



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 5, 2014

Mr. R. Brooks Moore
Managing Counsel
The Texas A&M University System
301 Tarrow Street, Sixth Floor
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2014-20065

Dear Mr. Brooks:

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# 542369 (AR 14-014).

The Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service (the "service") received a request for (1) winning bid proposals related to TAM 114 and TAM 204; (2) licensing agreements, licensing contracts, winning licensing bid proposals, and other related documents pertaining to TAM 111 and TAM 112; and (3) documentation showing the number of bags of TAM 111 and TAM 112 sold during a specified time period. You state the service does not have information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the interested 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.² *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) (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 Adaptive and Watley.³ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 only received comments from Adaptive and Watley explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Syngenta has 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 service may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Syngenta may have in the information.

Watley argues the information it seeks to withhold was marked "confidential." However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting 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, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 falls

²The third parties are Adaptive Genetics, L.L.C. ("Adaptive"), Syngenta Seeds ("Syngenta"), and Watley Enterprises, Inc. ("Watley").

³Although Adaptive raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.110 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act.

within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Adaptive and Watley raise section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure for portions of their information. This section excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 service does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld on this basis.

Adaptive and Watley claim some of their 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, 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 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.⁴ 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. 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 Records 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.

Adaptive and Watley assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find these parties have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of their information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find these parties have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of these parties' information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Adaptive and Watley claim portions of their information consist of commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Upon

⁴The 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).

review, we find Watley has demonstrated portions of its information constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the service must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Watley has not demonstrated that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. In addition, we find Adaptive has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its information at issue would cause it substantial competitive harm. *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), 319 at 3 (1982). Furthermore, we note the pricing information of winning bidders, such as Adaptive and Watley, is generally not excepted from disclosure 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 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Therefore, we find none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Adaptive raises section 552.113(a)(2) of the Government Code, which reads as follows:

Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is:

...

(2) geological or geophysical information or data, including maps concerning wells, except information filed in connection with an application or proceeding before an agency;

Gov't Code § 552.131(a)(2). In Open Records Decision No. 627 (1994), this office concluded section 552.113(a)(2) protects from public disclosure only (i) geological and geophysical information regarding the exploration or development of natural resources that is (ii) commercially valuable. ORD 627 at 3-4 (overruling rationale of Open Records Decision No. 504 (1988)). The decision explained the phrase "information regarding the exploration or development of natural resources" means "information indicating the presence or absence of natural resources in a particular location, as well as information indicating the extent of a particular deposit or accumulation." *Id* at 4 n.4. However, section 552.113(a)(2) does not except general geological information about a particular location that is unrelated to the "presence or absence of natural resources." In order to be commercially valuable for purposes of Open Records Decision No. 627 and section 552.113, information must not be publicly available. *See* Open Records Decision No. 669 (2000). Upon review, we conclude Adaptive has not demonstrated any of the information it seeks to withhold is commercially

valuable geological or geophysical information regarding the exploration of or development of natural resources. Accordingly, the service may not withhold any of Adaptive's information under section 552.113(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Adaptive also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides, in part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(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.

Gov't Code § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "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." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of Adaptive's claims under section 552.110, the service may not withhold any of Adaptive's information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may 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 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 service must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The service must release the remaining information, but may only release any copyrighted information 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.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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/cbz

Ref: ID# 542369

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Murphey Henry
Counsel for Watley Enterprises, Inc.
Henry Law Firm
P.O. Box 8850
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72703
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Newsom
Counsel for Adaptive Genetics, LLC
Lovell, Lovell, Newsom & Isern, LLP
112 West 8th Avenue, Suite 1000
Amarillo, Texas 79101-2314
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Nathaniel Dolloff
Syngenta Seeds
C/O: Mr. R. Brooks Moore
Managing Counsel
The Texas A&M University System
301 Tarrow Street, Sixth Floor
College Station, Texas 77840-7896
(w/o enclosures)