



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 27, 2010

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2010-05972

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 377482 (Dallas Request No. 9153).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all proposals submitted in response to the request for proposals for the district's 2002 bond program. You state you take no position on release of the requested information. You also explain that the submitted information may contain third parties' proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you have notified Corporate Express, Indeco Sales, Inc. ("Indeco"), We Bid Furniture Incorporated ("We Bid"), Virco, Inc. ("Virco"), and School Specialty, Inc. ("School Specialty") of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments received from Staples Contract & Commercial, Inc. ("Staples") which informs us it is the successor-in-interest to Corporate Express.

We note that 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 decision, we have not received any correspondence from Indeco, We Bid, Virco, or School Specialty. Thus, these private 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 (1990). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of these third parties' proprietary interest.

We next address Staples' arguments against disclosure. Staples argues that information submitted to the district is subject to a non-disclosure agreement. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submitted the information anticipated or requested 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 overrule or repeal provisions of the Act by agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [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). Thus, the district must release the submitted information unless it falls within the scope of an exception to disclosure, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary. *See* Open Records Decision No. 470 at 2 (1987).

Staples asserts its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov't Code § 552.104. We note that section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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 does not raise section 552.104, this section is not applicable to any portion of the submitted information. *See* ORD 592 (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of Staples' information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Staples also raises section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and (2) “[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(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “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 a single or ephemeral event 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). This office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless the party claiming this exception has shown that the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret and has demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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." 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999).

¹The 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 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Staples claims its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). After reviewing the information at issue and Staples' arguments, we determine that Staples has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information meets the definition of a trade secret nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We 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 business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." *See* Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Staples also seeks to withhold its information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that Staples has made only conclusory allegations that release of the submitted information would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Furthermore, we note that the information pertains to the prices Staples charges the district for its services. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 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). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b).

We note the remaining information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that "[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."² Gov't Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Therefore, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³

Finally, we note that some of the remaining information at issue appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception, such as section 552.136, on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³We note that this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.


exception applies to the information, but a custodian of public records must comply with copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). Thus, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must 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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_or1.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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Chris Schulz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CS/cc

Ref: ID# 377482

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Derrell Conway
Account Manager
Corporate Express
2230 Avenue J
Arlington, Texas 76006
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin Goldston
Sales Representative
Indeco Sales, Inc.
805 East 4th Avenue
Belton, Texas 76513
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Deshong
Vice President
We Bid Furniture Incorporated
~~1750 Empire Central~~
Dallas, Texas 75235
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Patricia Quinones
Corporate Director of Marketing Services
Virco, Inc.
2027 Harpers Way
Torrance, California 90501
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brad A. Snoke
Contracts Director
School Speciality, Inc.
100 Paragon Parkway
Mansfield, Ohio 44903
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert H. Kelley
Counsel
Staples
P.O. Box 9271
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701-9271
(w/o enclosures)