



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 13, 2014

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

OR2014-02831

Dear Ms. Vieira:

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# 513992 (OGC #153315).

The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (the "university") received a request for copies of responses to RFQ No. 13-025 from Centennial Contractors Enterprises, Inc. ("Centennial"); Jamail & Smith Construction, LP ("Jamail"); Kellogg, Brown, & Root, Inc. ("KBR"); and J.T. Vaughn Construction, LLC ("Vaughn"). 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 Centennial, Jamail, KBR, and Vaughn. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Centennial, Jamail, KBR, and Vaughn of the request for information and of their rights 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 the Act in certain circumstances).* We have received comments from Centennial and KBR. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note in a letter dated December 12, 2013, the university states it wishes to withdraw its request for an open records decision with regard to Vaughn's information because the requestor no longer seeks Vaughn's information. Thus, this information is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request.

Next, we note 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 letter, we have not received arguments from Jamail. Thus, Jamail has not demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interests in any of 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 university may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Jamail may have in the information.

Next, Centennial asserts its information should be withheld because the company expected confidentiality when the information was submitted to the university. 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 the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Centennial and KBR claim portions of their information are 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 from whom the information was obtained. See Gov't Code § 552.110. 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.<sup>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note 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 the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Record Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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).

---

<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 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Centennial and KBR assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude KBR and Centennial have each established a *prima facie* case that portions of their information constitute trade secret information. Therefore, the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We note, however, KBR has published the identities of some of its customers on its website. Thus, KBR has failed to demonstrate the information it has published on its website is a trade secret. Accordingly, to the extent any of the customer information KBR seeks to withhold has been published on the company's website, any such information is not confidential under section 552.110(a). Additionally, we conclude Centennial and KBR have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of their remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Centennial and KBR have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their remaining information. *See* ORDs 402, 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, none of Centennial's or KBR's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Centennial contends some of its information is commercial or financial information, release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the company. Upon review, we find Centennial has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of its information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Further, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). 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* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Consequently, the university may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."<sup>2</sup> Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some 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

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released in accordance with any applicable 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 513992

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas W. Julian, Jr.  
Corporate Counsel  
Centennial Contractors Enterprises, Inc.  
11111 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 350  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregory Smith  
Jamail & Smith Construction, LP  
16875 Diana Lane  
Houston, Texas 77058  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel J. Alexy  
Counsel  
Kellogg, Brown & Root, Inc.  
2451 Crystal Drive  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom Vaughn  
Vaughn Construction, LLC  
10355 Westpark Drive  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(w/o enclosures)