



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 6, 2015

Mr. Jonathan Kaplan
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2015-23436

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

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# 586560 (ORR# W067537).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received three requests from different requestors seeking information related to RFCSP number 6100004961. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Accela, CSDC Systems ("CSDC"), The Davenport Group ("Davenport"), Indra Systems ("Indra"), Tyler Technologies ("Tyler"), and 3DI Systems ("3DI").¹ Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Accela, CSDC, Davenport, Indra, Tyler, and 3DI 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

¹We note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, as third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider the public availability of the submitted information. *Id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Tyler. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

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 not received comments from Accela, CSDC, Davenport, Indra, or 3DI explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Accela, CSDC, Davenport, Indra, or 3DI 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 city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Accela, CSDC, Davenport, Indra, or 3DI may have in the information.

We now turn to Tyler's arguments against disclosure of the submitted information. Tyler first argues the city should not release portions of Tyler's submitted information because the information is subject to a protective order. Section 552.107(2) of the Government Code provides information is excepted from disclosure if "a court by order has prohibited disclosure of the information." Gov't Code § 552.107(2). Tyler has submitted a copy of a Protective Order that was issued by the Chancery Court for the First Judicial District in Hinds County, Mississippi. We note the submitted protective order states the information subject to the order "shall not be given, shown, disclosed, made available or communicated by the [Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services], or any subdivision thereof, in any form to anyone[.]" We note Tyler has not explained how the protective order applies to the city. Upon review, therefore, we find Tyler has not established the protective order makes the information at issue confidential or prohibits the city from releasing the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.107(2) of the Government Code.

Next, Tyler states portions of its information are excepted from disclosure 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 id.* § 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 establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). 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).

²The 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).

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).

Tyler argues portions of its information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Tyler has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Tyler has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (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), 319 at 3 (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), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of Tyler’s remaining information under section 552.110(b).

Tyler further asserts portions of its remaining information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Tyler 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 Tyler has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of Tyler’s remaining information under section 552.110(a).

The remaining documents also include information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136 provides, “Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected,

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).

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 determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining documents under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


We note some of the materials at issue 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 city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining documents under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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, 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 586560

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Abigail Diaz
Associate General Counsel
Tyler Technologies
One Tyler Drive
Yarmouth, Maine 04096
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Julian D. Munoz
Accela
2633 Camino Ramon, Suite 500
San Ramon, California 95683
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mihir Desai
3DI Systems
3 Pointe Drive, Suite 307
Brea, California 92821
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marcos Quintana
CSDC Systems
2821 West 7th Street, Suite 230
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steven Stillman
Indra Systems
800 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1270
Miami, Florida 33131
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry P. Davenport
The Davenport Group
651 West Terra Cotta Avenue
Suite 231
Crystal Lake, Illinois 60014
(w/o enclosures)