



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 3, 2009

Mr. Eric Bentley  
Assistant General Counsel  
office of the General Counsel  
University of Houston System  
E. Cullen Building, Suite 311  
Houston, Texas 77204-2162

OR2011-12348

Dear Mr. Bentley:

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# 427939.

The University of Houston (the "university") received a request for the university's current contract for athletic facility food services. Although you take no position as to the public availability of the responsive information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Aramark Educational Services of Texas, LLC ("Aramark"). Thus, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Aramark of the request and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *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 to disclosure under in certain circumstances). We have considered the comments submitted by Aramark and reviewed the submitted information.

Aramark raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted contract. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision," and (2) "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.” 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 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 that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. See Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim.<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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; see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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) (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).

The information Aramark has marked to withhold consists of the pricing and other financial terms of the contract between the university and Aramark. However, pricing information pertaining to a particular contract or project 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.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 306 at 3 (1982). Further, pricing information in contracts with governmental bodies is generally not excepted under section 552.110 because 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 reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). In this instance, Aramark has not explained how the pricing and financial information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret. Thus, no information in the submitted contract may be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(a).

In advancing its arguments under section 552.110(b), Aramark relies, in part, on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). *See also Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm’n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Aramark’s interest in its information.

However, having reviewed the company's submitted arguments, Aramark has made only conclusory assertions that release of its information would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such assertions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999), 509 at 5 (1988), 319 at 3 (1982); *see also* ORD 514. Therefore, the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no other exceptions are raised to disclosure of the submitted contract, it must be released in its entirety.

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,



Bob Davis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSD/agn

Ref: ID# 427939

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Coffman  
Contract Administrator  
ARAMARK Higher Education  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-2988