ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 15, 2012

Dr. Fernando C. Gomez
Vice Chancellor and General Counsel
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407

OR2012-18463

Dear Dr. Gomez:

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# 472207.

The Texas State University System (the "system") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Marsh Risk Consulting; QC7 Development Services, Ltd.; Spire Consulting Group, L.L.C.; Ernst & Young; Clifton Gunderson, L.L.P.; Deloitte Financial Advisory Services, L.L.P. ("Deloitte"); MFR, P.C.; RSM McGladrey, Inc.; Bury + Partners, Inc.; and Aguirre Roden, Inc. Accordingly, you state the system has notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why their 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 Deloitte. 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 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, we have only received comments from Deloitte. Thus, we find the remaining third parties have not demonstrated that they have any protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 system may not withhold any of the remaining third parties' information on the basis of any proprietary interests they may have in the information.

Deloitte asserts some of its submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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.[1] 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

---

[1]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 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).

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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find that Deloitte has established a *prima facie* case that its audit methodology information and customer information we have marked constitute trade secrets. Therefore, the system must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.[2] However, we find Deloitte has failed to demonstrate how any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 319 at 2 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, the system may not withhold any of Deloitte's remaining information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Deloitte claims that some of its remaining information is protected by section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find Deloitte has made only conclusory allegations that release of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position and has provided no factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *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 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. Consequently, the system may not withhold any of Deloitte's remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note a portion 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

---

[2]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 system must withhold the audit methodology information and customer information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright only may 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,

Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/bhf

Ref: ID# 472207

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Batsell
QC7 Development Services, Ltd.
Suite 140
750 East Interstate 30
Rockwall, Texas 75023
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Colin Daigle
Managing Director
Marsh Risk Consulting
1255 23rd Street, North West-Suite 400
Washinton, DC 20037
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Anthony Gonzales
Principal
Spire Consulting Group, LLC
114 West 7th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Frank N. Vito
Partner
Clifton Gunderson LLP
Suite C-500
11044 Research Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Ahola
Principal
MFR, P.C.
One Riverway, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77056
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Stauch
President
Bury + Partners-HS&A
Barton Oaks Plaza V, Suite 200
901 South Mopac Expressway
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Gibson
Principal
Ernst & Young
401 Congress, Suite 1800
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Deloitte Financial Advisory
C/O Mr. Scott D. Powers
Baker Botts LLP
1500 San Jacinto Center
98 San Jacinto Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78701-4078
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Croy
Director
RSM McGladrey, Inc.
501 North 44th Street, Suite 300
Phoeniz, Arizona 85008
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Pedro Aguirre
President and CEO
Aguirre Roden, Inc.
6th Floor
10670 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75231
(w/o enclosures)