



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 18, 2012

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

OR2012-14843

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# 465210.

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for (1) all responses to the request for proposal LH-203731; (2) the resulting contract; (3) two specified invoices from Norlight Telecommunications ("Norlight") related to the resulting contract; and (4) two specified invoices from Unite Private Networks ("Unite") related to the resulting contract. You indicate the district does not have information responsive to items two through four of the request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified FiberLight, L.L.C. ("FiberLight"), Norlight, Unite, and Zayo Bandwith, L.L.C. ("Zayo") of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

exception in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from FiberLight and Windstream NTI, Inc. ("Windstream").² Thus, we have considered the arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

You raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for the submitted information. However, section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. As such, a governmental body may not raise section 552.110 on behalf of a third party. Therefore, if we do not receive comments from a third party explaining why the information at issue should not be released, we will conclude section 552.110 is not applicable. 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 letter, we have not received arguments from Unite and Zayo. Thus, Unite and Zayo have failed to demonstrate 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. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Unite or Zayo may have in the information.

Next, we note a portion of the information FiberLight seeks to withhold was not submitted by the district for our review. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information submitted by the governmental body requesting the ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Because this information was not submitted by the district, this ruling does not address FiberLight's argument against its disclosure.

FiberLight also argues some of the submitted information should not be disclosed because it was made confidential by a non-disclosure agreement. However, we note information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits 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 overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an 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 section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

²In its correspondence to our office, Windstream informs us that Norlight has been renamed Windstream. Thus, we will refer to the company previously known as Norlight as Windstream.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. *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.³ 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

³The 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).

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.

Windstream and FiberLight assert their information should be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Windstream and FiberLight have established a *prima facie* case that some of their customer information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, the district must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We note, however, FiberLight has made the remaining customer information it seeks to withhold publicly available on its website. Because FiberLight has published this information, it has failed to demonstrate this information is a trade secret. We also find Windstream and FiberLight have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We further note 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.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Windstream also asserts its information should be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Windstream has established release of its pricing information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Windstream has not demonstrated how release of the remaining information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury. *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. Consequently, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the district must withhold the insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *See id.*; *see also* 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 insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only 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,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 465210

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Michelle Simpson
Counsel
Windstream Communications, Inc.
4001 Rodney Parham Road, Mailstop B1F03-71A
Little Rock, Arkansas 72212
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Brandy Noelle Hughes
Corporate Counsel
FiberLight, LLC
1700 Great Oaks Way, Suite 100
Alpharetta, Georgia 30022
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Graham
Unite Private Networks
950 West 92 Highway
Kearney, Missouri 64060
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Deering
Zayo Bandwith, LLC
400 Centennial Parkway, Suite 200
Louisville, Colorado 80027
(w/o enclosures)