



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 6, 2011

Ms. Sylvia Hardman-Dingle
General Counsel
Texas Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services
4900 North Lamar Boulevard, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78756

OR2011-06263

Dear Ms. Hardman-Dingle:

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# 416591 (DARS PIA request No. 2011 02/17-1).

The Texas Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services ("DARS") received a request for five categories of information pertaining to deliverable based IT services solicitations within IT and program areas for three specified fiscal years. You indicate DARS will release some of the requested information. DARS takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the interested third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received arguments from CMA Consulting Services ("CMA"). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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) of the Government

Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received arguments from CMA.¹ We, thus, have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes the other companies' proprietary information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, 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), 542 at 3. Accordingly, DARS may not withhold any of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of the non-briefing third parties.

CMA informs this office that its employees and proposed candidates submitted their resume information with the expectation that this information would only be used and evaluated by CMA and DARS. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”); 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

CMA claims some of its submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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

¹The remaining third parties you have notified are as follows: Applied Information Sciences, Inc.; Catapult Systems, Inc.; Deloitte Consulting, L.P.; Five Points & Associates, Inc.; Hewlett Packard; Keane Texas, Inc.; RFD & Associates, Inc.; Sierra Systems, Inc.; and Visionary Integration Professionals, Inc.

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). 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; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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,

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 other 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).

not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Having considered their submitted arguments, we find that CMA has established a *prima facie* case that some of its information, including its project methodology, technical approach, and the client information it seeks to withhold, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, DARS must withhold the information we have marked from Exhibits 3 and 4 pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, CMA has failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has CMA demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, and qualifications and experience are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of CMA's arguments and its information at issue, we find that CMA has established that the pricing information we have marked in CMA's submitted information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, DARS must withhold the information we have marked from Exhibits 3 and 4 under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find CMA has made only conclusory allegations that the release of the remaining submitted information it seeks to withhold would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, CMA has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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. Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Finally, we note some of the remaining information appears to be 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, DARS must withhold the information we have marked from Exhibits 3 and 4 under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information 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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/tf

Ref: ID# 416591

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Anne Davison
RFD & Associates, Inc.
401 Camp Craft Road
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Patty Nelson
Visionary Integration Professionals, Inc.
1750 Creekside Oaks Drive, Suite 210
Sacramento, California 95833
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Galloway
Sierra Systems Inc.
4801 Southwest Parkway
Building 1, Suite 115
Austin, Texas 78735
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rick Bunch
Keane Texas, Inc.
9 Fountain Place
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sanjeev Sethi
Deloitte Consulting LLP
400 West 15th, Suite 1700
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Hank Nations
Hewlett Packard
120 Summers Creek
Bastrop, Texas 78602
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Barbara Glover
Catapult Systems, Inc.
1221 South MoPac Expressway
Three Barton Skyway, Suite 350
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Tenpas
Applied Information Sciences, Inc.
7718 Wood Hollow Drive, Suite 150
Austin, Texas 78731
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Elizabeth VanAcker
Five Points & Associates, Inc.
109 C West 10th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Davis
Vice President
CMA Consulting Services
700 Troy Schenectady Road
Latham, New York 12110
(w/o enclosures)