



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 26, 2016

Ms. Andrea Sheehan
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Association of School Boards
P.O. Box 400
Austin, Texas 78767-0400

OR2016-01905

Dear Ms. Sheehan:

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# 595682.

The Texas Association of School Boards, Inc., custodian of records for the Texas Local Government Purchasing Cooperative d/b/a BuyBoard ("BuyBoard") received a request for (1) several categories of information pertaining to BuyBoard contract #465-14; (2) information pertaining to any other document, microfilm, or microfiche scanning contracts which BuyBoard has awarded over a specified time period; and (3) BuyBoard contract #409-12.¹ You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of several third parties. Accordingly, you state you notified Antares Development Corporation; Centex Records Management; Complete Records Management, Inc.; doc2e-file, Inc.; DocuNav Solutions; MCCI, LLC; Optitek, Inc.;

¹You state BuyBoard sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Precision Products, Inc.; Professional Document Systems, Inc. (“PDS”); Records Consultants, Inc.; The Harding Group; and YellowFolder, LLC (“YellowFolder”) of the request for information and of the companies’ rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 PDS and YellowFolder. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 not received comments from any of the remaining third parties 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, BuyBoard may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

PDS and YellowFolder claim their information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code.² 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. 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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

²Although PDS also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, PDS makes no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume PDS has withdrawn its claim this section applies to its information.

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 have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* 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 Record Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual

³ 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).

evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

PDS and YellowFolder assert section 552.110(b) for their information. Upon review, we find PDS has demonstrated its customer information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, BuyBoard must withhold PDS's customer information, to the extent the information is not publicly available on the company's website, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find PDS and YellowFolder have failed to demonstrate the release of any of the remaining information would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, 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, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Furthermore, we note contracts were awarded to PDS and YellowFolder. 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* 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). Therefore, BuyBoard may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

PDS and YellowFolder also state portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find PDS and YellowFolder have failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret and have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *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 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing 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(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 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 determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Upon review, BuyBoard must withhold the insurance policy numbers you have marked in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

BuyBoard states portions of the remaining information are 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.

In summary, BuyBoard must withhold PDS’s customer information, to the extent the information is not publicly available on the company’s website, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. BuyBoard must withhold the insurance policy numbers you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. BuyBoard must release the remaining 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, 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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 595682

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Andrea Smith
YellowFolder
1125 Longpoint Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew L. Bowman
Professional Document Systems
1414 Common Drive
El Paso, Texas 79936
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Davila
Antares Development Corporation
6243 IH 10 West, Suite 870
San Antonio, Texas 78201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Peter Kiely
Centex Records Management
1130 Rutherford Lane, Suite 220
Austin, Texas 78753
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert English
Complete Records Management, Inc.
33817 Hoff Road, Suite A106
Brookshire, Texas 77423
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sherry McManus
doc2e-file, Inc.
4500 South Wayside Drive, Suite 102
Houston, Texas 77087
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ashley Jackson
DocuNav Solutions
8501 Wade Boulevard
Frisco, Texas 75034
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Donny Barstow
MCCI, LLC
P.O. Box 2235
Tallahassee, Florida 32316
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ricki McGuire
Optitek, Inc.
2001 South Hanley Road, Suite 250
St. Louis, Missouri 61244
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Will Waterall
Precision Products, Inc.
12950 Dairy Ashford Road, Suite 121
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Gibbens
Records Consultants
12829 Wetmore Road
San Antonio, Texas 78247
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Yaser Wassef
The Harding Group
201 East John Carpenter Freeway, Suite 600
Irving, Texas 75062
(w/o enclosures)