



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 1, 2014

Mr. Fred A. Stormer  
Counsel for Lazbuddie Independent School District  
Underwood Law Firm, P.C.  
P.O. Box 9158  
Amarillo, Texas 79105-9158

OR2014-17490

Dear Mr. Stormer:

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# 538157.

The Lazbuddie Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the evaluation sheet and copies of proposals submitted by all firms that responded to a specified request for proposal. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Jim D. Koontz & Associates ("JDKA"); Grimes & Associates; ARMKO Industries, Inc.; and Shiver Mergert & Associates, L.L.P. ("SMA") of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments from JKDA and SMA. 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 only received briefs from JDKA and SMA. Thus, the remaining third parties have not demonstrated that they have 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

JDKA argues its information is confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise. As JDKA does not raise any exceptions to disclosure under the Act, the district may not withhold any of the requested information based on any proprietary interests JDKA may have in the information.

SMA raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. However, SMA has not pointed to any confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of the submitted information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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 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).

SMA claims its information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find SMA has failed to establish a *prima facie* case its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has SMA demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* 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). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

SMA also claims its information constitutes commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause it competitive harm. Upon review, we find SMA has not established that the release of any portion of its information would result in substantial harm to its

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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 substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) 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.”<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. As there are no remaining arguments against disclosure, 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.

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](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,



Joseph Behrke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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).

Ref: ID# 538157

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim D. Koontz, P.E., R.R.C.  
President  
Jim D. Koontz & Associates, Inc.  
3120 North Grimes Street  
Hobbs, New Mexico 88240  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jay Bingham  
A.I.A. Architect  
Shiver Megert & Associates, L.L.P.  
102 East Ninth Avenue, Suite 200  
Amarillo, Texas 79101  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Blankenship  
Business Development  
Grimes & Associates  
7120 IH-40 West, Suite 120  
Amarillo, Texas 79106  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brad Draper, RRO  
Vice President of Sales and Marketing  
ARMKO Industries, Inc.  
7302 82<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite #14  
Lubbock, Texas 79424  
(w/o enclosures)