



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 1, 2007

Mr. Scott A. Kelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas A & M University System  
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079  
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2007-02397

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 272510.

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi (the "university") received a request for the bidder name, evaluation sheet, score, and pricing information for each proposal submitted in response to RFP #5-0003, as well as a copy of the winning proposal. You state that you have released each of these except for a copy of the winning proposal. The university takes no position on whether the winning proposal is excepted from disclosure, but you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Campus Partners ("CP").<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, you inform us that you notified CP of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)* (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that in your letter dated December 19, 2006, the university raised sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.110, 552.112, 552.114, 552.133, and 552.136 of the Government Code as exceptions to disclosure for the requested information. Subsequently in the same letter, you stated that you only sought to withhold third party proprietary information. In your letter dated December 21, 2006, the university stated that it took no position on the proprietary nature of the requested information and that you would not submit reasons for or against the release of the information. Thus, we understand the university to take no position on the disclosure of the submitted proposal.

to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). CP has responded to the notice and argues that parts of the submitted proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. We have reviewed the submitted proposal and considered the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the university has not complied with the time period prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code in seeking an open records decision from this office. When a governmental body fails to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301, the information at issue is presumed public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *City of Houston v. Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 673 S.W.2d 316, 323 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). To overcome this presumption, the governmental body must show a compelling reason to withhold the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock*, 797 S.W.2d at 381. Because the third party interests in this case can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will address CP's arguments concerning the submitted proposal.

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(a)–(b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A “trade secret”

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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 to [its competitors];
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552. 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We also note that 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 (1939); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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.* § 552.110(b); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

CP argues that information relating to services which it exclusively offers constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). After reviewing CP's arguments and the submitted proposal, we agree that CP has presented a *prima facie* showing that the claimed portions of its technical proposal qualify as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We have received no arguments that rebut CP's trade secret claims as a matter of law. We therefore conclude that the university must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a).

CP argues that its financial information and the financial information of its parent company constitute protected commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b). Upon review of the remaining information in the submitted proposal, we find that CP has not made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of the claimed financial information in the submitted proposal would cause substantial competitive harm. CP made a conclusory assertion that the requestor should not have access to its financial records. Thus, the university may not withhold the information under section 552.110(b).

In summary, the university must withhold the marked portions of the technical proposal under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Kara A. Batey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KAB/krl

Ref: ID# 272510

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Holly Artenian  
Corporate Proposal Group  
2520 179<sup>th</sup> Street  
New Berlin, Wisconsin 53151  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Donna L. Powell  
Contract Administrator  
Campus Partners  
2400 Reynolda Road  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27106  
(w/o enclosures)