



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 11, 2010

Mr. Damon C. Derrick
Office of General Counsel
Stephen F. Austin State University
SFA Station
P.O. Box 13065
Nacogdoches, Texas 75962-3065

OR2010-06743

Dear Mr. Derrick:

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# 379822.

Stephen F. Austin State University (the "university") received two requests for certain bids submitted in response to a specified RFQ. Although the university takes no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you believe the request may implicate the proprietary interests of certain interested third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the university notified these third parties of the requests for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.¹ *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). We have received comments from CSI, considered the claimed exception, and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code 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, none of

¹The notified third parties are: Aircraft Logix, Air Planning, LLC; CSI Aviation Services, Inc. ("CSI"); Performance Aviation; and Short's Travel Management.

the remaining notified third parties have submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of the remaining third parties, and none of the information may be withheld on that basis. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret).

CSI asserts portions of its information are excepted from disclosure 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 university does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find that section 552.104 is not applicable to CSI’s proposal. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

CSI argues portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and (2) “[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(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be:

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 a single or ephemeral event 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.² Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless the party claiming this exception has shown the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret and has demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) 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) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of CSI's arguments and the information at issue, we find CSI has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the information at issue is a trade secret protected by section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). CSI also raises section 552.110(b). However, we find CSI has made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Furthermore, we note CSI was the winning bidder in this instance. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder 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

²The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors 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).

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). Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We note a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136(b) states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the university must withhold the account and routing numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁴ As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the remaining information must be released to the requestors.

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

Sincerely,



Matt Entsminger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRE/rl

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁴We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold ten categories of information, including bank account and routing numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestors (2)
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sharon Thomas
Air Planning, LLC
2 Main Street
Salem, New Hampshire 03079
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Michele Martinez
CSI Aviation Services, Inc.
3700 Rio Grande Boulevard Northwest, Suite 1
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87107
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sean Cross
Performance Aviation
11662 Frontier Drive
Frisco, Texas 75034
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ryan Dohmen
Short's Travel Management
1203 West Ridgeway Avenue
Waterloo, Iowa 50701
(w/o enclosures)