



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 7, 2018

Ms. JoAnna Talley  
Office of Legal Services  
Fort Worth Independent School District  
100 North University Drive, Suite Southwest 172  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2018-02863

Dear Ms. Talley:

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# 694822 (Ref. No. W001441-110917).

The Fort Worth Independent School District (the "district") received a request for proposals and evaluations pertaining to a specified bid number. Although the district takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, it states release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of ADF Solutions ("ADF"); Heery International, Inc. ("Heery"); Hoar Program Management ("Hoar"); Jacobs Project Management Co. ("Jacobs"); LAN-Howard Owner's Representative ("LAN"); PBK; Procedeo Group; and TMR Partners. Accordingly, the district states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right 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 arguments from ADF, Heery, Hoar, Jacobs, and LAN. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note Hoar objects to disclosure of information the district has not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the district and is limited to the information the district has submitted for our review. *See*

Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

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 id.* § 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 the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. ADF and LAN state they have competitors. In addition, ADF states release of its information at issue would reveal financial weaknesses and provide competitors with an advantage. LAN also states release of its information would give competitors an advantage and allow competitors to use its information for their own benefit. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find ADF and LAN have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold LAN's information in its entirety and the information ADF seeks to withhold, which we have marked, under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

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. 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:

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.<sup>2</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* 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

---

<sup>2</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).

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.

In advancing their arguments, we understand Hoar and Jacobs to rely, in part, on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d at 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only the interest of Hoar and Jacobs in the information at issue.

Heery, Hoar, and Jacobs contend some of their information is commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the company. Upon review, we find Heery, Hoar, and Jacobs have demonstrated some of their information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must generally withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> However, to the extent any of the customer identities Hoar seeks to withhold have been published on its website, we find Hoar has failed to establish release of such information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Further, we find Heery, Hoar, and Jacobs have not established any of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue on this basis.

Hoar and Jacobs assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Hoar and Jacobs

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of their information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Hoar and Jacobs have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information at issue. See ORDs 402, 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, none of Hoar's or Jacobs's information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “[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.”<sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 552.136(b); see *id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of this exception. Thus, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to copyright law. 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, the district may withhold LAN's information in its entirety and the information ADF seeks to withhold, which we have marked, we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. To the extent Hoar's customer information is not publicly available on the company's website, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; however, 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.

---

<sup>4</sup>The 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).

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,



Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/tdw

Ref: ID# 694822

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

7 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)