



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 2, 2017

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
Assistant General Counsel
Dallas Independent School District
9400 North Central Expressway, Suite 614
Dallas, Texas 75231

OR2017-22420

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# 677938 (ORR #16372).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the winning bid for a specified request for proposals. You state the district has released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We understand the release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of NCH Corporation ("NCH"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified NCH of the request for information and of its 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 NCH. We have considered the submitted argument and reviewed the submitted information.

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). Although the district argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110, 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 argument under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

NCH asserts portions of its information is protected 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. *Id.* § 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.¹ 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

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

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, 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

NCH claims portions of its information are excepted under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, which 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* Open Records Decision 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).

NCH states its information consists of commercial and financial information, the release of which would cause it substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review of NCH’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we conclude NCH has established the release of the information we marked would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find NCH has failed to demonstrate the release of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *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). Furthermore, we note the information at issue relates to a contract awarded to NCH. This office considers the terms of government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the contract awarded to a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Division No. 514 (1998) (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). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state

agency). Consequently, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find NCH has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find NCH has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. See ORD 402. Consequently, the district may not withhold NCH's information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."² Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Thus, the district must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 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. Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.

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.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jahanna Ward', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jahanna Ward
Attorney
Open Records Division

JW/tdw

Ref: ID# 677938

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)