



KEN PAXTON

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 23, 2015

Ms. Maria Miller
Public Information Officer
Dallas County Community College District
1601 South Lamar Street, Suite 208
Dallas, Texas 75215-1816

OR2015-22330

Dear Ms. Miller:

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# 584325.

The Dallas County Community College District (the "district") received a request for all records pertaining to a specified request for proposal including all proposals, bids, bid tabulations, and plans belonging to the winning bidder. Although you take no position on the submitted information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Zielinski Design Associates Inc. and The Hall Agency Inc. ("Zielinski and Hall"), El Creative, Inc. ("El Creative"), STUDIOS 121 ("STUDIOS"), AMS Pictures, Inc. ("AMS"), and The Barber Shop Marketing ("Barber"). Accordingly, you state you notified the 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. *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 Zielinski and Hall. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered 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) of the Government Code 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 El Creative, STUDIOS, AMS, or Barber explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of these parties have protected proprietary interests 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, 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 interest El Creative, STUDIOS, AMS, or Barber may have in the information.

Zielinski and Hall claims portions of the submitted 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 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.¹ 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).

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 5-6.

Zielinski and Hall claims section 552.110(b) for portions of its information. Upon review, we find Zielinski and Hall has established the release of its pricing information would cause it substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Zielinski and Hall has failed to establish the release of any portion of the remaining information would cause it substantial competitive injury. *See id.* § 552.110(b); *see also* ORD 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). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code on behalf of Zielinski and Hall.

¹ 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).

Zielinski and Hall asserts portions of its information constitute a trade secret. Upon review, we find Zielinski and Hall failed to show any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code on behalf of Zielinski and Hall.

Section 552.136 states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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.”² *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note portions 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 have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only 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

²The 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).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/eb

Ref: ID# 584325

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas L. Zielinski
President
Zielinski Design.com
6301 Gaston Avenue, Suite 820
Dallas, Texas 75214
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Liz Barber
The Barber Shop Marketing
8140 Walnut Hill Lane, Suite 820
Dallas, Texas 75231
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Gonzalez
El Creative, Inc.
3816 San Jacinto
Dallas, Texas 75204
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Will Raymond
STUDIOS 121
6125 Airport Freeway
Haltom City, Texas 76117
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Eileen Yedwab
AMS Pictures, Inc.
16986 North Dallas Pkwy
Dallas, Texas 75248
(w/o enclosures)