ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 8, 2009

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2009-06159

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 342761 (TEA PIR#10839).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for the top two proposals submitted in response to the agency's RFP #701-09-013.[1] You state you have released some of the responsive information. Although you take no position on the public availability of the submitted information, you indicate that it may contain proprietary information. You state that you have notified Arroyo Research Services ("Arroyo") and WestEd of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released to the requestor. *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 disclose under Act in certain circumstances). A

[1]The agency sought and received a clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed).

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Arroyo has not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of its submitted information should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to Arroyo would implicate its proprietary interests. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the agency may not withhold any portion of Arroyo's submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests that Arroyo may have in the information.

Based on WestEd's arguments, we understand WestEd to raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for its submitted information. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets; and (b) commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). 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. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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 (1939). 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 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. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999).

After reviewing WestEd's information and the submitted arguments, we find WestEd has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its proposal meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Therefore, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

WestEd argues that releasing its proposal would "restrict WestEd's ability to compete in future proposal work." Upon review, we find that WestEd has made only conclusory allegations that release of its submitted information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. Thus, WestEd has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of its information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue) 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). Therefore, the agency may not withhold any portion of WestEd's submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

---

[2]The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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).

We note that some of the submitted information is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, 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). As WestEd and the agency make no further arguments against the disclosure of the submitted information, it must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,

Greg Henderson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GH/rl

Ref: ID#342761

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Kirk Vandersall
Managing Director
Arroyo Research Services
858 Adelaide Drive
Pasadena, California 91104
(w/o enclosures)

Sharon A. Herpin
WestEd Project Director
4665 Lampson Avenue
Los Alamitos, California
(w/o enclosures)