



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 6, 2014

Ms. Ashley Wilson
General Counsel
Dallas County Schools
612 North Zang Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75208

OR2014-13711

Dear Ms. Wilson:

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# 531801 (PIR No. W000367).

Dallas County Schools ("DCS") received a request for information pertaining to RFP 03-21-14-01. You state DCS has provided some information to the requestor. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Blue Duck Education Ltd. ("Blue Duck"), BrainPOP, L.L.C., Capstone, Cerebellum Corporation d/b/a Standard Deviants Accelerate, Compass Learning, EBSCO Industries, Inc. ("EBSCO"), Encyclopedia Britannica/Britannica Digital Learning, Knovation, Inc. ("Knovation"), Nearpod, Inc., and The World & I Online.¹ Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of each company's 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 Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Blue Duck,

¹We note, and you acknowledge, DCS did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, third party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* § 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2(1977). Because third party interests are at stake in this instance, we will consider whether the information at issue must be withheld under the Act.

EBSCO, and Knovation. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note 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 only received comments from Blue Duck, EBSCO, and Knovation explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests in 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, DCS may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in it.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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.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 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.

EBSCO and Knovation raise section 552.110(a) of the Government Code for some of their information. Upon review, we find both parties have established a *prima facie* case their customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent EBSCO's and Knovation's customer information is not publicly available on their company websites, DCS must withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find the third parties at issue have failed to establish a *prima facie* case the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; 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, and experience not excepted under section 552.110). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret.

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).

See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, we find none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Blue Duck and EBSCO raise section 552.110(b) of the Government Code for some of their information. Upon review, however, we find the third parties at issue have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the information at issue would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Further, the pricing information of winning bidders, such as Blue Duck and EBSCO, 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 interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *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). Therefore, DCS may not withhold any of Blue Duck's or EBSCO's information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which states “[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.”³ Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, DCS must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent EBSCO's and Knovation's customer information is not publicly available on their website, DCS must withhold the customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. DCS must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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.

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).

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,



Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 531801

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jane Troller
Director of Marketing Services
EBSCO Information Services
P.O. Box 682
Ipswich, Massachusetts 01938
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mohit Midha
Blue Duck Education
One Euston Square
40 Melton Street
London NW1 2FD, United Kingdom
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Josephine McCann
Cerebellum Corporation
Suite 3D
16601 Tennessee Street
San Francisco, California 94107
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Avraham Kadar
BrainPOP
17th Floor
71 West 23rd Street
New York, New York 10010
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Gina Rivera
Compass Learning
203 Colorado Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Becky Henry
Encyclopedia Britannica
331 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Melisa Bebchik
Nearpod
1062 Northwest 1st Court
Hallandale Beach, Florida 33009
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles Kim
The World & I Online
3600 New York Avenue Northeast
Washington, D.C. 20002
(w/o enclosures)

Knovation
c/o Mr. Bryan A. Jacobs
Keating Muething & Klekamp
Suite 1400
One East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3752
(w/o enclosures)