



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 28, 2010

Mr. James W. Deatherage  
Jim Deatherage & Associates, P.C.  
800 West Airport Freeway, Suite 518, LB 6060  
Irving, Texas 75062

OR2010-09520

Dear Mr. Deatherage:

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# 384443.

The Irving Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests for all responses to RFQ# 10-11 for a Professional Development Management System and materials used in the evaluation/decision process. You state you are releasing some of the requested information, including information responsive to the request for materials used in the evaluation/decision process. The district takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Alchemy Systems, L.P. ("Alchemy"), EDMIN, and iAssessment, LLC d/b/a Truenorthlogic (collectively, the "third parties"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 received correspondence from a representative of Alchemy. We have considered the submitted arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

We note that 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received any arguments from EDMIN or iAssessment, LLC d/b/a Truenorthlogic. We, thus, have no basis for concluding that any portion of these companies' proposals constitutes their proprietary 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 any of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of EDMIN and iAssessment, LLC d/b/a Truenorthlogic.

Next, Alchemy states that it would not have responded to the RFQ if it knew its information would be disclosed. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *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. 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 falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Alchemy raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for its proposal. 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. *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.<sup>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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 that section 552.110(a) is applicable 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).

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.* § 552.110(b); *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Alchemy claims that portions of the submitted information constitute trade secrets and are excepted under section 552.110(a). Having considered Alchemy’s arguments, we find that it has established a *prima facie* case that some of its customer information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We note that Alchemy has published the identities of some of its customers on its website. Thus, Alchemy has failed to demonstrate that the information it has published on its website is a trade secret. Further, Alchemy has failed to demonstrate that any of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Alchemy demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply

---

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

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.” 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). Thus, none of Alchemy’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Alchemy also contends that its proposal is excepted under section 552.110(b) and argues that release of its information would harm the district’s ability and the ability of other governmental entities to obtain information in response to future requests for proposals. In advancing this argument, Alchemy appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. However, section 552.110(b) has been amended since the issuance of *National Parks*. Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard for excepting from disclosure confidential information. The current statute does not incorporate this aspect of the *National Parks* test; it now requires only a specific factual demonstration that release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). Thus, the ability of a governmental body to obtain information from private parties is no longer a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Alchemy’s interests in its information.

Upon review of Alchemy’s arguments and its information, we find Alchemy has established that the pricing information we have marked in its proposal constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked in Alchemy’s proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Alchemy has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, Alchemy has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Next, we address Alchemy’s contention that its remaining information is excepted from disclosure by section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (2) commercial 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.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "commercial 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." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). As previously stated, Alchemy has failed to demonstrate any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, and Alchemy has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing release of its remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Consequently, we conclude that the district may not withhold any portion of Alchemy's remaining information pursuant to section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we note that section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the district does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude that no portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

Finally, Alchemy informs us that its information is 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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 have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information 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\\_orl.php](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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Laura Ream Lemus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LRL/jb

Ref: ID# 384443

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas A. Kulik  
Scheff & Stone, L.L.P.  
500 North Akard, Suite 2700  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sage Ann Scheer, Ph.D.  
Vice President - General Manager  
EDMIN  
5471 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 310  
San Diego, California 92123  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kim Tafiti  
Director, Solutions Development  
Truenorthlogic  
8160 Highland Drive, Suite A-5  
Sandy, Utah 84093  
(w/o enclosures)