



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 18, 2020

Ms. Sandra D. Carpenter
General Counsel
Round Rock Independent School District
1 Chisholm Trail, Suite 400
Round Rock, Texas 78681

OR2020-08517

Dear Ms. Carpenter:

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# 817265 (TPIA 2020-205).

The Round Rock Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to Bid Number 20-033, Local Tax Roll Audit Services.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.110, and 552.153 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson, L.L.P. ("Linebarger"); Perdue Brandon Fielder Collins & Mott; and Pope Consulting. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these interested 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 Linebarger. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ The district states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

Although the district argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepting from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and “[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”). Thus, we do not address the district’s argument under section 552.110.

We note 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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have only received comments from Linebarger. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining interested third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See generally 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 interest any of the remaining interested third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). 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.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). Upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder, and thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

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). 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 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.² 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, 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.

Linebarger claims portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Linebarger has established a *prima facie* case that some of its information constitutes trade secret information. Accordingly, to the extent Linebarger's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the district must withhold Linebarger's customer information under section

² 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).

552.110(a) of the Government Code.³ However, we find Linebarger has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Linebarger has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the 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 the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Linebarger also argues some of the remaining information consists of commercial or financial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the company under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note Linebarger was the winning bidder in this instance. 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 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Upon review, we find Linebarger has not established any of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.153 of the Government Code reads, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) In this section, “affected jurisdiction,” “comprehensive agreement,” “contracting person,” “interim agreement,” “qualifying project,” and “responsible governmental entity” have the meanings assigned those terms by Section 2267.001.

(b) Information in the custody of a responsible governmental entity that relates to a proposal for a qualifying project authorized under Chapter 2267 is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(2) the records are provided by a proposer to a responsible governmental entity or affected jurisdiction under Chapter 2267 and contain:

(A) trade secrets of the proposer; [or]

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

(B) financial records of the proposer, including balance sheets and financial statements, that are not generally available to the public through regulatory disclosure or other means[.]

Gov't Code § 552.153(a), (b)(2)(A)-(B). Section 2267.001(10) of the Government Code defines a "qualifying project" as the following:

(A) any ferry, mass transit facility, vehicle parking facility, port facility, power generation facility, fuel supply facility, oil or gas pipeline, water supply facility, public work, waste treatment facility, hospital, school, medical or nursing care facility, recreational facility, public building, or other similar facility currently available or to be made available to a governmental entity for public use, including any structure, parking area, appurtenance, and other property required to operate the structure or facility and any technology infrastructure installed in the structure or facility that is essential to the project's purpose; or

(B) any improvements necessary or desirable to unimproved real estate owned by a governmental entity.

Id. § 2267.001(10). Further, section 2267.001(11) defines a "responsible governmental entity" as "a governmental entity that has the power to develop or operate an applicable qualifying project." *Id.* § 2267.001(11). The district generally asserts it is a "responsible governmental entity" as defined by section 2267.001(11) and the information at issue relates to "a qualifying project for local tax roll audit services" authorized under chapter 2267. Assuming, without deciding, the district's assertion is correct, we find the district has not established any of the information it seeks to withhold constitutes a trade secret or that its release would provide a competing proposer an unjust advantage or adversely affect the third parties' financial interests or bargaining positions. *See generally id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); ORD Nos. 661 at 5-6, 552 at 5, 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.153 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent Linebarger's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the district must withhold Linebarger's customer information under section 552.110(a) 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.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

Ms. Sandra D. Carpenter - Page 6

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Michelle Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/mo

Ref: ID# 817265

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

3 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)