



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 7, 2016

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

OR2016-24815

Dear Mr. 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# 633295 (File Nos. 16062.22 and 16062.7).

Texas State University (the "university") received two requests from two different requestors for certain information, including any e-mail correspondence during a specified time period, pertaining to a specified request for proposals issued by the university.¹ You state the university will release some information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interest of Abacus Computers, Inc.; Ingram Technologies, LLC; Korcett, M&S Technologies, Inc.; Presidio Networked Solutions Group, LLC; Solid IT Networks ("Solid IT"); Extreme Networks, Inc.; Brocade Communications Systems, Inc., and Ruckus Wireless (collectively, "Brocade"); Walker Engineering; and Aruba. Accordingly, you state you notified these parties of the requests for information and of their rights to

¹You state the university sought and received clarification of the first request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). Additionally, you inform us you sent the second requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the university received the required deposit on September 16, 2016. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 Solid IT and Brocade.² We have reviewed the submitted arguments and the submitted information.

Initially, we note Brocade makes arguments for withholding certain information that was not submitted by the university to this office for review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address any such information, and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the university. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested, or representative sample if voluminous amount of information was requested).

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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the remaining notified third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of these parties have protected proprietary interests 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining notified third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. Brocade and Solid IT state they have competitors. In addition, Brocade and Solid IT state release of the information at issue would give an advantage to their competitors. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Brocade and Solid IT have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may

²Although Solid IT raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.104 of the Government Code, we note section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

withhold the submitted information related to Brocade in addition to the information Solid IT has indicated under section 552.104(a).³

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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 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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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

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).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Solid IT claims section 552.110(b) of the Government Code for portions of its remaining information. We note the pricing information of winning bidders of a government contract, such as Solid IT, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *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 cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* ORD 514. Upon review, we find Solid IT has not demonstrated release of the remaining information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, 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, 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Solid IT argues some of its remaining information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find Solid IT has failed to establish a *prima facie* case the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret and it has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *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). Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

We note portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁵ Section 552.136 of the Government Code states, “[n]otwithstanding any

⁵The 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).

other provision of this chapter, 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the university must withhold all insurance policy numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be subject to copyright law. 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 university may withhold the submitted information related to Brocade in addition to the information Solid IT has indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. Within the remaining information, the university must withhold all remaining insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only 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.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,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/bhf

Ref: ID# 633295

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)