



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 30, 2009

Mr. Eric V. Grimmett
Superintendent of Schools
Danbury Independent School District
P.O. Box 378
Danbury, Texas 77534-0378

OR2009-09016

Dear Mr. Grimmett:

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# 347771.

The Danbury Independent School District (the "district") received a request for a specified lease agreement between the district and Clearwire Spectrum Holdings II, L.L.C. ("Spectrum"). While you raise sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.110, and 552.136 of the Government Code as possible exceptions to disclosure for portions of the submitted information, you make no arguments as to whether the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under those sections. Instead, you state that you have notified Spectrum of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted lease agreement 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 correspondence from an attorney for Spectrum. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Spectrum points out that the submitted information is protected under a confidentiality and non-disclosure agreement signed by the district. We note that 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 Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Spectrum has not directed our attention to any law under which any of the submitted information is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Spectrum raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. Section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the district did not submit any arguments in support of withholding any information pursuant to section 552.104, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that 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 also note that 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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." Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business

¹The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 others 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).

enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm). However, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* ORD 514.

Spectrum contends portions of the submitted lease agreement qualify as trade secret information under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find Spectrum has failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret. In addition, Spectrum has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted lease agreement under section 552.110(a).

We also find Spectrum has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating release of any of the submitted lease agreement would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. *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). Accordingly, we determine that no part of the submitted lease agreement is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. We find that Spectrum has failed to demonstrate how the “password” it has marked constitutes an access device number subject to section 552.136. We therefore conclude that the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.136. As no other arguments against disclosure have been raised, the district must release the submitted lease agreement to the requestor.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/eeg

Ref: ID# 347771

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John F. McGrory
Davis Wright Tremaine LLC
1300 SW Fifth Avenue Suite 2300
Portland, Oregon 97201-5630
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Hope Cochran
Clearwire Spectrum Holdings II LLC
4400 Carillon Point
Kirkland, Washington 98033
(w/o enclosures)