



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 23, 2010

Ms. Neera Chatterjee  
Public Information Coordinator  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2010-04025

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 373509 (OGC# 122789).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for the administrative fee portion of the contract with PayFlex Systems USA, Inc. ("PayFlex") concerning flexible spending accounts. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state that the submitted documents may contain proprietary information of a third party subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you provide documentation showing that the system notified PayFlex of the request for information and of PayFlex's 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) (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). PayFlex has responded to this notice. We have considered Payflex's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note you have marked portions of the submitted information as not responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the system need not release non-responsive information.

PayFlex claims that the information at issue is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the system has not claimed that any of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104, we find that this section is not applicable to the information at issue, and it may not be withheld on that basis. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Next, PayFlex claims the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 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* 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 . . . . 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. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939).

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.

*Id.*; see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980). 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 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

PayFlex claims the pricing information at issue constitutes a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a). We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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.” See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORD 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Upon review of PayFlex’s arguments, we find that PayFlex has failed to demonstrate how its pricing information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. See ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been

demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, the system may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(a).

PayFlex also claims that release of the information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive harm. In this instance, PayFlex has made only conclusory allegations that release of its pricing information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Further, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as PayFlex in this instance, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *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 reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). We therefore conclude that none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As there are no further arguments against disclosure, the responsive submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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](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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Christopher D. Sterner  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CDSA/eeg

Ref: ID# 373509

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert J. Camenzind  
Pay Flex  
10802 Farnam Drive, Suite 100  
Omaha, Nebraska 68154  
(w/o enclosures)