



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 12, 2006

Ms. Renee Smith Byas
Vice Chancellor and General Counsel
North Harris Montgomery Community College District
District Services and Training Center
5000 Research Forest Drive
The Woodlands, Texas 77381-4356

OR2006-06162

Dear Ms. Byas:

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# 251324.

The North Harris Montgomery Community College District (the "district") received a request for responses to a specific request for qualification. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you claim that this information may be proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the district notified the interested third parties, SAS Institute, Inc ("SAS") and Kerdock Consulting, LLC ("Kerdock"), of the district's receipt of the request and of their right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code §552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered arguments received from SAS, and have reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code §552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from Kerdock. Thus, there has been no demonstration that any of the information that relates to Kerdock is proprietary for the purposes of the Act. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999).

SAS claims exceptions to disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “commercial 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.” See Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “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 a single or ephemeral event 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ See Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that 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).

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 (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Section 552.110(b) 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. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

SAS asserts that its proposal contains trade secret information that is protected by section 552.110(a). We also understand SAS to contend that its proposal contains information that is protected by section 552.110(b). Having considered these arguments and reviewed the submitted information that relates to SAS, we have marked customer and pricing information that the district must withhold under section 552.110(b). We find that SAS has not sufficiently demonstrated, for purposes of section 552.110(b), that the release of any other information submitted by the district would likely result in substantial competitive injury to SAS. We also find that SAS has not established that any of the remaining information in question qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business"). We note that some of the client information SAS seeks to withhold has been made publicly available by SAS on its website. We therefore conclude that the district may not withhold any of the remaining information that relates to SAS under section 552.110. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing).

We note that some of the submitted information indicates that it is protected by copyright law. A custodian of public records must comply with copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of materials that are subject to copyright law unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials that are protected by copyright law, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the district must withhold the information that we have marked in SAS's proposal under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor. However, in releasing any information that is protected by copyright, the district must comply with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Brian J. Rogers
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BJR/krl

Ref: ID# 251324

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Tim Beckett
Higher Education Account Manager
Information Builders
10375 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1400
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John G. Boswell
Vice President, General Counsel
SAS Institute, Inc.
100 SAS Campus Drive
Cary, North Carolina 27513-2414
(w/enclosures)

Kerdock Consulting, LLC
2700 Post Oak Blvd, Suite 1310
Houston, Texas 77056
(w/o enclosures)