



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 30, 2011

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2011-09369

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# 422533 (OGC# 136954 and OGC# 137959).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received two requests for the winning proposal submitted by CedarCrestone, Inc. ("CedarCrestone") in response to request for proposals number EIS 20101108. Although you take no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of CedarCrestone. Accordingly, you have notified CedarCrestone of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its 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 comments from CedarCrestone and reviewed the submitted information.

We understand CedarCrestone to claim that portions of the submitted information, including its submitted employee resumes and employment backgrounds, are confidential under common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of

common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. We note that education, prior employment, and personal information are not ordinarily private information subject to section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986). Upon review, we determine that CedarCrestone has failed to demonstrate that any of the information at issue is intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, we find the system may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, CedarCrestone claims portions of its proposal are excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, this section only protects the interests of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (purpose of section 552.104 is to protect governmental body's interest in competitive bidding situation). Because section 552.104 does not protect the interests of third parties, and the system does not claim this section applies to the submitted information, the system may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and “commercial 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 Supreme Court of Texas 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 single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as, for example, the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees 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) (emphasis added); *see 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.¹ See ORD 552 at 5. We cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable, however, 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).

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). 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 requested information. 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).

CedarCrestone contends that portions of its proposal are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Having considered CedarCrestone’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that CedarCrestone has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. 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). Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of CedarCrestone’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we note CedarCrestone was the winner of the bidding processes to which its information pertains.

¹The 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 Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, 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). Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of CedarCrestone's pricing information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Further, we find CedarCrestone has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial damage to the company's competitive position. Thus, CedarCrestone has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. *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), 319 at 3 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, and qualifications and experience), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of CedarCrestone's information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that portions of the submitted information are 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. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released to the requestor, but any information that is protected by copyright may only 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,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 422533

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Walter Kisner
Business Development Manager
CedarCrestone, Inc.
1255 Alderman Drive
Alpharetta, Georgia 30005
(Third Party w/o enclosures)