



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 7, 2006

Ms. Carol Longoria
The University of Texas System
Office of the General Counsel
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2006-05958

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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# 250905.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (the "university") received a request for the following information: 1) all contracts and agreements between the university and Wireless Generation ("Wireless") relating to the Center for Improving the Readiness of Children for Learning and Education ("CIRCLE"), including contract amendments and any related memoranda; and 2) evidence of all payments made by the university to Wireless in connection with CIRCLE, including payments by warrant, direct deposit, checks, cashier's checks, electronically or via wire transfers. You claim that portions of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.110, 552.113, and 552.131 of the Government Code, but only make arguments with regard to section 552.101. Furthermore, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Wireless, the interested third party, of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Wireless. The university has submitted information for our review. We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you did not submit information responsive to the second part of the request for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D). As you have not submitted this information, we assume the university has released it to the extent it existed on the date the university received this request. If not, the university must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part:

[T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

....

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted documents contain information relating to the expenditure of public funds by the university. This information is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(3) and must be released unless expressly made confidential under other law. Sections 552.101 and 552.110 are considered other law for purposes of section 552.022, therefore we will address the university's and Wireless' arguments concerning these exceptions for the information that is subject to section 552.022, as well as the information that is not subject to section 552.022.

Wireless contends that portions of the submitted information are 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 id.* § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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. *See id.*; *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Having considered Wireless’ arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we find that Wireless has not established by specific factual evidence that any of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure as either trade secret information under section 552.110(a) or commercial or financial information the release of which would cause Wireless substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business”); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110(b), business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 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). Specifically, we note that the some of the information Wireless seeks to withhold includes pricing information. We note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110.

The university contends that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision,” and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Gov’t Code § 552.101. You contend that the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 51.914 of the Education Code, which provides in pertinent part:

In order to protect the actual or potential value, the following information shall be confidential and shall not be subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, or otherwise:

- (1) all information relating to a product, device, or process, the application or use of such a product, device, or process, and all technological and scientific information (including computer

programs) developed in whole or in part at a state institution of higher education, regardless of whether patentable or capable of being registered under copyright or trademark laws, that have a potential for being sold, traded, or licensed for a fee[.]

(2) any information relating to a product, device, or process, the application or use of such product, device, or process, and any technological and scientific information (including computer programs) that is the proprietary information of a person, partnership, corporation, or federal agency that has been disclosed to an institution of higher education solely for the purposes of a written research contract or grant that contains a provision prohibiting the institution of higher education from disclosing such proprietary information to third persons or parties[.]

Educ. Code § 51.914(1), (2). The purpose of section 51.914(1) is to protect the “actual or potential value” of technological and scientific information developed in whole or in part at a state institution of higher education. *See* Open Records Decision No. 497 at 6 (1988) (interpreting statutory predecessor to section 51.914). Whether particular scientific information has such a potential is a question of fact that this office is unable to resolve in the opinion process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 651 (1997). Thus, this office has stated that in considering whether requested information has “a potential for being sold, traded, or licensed for a fee,” we will rely on a governmental body’s representation that the information has this potential. *See id.*

In this case, you represent that the information at issue pertains to the university’s research efforts and discoveries. You assert that the information gained from these studies has the potential to be sold, traded, or licensed for a fee. We note, however, that the information at issue is tangential to the proposed research. You have not explained, nor can we discern, how the release of this information would reveal the details of the research at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 497 (1988) (stating that information related to research is not protected if it does not reveal details about research). Accordingly, the university may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 51.914. As you make no other arguments against disclosure, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jaime L. Flores
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLF/krl

Ref: ID# 250905

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rudy Comenero
Mitchell & Colmenero, LLP
The Chase Building
700 Lavaca Street, Suite 607
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Cyr
General Counsel and V. P., Legal & Business Affairs
Wireless Generation, Inc.
711 West 40th Street, Suite 317
Baltimore, Maryland 21211
(w/enclosures)