



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 29, 2015

Ms. Heather Silver
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-27179

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 592249.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for all proposals submitted for the request for competitive sealed proposal number BHZ1515 for an Agenda System. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of PROVOX Systems, Inc. ("PROVOX"); Hyland Software, Inc. ("Hyland"); and Granicus, Inc. ("Granicus"). Accordingly, you state and provide documentation showing, you have notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the circumstances). We have received comments from PROVOX and Hyland. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Granicus. Thus, Granicus has not demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 interests Granicus may have in the information.

PROVOX and Hyland claim some of their information is 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* 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.¹ 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 ORD 552 at 5. 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).

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.

Upon review, we find Hyland has demonstrated some of its information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause it substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We also find Hyland has demonstrated its customer information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, to the extent Hyland's customer information is not publicly available on its company website, the city must withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government

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

Code.² Although PROVOX seeks to withhold its pricing information, PROVOX was the winning bidder with respect to the contract at issue. We note the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interested in knowing prices charged by government contractors) *see also* ORD 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Upon review, we find PROVOX and Hyland have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would cause either company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988), 319 at 3, 175 at 4 (1977). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

PROVOX and Hyland also claim the remaining information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we conclude PROVOX and Hyland have failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of the information they seek to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has PROVOX or Hyland demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; ORD 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). 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* Huffines, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) 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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. To the extent Hyland's customer information is not publicly available on its company website, the city must withhold Hyland's customer information under section 552.110(b) 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, 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,



Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 592249

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Markus Vogt
President
PROVOX Systems, Inc.
8951 Synergy Drive, Suite 223
McKinney, Texas 75070
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Noreen B. Kilbane
VP, Accounting & Finance
Hyland Software, Inc.
28500 Clemens Road
Westlake, Ohio 44145
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jack Melnicoff
Granicus, Inc.
707 17th Street, Suite 4000
Denver, Colorado 80202
(w/o enclosures)