



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 4, 2007

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Office of Legal Services
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2007-15918

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 296441.

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received two requests for the evaluation matrix and copy of the winning proposal related to a specified RFP. The agency subsequently received a third request for all proposals submitted in response to the same specified RFP. You state that the agency has released the evaluation matrix in response to the first two requests. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining information, you indicate that it may contain proprietary information. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified Abt Associates, Inc. ("Abt"), Oak Hill Technology, Inc. ("Oak Hill"), SRI International ("SRI"), and WESTAT of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* 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 the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). Representatives from Abt, Oak Hill, and SRI have submitted comments to our office. We have considered the arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, WESTAT

has not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to it should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to WESTAT would implicate its proprietary interests. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the agency may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pertaining to WESTAT on the basis of any proprietary interests that this company may have in the information.

SRI raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. 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 agency did not submit any arguments in support of withholding any information pursuant to section 552.104, the agency may not withhold any of SRI’s information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Abt, Oak Hill, and SRI each claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) 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 § 552.110(a), (b).

Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov’t Code § 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.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Abt and SRI claim that portions of their proposals are excepted under section 552.110(a). After reviewing the submitted information and the arguments of Abt and SRI, we find that these companies have made *prima facie* cases that some of their client and reference information is protected as trade secret information. We note, however, that Abt and SRI publish the identities of some of their current and past clients on their websites. In light of Abt's and SRI's own publication of such information, we cannot conclude that the identities of these clients qualify as trade secrets. Furthermore, we determine that Abt and SRI have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have these companies demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the agency must only withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We determine that no portion of the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

¹The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 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).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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 National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review of the remaining information and arguments, we conclude that Abt and Oak Hill have demonstrated that the release of their pricing information, which we have marked, would cause them each substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the agency must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, Abt, Oak Hill, and SRI have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of the remaining submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to each company. Accordingly, we determine that no portion of the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (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 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 2 (1982) (finding information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Furthermore, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as SRI in this instance, 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* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). We therefore conclude that none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b).

Finally, we note that the remaining information relating to SRI contains an account number.² Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides:

- (a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or

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

instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any 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. We have marked the account number in the remaining information that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the agency must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information related to SRI must be released to all of the requestors. The remaining information related to Abt, Oak Hill, and WESTAT must be released to the third requestor.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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.

Sincerely,



Jordan Johnson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJ/jb

Ref: ID# 296441

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Julie M. Brownson
President
Oak Hill Technology, Inc.
12505-A Trail Drive
Austin, Texas 78737
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ryoko Yamaguchi
Abt. Associates, Inc.
4550 Montgomery Avenue
Suite 800 North
Bethesda, Maryland 20814-3343
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kathryn Baughman
Contract Manager
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, California 94025
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel K. Aladjem
American Institute for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NorthWest
Washington, D.C. 20007-3835
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Joy Frechtling
Vice President
WESTAT
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Massachusetts 20850-3195
(w/o enclosures)