



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 16, 2015

Ms. Lauren M. Wood
Counsel for the McKinney Independent School District
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Hullett, PC
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2015-11874

Dear Ms. Wood:

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# 567614.

The McKinney Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the bids submitted for a specified project.¹ The district states it is releasing the bids submitted by Consolidated Communications, Netsync Network, and Windstream as they do not object to the release of their information. Although the district takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, it states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Affiliated Communications ("Affiliated"); AT&T; Encore Technology Group, LLC ("Encore"); Flowroute, LLC; Insight Public Sector, Inc.; Jive Communication, Inc.; Netrix, LLC; and Presidio Networked Solutions, Inc. ("Presidio"). Accordingly, the district states, and provides documentation showing, it notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

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). The district submitted comments from Affiliated, Encore, and Presidio. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 only received comments from Affiliated, Encore, and Presidio explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

We understand Affiliated, Encore, and Presidio to argue 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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim 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).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

We understand Affiliated, Encore, and Presidio to argue their information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find Affiliated, Encore, and Presidio have failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of their 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* ORD 402. Therefore, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

We understand Affiliated, Encore, and Presidio to further argue their information consists of commercial information, the release of which would cause their companies substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Affiliated, Encore, and Presidio have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of their information would cause their

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).

companies substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661. Therefore, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note the submitted information contains information subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which 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.”³ 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. Upon review, we find the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

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

Ref: ID# 567614

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Philip Ryu Baker
Flowroute, LLC
1221 2nd Avenue, Suite 330
Seattle, Washington 98101
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Samir Patel
Netrix, LLC
2801 Lakeside Dr., Third Floor
Bannockburn, Illinois 60015
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Fred Zamora
Jive Communications, Inc.
1275 West 1600 North, Suite 100
Orem, Utah 84057
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daren Fisher
Insight Public Sector, Inc.
3480 Lotus Drive
Plano, Texas 75075
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken Robbins
AT&T
311 S. Akard Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Luke Taylor
Account Executive
Presidio Networked Solutions, Inc.
1955 Lakeway Drive, Suite 220
Lewisville, Texas 75057
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. April Hughes
Encore Technology Group, LLC
200 Wade Hampton Blvd., Suite 210
Greenville, South Carolina 29615
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Carter
Affiliated Communications
c/o Lauren M. Wood
Counsel for the McKinney Isd
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210
(w/o enclosures)