



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 22, 2014

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler  
Senior Counsel  
Office of Legal Services  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2014-12683

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 530047 (TEA PIR# 21944).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for the bids submitted by all vendors and any bid tabulation for RFP 701-14-023. You state the agency will release some of the requested information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Atlantic Research Partners; BloomBoard, Inc.; Knowledge Delivery Systems; Learning Sciences International, L.L.C. ("LSI"); National Institute for Excellence in Teaching; Netchemia, L.L.C.; Safal Partners; School Improvement Network; and SoftSearch Solutions, Incorporated. Accordingly, you state you notified these third parties of the 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); *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

comments from LSI. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note 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) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B)*. As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from LSI explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted 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 agency may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Next, LSI asserts portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. 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, 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 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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 have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note 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 also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

LSI asserts its pricing information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude LSI has failed to establish a *prima facie* case the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find LSI has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of LSI's pricing information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note 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 (1977). 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. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the agency must release the submitted

---

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

information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/akg

Ref: ID# 530047

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Toth  
Learning Sciences International  
175 Cornell Road, Suite 18  
Blairsville, Pennsylvania 15717  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jason Lange  
Bloomboard, Inc.  
430 Cowper Street, Suite 250  
Palo Alto, California 94041  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wayne Morgan  
Netchemia LLC  
3520 West 75<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
Prairie Village, Kansas 66208  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Amy Mims  
Atlantic Research Partners  
13720 Old St. Augustine Road, Suite 8-256  
Jacksonville, Florida 32258  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alvin Crawford  
Knowledge Delivery Systems  
110 William Street, Suite 2201  
New York, New York 10038  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jason Culbertson  
National Institute for Excellence in Teaching  
1250 4<sup>th</sup> Street  
Santa Monica, California 90401  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mukta Pandit  
Safal Partners  
10700 Richmond Avenue, Suite 227  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Christensen  
School Improvement Network  
32 West Center Street  
Midvale, Utah 84047  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark VanHooser  
Searchsoft Solutions  
47 South Meridian Street, Suite 307  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
(w/o enclosures)