



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 30, 2007

Ms. Carol Longoria
University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2007-14242

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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 #293189.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (the "university") received two requests from the same requestor for all documents submitted to the university with respect to its request for proposals to manage its campus bookstore. You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Matthews Medical Bookstores ("Matthews") and the Follett Corporation ("Follett") of the university's receipt of the requests for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.552.305(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 Matthews and Follett. We have considered the submitted arguments 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). 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* Gov't Code § 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. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 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; *see also* ORD No. 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted 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 (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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

After reviewing the information at issue and the submitted arguments, we conclude that Matthews has established a *prima facie* case that portions of the information within its bid proposal, such as customer lists and store-opening checklists, are trade secrets. Therefore, the university must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a). But we conclude that Matthews has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the remaining information in its proposal is a trade secret. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). Some of the information it wishes to withhold pertains to information that is publicly available on its website. Because Matthews has published this information, the company has failed to demonstrate that it considers this information confidential.

For the remaining information, we find that Matthews and Follett have demonstrated that the release of their financial statements, which we have marked, would cause them substantial competitive harm. However, only this information must be withheld under section 552.110(b).¹ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *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 is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Matthews in this instance, 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* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, the university must only withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b).

Matthews’ proposal also contains information that appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception to

¹As this is the only information Follett seeks to withhold from disclosure, the remainder of its bid proposal must be released to the requestor.

disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information also must comply with the copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, he or she 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 at 8-9 (1990).

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor in accordance 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,



Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General

Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 293189

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jay M. Dorman, Esq.
Bryan Cave LLP
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Suhaib H. Ghazi
Counsel, Follett Corporation Legal Department
2233 West Street
River Grove, Illinois 60171
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Zausmer
Winstead
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

