



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 23, 2010

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

OR2010-17726

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# 400972.

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all submitted responses and scoring documents associated with RFP TF-203640. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state the submitted information may implicate the interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and submit documentation showing, that you notified the following third parties: Achieve3000; Apex Learning ("Apex"); CompassLearning ("Compass"); Education 2020; Education Technology Learning ("ETL"); KC Distance Learning, Inc. d/b/a Aventa Learning ("Aventa"); Thinkmap, Inc. ("Thinkmap"); and Virtual School Network ("Virtual") 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 considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments received from Apex, Compass, and Thinkmap.

Initially, 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 Achieve3000, Education 2020, ETL, Aventa, or Virtual. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that any portion of the submitted information constitutes the proprietary information of Achieve3000, Education 2020, ETL, Aventa, or Virtual. *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 any proprietary interests Achieve3000, Education 2020, ETL, Aventa, or Virtual may have in it.

Apex asserts some of its information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies such as the district, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as Apex. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the district does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of Apex's information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Although the district argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the district's arguments under section 552.110. We will, however, address the arguments under section 552.110 of Apex, Compass, and Thinkmap. Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 552.110(a). 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. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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 (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. 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.*; *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).

Apex and Compass argue that portions of their information constitute protected trade secrets. Upon review, we find that Compass has established a *prima facie* case that portions of its customer information, which we have marked, constitute trade secrets. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a). However, we note that Compass has made some of the customer information it seeks to withhold publicly available on the company’s website. Because Compass has published this information, Compass has failed to demonstrate that release of this information would cause

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 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).

substantial competitive injury. *See* ORD 402. Furthermore, Apex and Compass have failed to demonstrate that any portion of their remaining information at issue constitutes a trade secret. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORD 319 at 3, 306 at 3 (1982). Thus, no portion of their remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Next, Apex, Compass, and Thinkmap assert that portions of their remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). Thinkmap asserts its customer information constitutes commercial information, the release of which would cause Thinkmap substantial competitive injury. Upon review, we find Thinkmap has established that release of its customer information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. We also find that Apex and Thinkmap have established that their pricing information constitutes commercial and financial information, the release of which would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). We note, however, that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Compass, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, the pricing information of Compass may not be withheld on that basis. Further, Compass and Thinkmap have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of the remaining submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to these companies. Accordingly, none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* ORD 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).

We note that some of the remaining information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable

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).

person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976).

This office has generally found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). We note that common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporations and other types of business organizations. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); see also *U. S. v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy). Furthermore, although this office generally classifies percentages of ownership of a business as personal financial information, we do not so hold where an individual owns a one hundred percent interest in a business. Such information simply reflects that an individual owns his own business. Upon review, we find that the district must withhold the ownership percentage information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the information that reflects one hundred percent ownership and corporate ownership is not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld on that basis under section 552.101.

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue 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 (1978). 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 of the Government Code and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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_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,



Nneka Kanu
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NK/em

Ref: ID# 400972

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Fredman
CEO
Thinkmap, Inc.
155 Spring Street, 3A
New York, New York 10012
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jordan Herman
Attorney for CompassLearning
Baker Botts, L.L.P.
98 San Jacinto Boulevard., Suite 1500
Austin, Texas 78701-4078
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Regis Lacher
Proposal Specialist
Apex Learning
1215 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1500
Seattle, Washington 98161
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregg Levin
KC Distance Learning, Inc.
DBA Aventa Learning
650 NE Holiday Street, Suite 1400
Portland, Oregon 97232
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Beverlye Horton
Virtual School Network
160 Continental Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75207
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ed Tweedie
Educational Technology Learning
1256 Main Street, Suite 263
Southlake, Texas 76092
(w/o enclosures)

President/CEO
Achieve3000
1091 River Avenue
Lakewood, New Jersey 08701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gene Storz
Education 2020
7303 E. Earll Drive, Suite 200
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
(w/o enclosures)