



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 26, 2011

Ms. Idolina Garcia
Associate General Counsel
University of North Texas
1901 Main Street, Suite 216
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2011-10725

Dear Ms. Garcia:

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# 424945 (UNT PIR No. 11-092).

The University of North Texas (the "university") received a request for all proposals submitted in response to RFP773-11-0339CP for web design and development. You state the university has released some of the responsive information. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the university notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from CampusEAI. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure.

See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have received comments only from CampusEAI explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining notified companies have protected proprietary interests in their information.¹ *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, the university may not withhold these companies' information on the basis of any proprietary interest they may have in their information.

We now turn to CampusEAI's arguments. We understand CampusEAI to assert that its information is confidential because its documents were marked as such when they were submitted to the university. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [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 section 552.110). Consequently, unless CampusEAI's information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Next, CampusEAI asserts its information is 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. We note that section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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 raise section 552.104, this section is not applicable to the requested information. *See* ORD 592 (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the university may not withhold any of CampusEAI's information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, CampusEAI claims its 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

¹The other third parties are: Avanara L.L.C.; Idea Integration Corp. d/b/a Idea; Indusa Technical Corp.; Savvy Technology Solutions, L.L.C.; Tribe Creative Agency; and Vertex Software Corp.

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 Open Records Decision No. 552 (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.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

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).

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, 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).

Upon review of CampusEAI’s arguments and the information at issue, we find CampusEAI has failed to demonstrate any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has CampusEAI demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. See ORD 319 at 3 (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). Thus, none of CampusEAI’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We find that CampusEAI has established that the pricing information we have marked constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find CampusEAI has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, CampusEAI 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). Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Finally, 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. 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, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information 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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Tamara H. Holland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

THH/tf

Ref: ID# 424945

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Raju (Abhishek) Dave
Avanara L.L.C.
99 Main Street
Nayck, New York 10960
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael C. DeJohn
Campus EAI Consortium
1111 Superior Avenue, Suite 310
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Hemant Shah
Indusa Technical Corporation
1 Tran Am Plaza Drive, Suite 350
Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois 60181
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Adarsh Karia
Idea Integration Corporation d/b/a Idea
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2900
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Liam Kernell
Tribe Creative Agency
102 East 38 ½ Street
Austin, Texas 78751
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Katherine Chen
Savvy Technology Solutions L.L.C.
100 Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Macdonald
Vertex Software Corporation
1515 South Capital of Texas Highway, #400
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)