ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 6, 2012

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2012-12253

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# 461471 (OGC# 143750).

The University of Texas at Dallas (the "university") received a request for five categories of information pertaining to a specified request for questionnaires. The university informs us it has released the information responsive to categories four and five of the request. Although the university takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the university states release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of HKS, Inc.; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.; Kirksey; Page Southerland Page; and Pierce Goodwin Alexander & Linville ("PGAL"). Accordingly, the university notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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 Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from PGAL. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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) 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, only PGAL has submitted comments to this office explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted 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, the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of the remaining third parties.

PGAL raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of its information. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides 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.[1] RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a

---

[1]The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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).

private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110 if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) applies 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. *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). This section 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).

PGAL raises section 552.110(a) for portions of its information. Upon review, we find PGAL has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its information is a trade secret protected by section 552.110(a). *See* ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim). We further note 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; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Thus, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

PGAL also raises section 552.110(b) for portions of its information. Upon review, we find that PGAL 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 this information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, PGAL has not demonstrated how any of its remaining information constitutes commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause PGAL substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

In summary, the university must withhold the pricing information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information.

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,

Kenneth Leland Conyer
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 461471

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick McFarlin
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
777 Main Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wes Good
Kirksey
6909 Portwest Drive
Houston, Texas 77024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Vander Voort
HKS, Inc.
1919 McKinney Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Pierce, Goodwin, Alexander & Linville
c/o Ms. Carole R. Riggs
Campbell & Riggs
1980 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77056-3810
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mattia Flabiano
Page Southerland Page
1800 Main Street, Suite 123
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)