



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 7, 2015

Mr. Dan T. Saluri
Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Angelo
72 West College Avenue
San Angelo, Texas 76903

OR2015-25603

Dear Mr. Saluri:

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# 589381.

The City of San Angelo (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to request for proposals number PD-01-14 for Computer Aided Dispatch. 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 third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Archonix Public Safety Software ("Archonix"); Cyrun; Diversified Computer Systems, Inc. ("DCS"); Integrated Computer Systems ("ICS"); J2 Software ("J2"); New World Systems Corporation ("New World Systems"); Spillman Technologies, Inc. ("Spillman"); and TriTech Software Systems (TriTech") 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 Spillman and TriTech. 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 not received comments from Archonix, Cyrun, DCS, ICS, J2, or New World Systems explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Archonix, Cyrun, DCS, ICS, J2, or New World Systems 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 any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Archonix, Cyrun, DCS, ICS, J2, or New World Systems 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*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 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 841. TriTech states it has competitors. In addition, TriTech states release of the information it seeks to withhold would allow a competitor attempt to initiate the quality of TriTech's offering and undercut TriTech's bid price. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find TriTech has established the release of its pricing information and Confidential Financial Statement would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold TriTech's pricing information and Confidential Financial Statement under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.¹

Next, Spillman claims its information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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

¹As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address TriTech's remaining argument against disclosure.

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.² 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 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual

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

evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of Spillman's arguments, we find Spillman has failed to demonstrate that any of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Spillman demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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). Thus, none of Spillman's submitted information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of Spillman's arguments and the information at issue, we find Spillman has established that its Confidential Financial Statement constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold Spillman's Confidential Financial Statement under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Spillman has failed to make the specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, Spillman has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of its remaining information. *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). Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136 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 city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


In summary, the city may withhold TriTech's pricing information and Confidential Financial Statement under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold Spillman's Confidential Financial Statement under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 589381

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd Jorgensen
Spillman Technologies, Inc.
4625 Lake Park Boulevard
Salt Lake City, Utah 84120
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sanjay Singhvi
Archonix Public Safety Software
401 Route 73 North, Suite 105
Marlton, New Jersey 08053
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jack Reynolds
For TriTech Software Systems
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw
Pittman LLP
909 Fannin, Suite 2000
Houston, Texas 77010
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sarath Boyapati
Cyrun
5615 Scotts Valley Drive, Suite
210
Scotts Valley, California 95066
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Mary T. Lucas
Diversified Computer Systems
P.O. Box 2656
Summerville, South Carolina
29484
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tommy Galbraith
ICS
3499 FM 1461
McKinney, Texas 75071
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Lutfy
J2 Software Solutions
217 Big Springs Avenue
Tullahoma, Tennessee 37388
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig Bickley
New World Systems Corporation
888 West Big Beaver Road, Suite
600
Troy, Michigan 48084
(w/o enclosures)