



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 25, 2008

Ms. Carol Longoria
The University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
201 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2008-11628

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# 320000.

The University of Texas at El Paso (the "university") received a request for the following information: 1) communications between the director of the university's Institute for Policy and Economic Development ("IPED") and other university employees, 2) a specified contract award from AAI Corporation ("AAI"), 3) any communications between university employees and AAI, 4) a specified contract award from Boeing-Texas, and 5) a specified contract award from Aerospace Mission Corporation ("AMC"). You inform the requestor that there is no information responsive to the requests for communications between university employees and AAI and a specified contract award from Boeing-Texas. We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 534 at 2-3 (1989), 518 at 3 (1989), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you believe that this information implicates the interests of AMC and AAI. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified these parties of this 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) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third-party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the arguments submitted by AMC and AAI, and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have not submitted any information responsive to the request for communications between the director of the university's IPED and other university employees. Further, you have not indicated that such information does not exist or that you wish to withhold any such information from disclosure. Therefore, to the extent information responsive to this aspect of the request existed on the date the request was received, we assume that you have released it to the requestor. If you have not released any such information, you must release it to the requestor at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

Next, the university acknowledges, and we agree, that the university failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.301. A governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome by demonstrating that the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Because AMC's and AAI's interests are at stake, we will address their arguments against disclosure.

Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (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 . . . [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.

RESTATEMENTS OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776.

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;
- (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 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). 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. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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) excepts from disclosure "[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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Upon review, we conclude that AMC and AAI have not demonstrated that any of the submitted information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We 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 business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." *See* Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Likewise, we conclude that AMC and AAI have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of the information at issue would cause AMC or AAI substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). The pricing aspects of a contract with a governmental entity are generally not excepted from disclosure 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). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). We therefore conclude that the university may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110. As the university, AAI, and AMC make no further arguments against disclosure, the submitted 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,



Benjamin A. Diener
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 320000

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Richard Tansey
2804 Riverplace Drive #3055
Arlington, Texas 76006
(w/o enclosures)

Aerospace Missions Corporation
Attn: Mr. Ricky Morgan
7362 Remcon Circle
El Paso, Texas 79912
(w/o enclosures)

AAI Corporation
ATTN: Ms. Kristi Moe
P.O. Box 126
Hunt Valley, Maryland 21030-0126
(w/o enclosures)