



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 19, 2015

Ms. Cynthia Rincon
General Counsel
Fort Bend Independent School District
16431 Lexington Boulevard
Sugar Land, Texas 77479

OR2015-21913

Dear Ms. Rincon:

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# 583494 (FBISD 2015-16-66).

The Fort Bend Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the documentation and submitted proposals for seven specified bids. Although you state the district takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of several third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of the companies' rights 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from NWN Corporation ("NWN"); Presidio Networked Solutions Group, L.L.C. ("Presidio"); and Prime Systems ("Prime"). We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

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 not received comments from any of the remaining third parties 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 note the district has redacted portions of the submitted information. We further note the district may redact bank account and routing numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.¹ However, you do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold any of the remaining redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the district should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See Gov't Code* § 552.302.

NWN states it does not have the authority to release some confidential information from its customers and manufacturers. Information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information to a governmental body anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). Thus, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. 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 requested information falls within an exception to disclosure, the district must release it, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Presidio asserts a portion of its information is confidential under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, which 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(a) applies to information in the personnel file of a governmental employee. *See id.* None of Presidio's information consists

¹Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact, without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the information described in section 552.136(b). Gov't Code § 552.136(c); *see also id.* § 552.136(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to withhold information under section 552.136(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.136(c) must provide certain notice to requestor).

of information in the personnel file of a governmental employee. Therefore, section 552.102(a) is not applicable and the district may not withhold any of Presidio's information on that basis.

Prime claims its submitted information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104(a) excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. Prime states it has competitors. In addition, Prime states release of its information would provide an unfair advantage to its competitors on future bids. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Prime has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold Prime's submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

NWN and Presidio also claim portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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. *See* 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 Record 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 5-6 (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).

We understand NWN to argue portions of the company’s information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find NWN has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret and has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *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 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory

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

predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Presidio contends portions of its information are commercial or financial information, release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to Presidio. Upon review, we find Presidio has demonstrated its customer information and pricing information constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must withhold Presidio's customer information, to the extent the information is not publicly available on the company's website, and its pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Presidio has failed to demonstrate the release of any of the remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *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). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

As noted above, the district has redacted bank account numbers and routing numbers pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information contains additional information subject to section 552.136. Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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." 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. Thus, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be subject to copyright law. 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 may withhold Prime's submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold Presidio's customer information, to the extent the information is not publicly available on the company's website, and its pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the

remaining submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; 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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 583494

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Pam Faver
CTS Consolidated Telecom
Services
204 Texas Avenue, Suite A
Round Rock, Texas 78664
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Shawn E. O'Brien
MTM Technologies, Inc.
15660 Dallas Parkway, Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75248
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ricky Johnson
Design Security Controls
1511 Upland Drive, Suite 103
Houston, Texas 77043
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Veltri
Network Cabling Services
12626 Fuqua Street
Houston, Texas 77034
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Wade
Wade Garcia & Associates
16607 Blanco Road, Suite 706
San Antonio, Texas 78232
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dennis Vogelpohl
Stanley Convergent Security
Solutions
6699 Portwest Drive, #100
Houston, Texas 77024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Hoffman
STS360
1081 Ohio Drive, Suite 1
Plano, Texas 75093
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rob Emmert
Entech Sales and Service
1930 Lauder Road
Houston, Texas 77039
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wayne McDonald
Fisk Electric Company
10855 Westview Drive
Houston, Texas 77043
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Rodriguez
Astatic Technologies dba Allied
Security Links
1005 Kramer Lane
Austin, Texas 78758
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brett McDowell
Critical Infrastructure Solutions
17225 El Camino Real, Suite 450
Houston, Texas 77058
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wasi Ahmed Yousaf
En Pointe Technologies Sales
18701 South Figueroa Street
Gardena, California 90248
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Hemant Parekh
ABC Laser USA
6000-G Unity Drive
Norcross, Georgia 30071
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Meagan Vander
AC/DC Synergy Group
623 South Chestnut Street, Suite B
Tomball, Texas 77375
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Marjan Du Bois
Adaptive Technology Systems
21015 Plum Ranch
Garden Ridge, Texas 78266
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Morrone
Advanced Networks of Texas
1611 Taylor Mills Court
Katy, Texas 77494
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Jones
Anixter, Inc.
9900 San Houston Center Drive
Houston, Texas 77064
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ryan Grant
Austin Ribbon & Computer
Supply
9211 Waterford Centre Boulevard,
Suite 202
Austin, Texas 78758
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Weston
ASAP Security Services
8713 Fallbrook Road
Houston, Texas 77064
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Caesar Otieno
Avid Systems
9120 Dietz Elkhorn Road
Boerne, Texas 78015
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Tapiawala
Collaboration Solutions
2941 Trade Center Drive #120
Carrollton, Texas 75007
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ron Smith
Communications & Emergency
Production
10404 Cash Road, Building E,
Suite 100
Stafford, Texas 77477
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry Martin
Data Optics Cable
250 East Ramsey Road
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Aemisegger
Digital Plaza
741 Tennis Avenue
Ambler, Pennsylvania 19002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ricky Johnson
Deisgn Security Controls
1511 Upland, Suite 103
Houston, Texas 77043
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt Anderson
Globe Electric Supply
P.O. Box 710548
Houston, Texas 77271
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Danny Hoffman
JDN Acme
1308 North First Street
Bellaire, Texas 77401
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eugene Pascual
Komputer & Peripherals
11750 Wilcrest Drive
Houston, Texas 77099
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris McEntee
Office Max North America
6600 Military Trail
Boca Raton, Florida 33496
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Shaun Castillo
Preffered Technologies
1414 Wedgewood Street
Houston, Texas 77093
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Huffman
Convergent Technologies
1420 North Sam Houston Parkway
East, Suite 190
Houston, Texas 77032
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Chang
Prime Systems
10402 Harwin Drive
Houston, Texas 77036
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael McKean
CDI Computer Dealers
130 South Town Centre Boulevard
Markham, Ontario L6G 1B8
Canada
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Pellettiere
CDW-G
One CDW Way
200 North Milwaukee Avenue
Vernon Hills, Illinois 60061
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alexander Murdoch
QA Systems
5811 Blue Bluff Road
Austin, Texas 78724
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Nancy Hemmen
TSA, Inc.
2050 West Sam Houston Parkway
Houston, Texas 77043
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Hicks
Insight Public Sector
2250 West Pinehurst Boulevard,
Suite 200
Addison, Illinois 60101
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stephanie Clark
NWN Corporation
4802 South Sam Houston Parkway
West, #500
Houston, Texas 77086
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Brick
All-Tex Networking Solutions
1815 Mons Avenue
Rosenberg, Texas 77471
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Vinant Prahlad
DISYS Solutions
4151 Lafayette Center Drive, Suite
600
Chantilly, Virginia 20151
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew Rosenbaum
Presidio Networked Solutions
1955 Lakeway Drive
Lewisville, Texas 75057
(w/o enclosures)