



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 15, 2014

Ms. Marney Collins Sims
General Counsel
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District
P.O. Box 692003
Houston, Texas 77269-2003

OR2014-12174

Dear Ms. Sims:

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#529098.

The Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District (the "district") received a request for vendor responses for three specified requests for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the requested information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released.¹ *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 on behalf of Comcast Business Communications, L.L.C. ("Comcast") and DC2GO Inc. ("DC2GO"). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it is not a vendor response to any of the three specified requests for proposals. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the district is not required to release such information in response to this request.

¹The third parties notified pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: AT&T; Cogent Communications; Comcast Business Communications, L.L.C.; DC2GO Inc.; General Datatech, L.P.; Interfacing Company of Texas; Internap; Level 3; LSI; Lumenate; and Windstream.

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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has received comments only from Comcast and DC2GO explaining why their information should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude the release of the submitted responsive information would implicate the interests of the remaining third parties, and none of the submitted responsive information may be withheld on that basis. *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.

DC2GO claims portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.102(a) 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). However, section 552.102 applies to only information in the personnel file of a governmental employee. *See id.* None of DC2GO'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 district may not withhold any of DC2GO's information on that basis.

DC2GO asserts its information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies such as the district, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as DC2GO. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the district does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted responsive information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Comcast and DC2GO assert some of their submitted information is excepted from disclosure under subsections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code.² 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.*

²Although Comcast raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.110 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

§ 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.³ 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).

³The 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* ORD 661 at 5 (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).

Upon review, we find DC2GO and Comcast have failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted responsive information meets the definition of a trade secret. *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), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Consequently, the district may not withhold any of the submitted responsive information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find Comcast and DC2GO have demonstrated portions of their information consist of commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, Comcast and DC2GO have not demonstrated the release of any of the remaining responsive information would result in substantial harm to their competitive positions. *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, 175 at 4. Accordingly, none of the remaining responsive information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding 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.”⁴ 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. *See*

⁴The 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).

Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Upon review, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we 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 district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code and section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining responsive information must be released; however, any information protected by 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,



Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 529098

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Natasha Pratt
AT&T
6500 West Loop South
Bellaire, Texas 77401
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stacy Baxter
Cogent Communications
1015 31st Street, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20007
(w/o enclosures)

Comcast Business Communications, L.L.C.
c/o Ms. Dineen J. Majcher
Smith & Majcher
4210 Spicewood Springs Road, Suite 202
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew Coe
DC2GO, Inc.
64 Burbridge Avenue
Halifax, Nova Scotia
Canada B3B 06G
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sam Tenorio
General Datatech
999 Metro Media Place
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christi Caple
ICTX
P.O. Box 131835
The Woodlands, Texas 77393
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ashley Walker
Internap
1301 Fannin Street, Suite 1150
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dwight Steiner
Level 3
1025 Eldorado Boulevard
Broomfield, Colorado 80021
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Pruitt
LSI
P.O. Box 79353
Houston, Texas 77279
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Layton
Lumenate
16365 Park Ten Place, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77084
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Coy Highsmith
Windstream
14100 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 500
San Antonio, Texas 78232
(w/o enclosures)