



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 29, 2008

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

CORRECTED COPY

OR2008-00892A

Dear Ms. Longoria:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-00892 (2008) on January 18, 2008. We have examined this ruling and determined that we made an error. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on January 18, 2008. *See generally* Gov't Code 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act")).

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 305207.

The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (the "university") received a request for all RFP service responses for RFP No. ERPIMPI. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you indicate that it may contain proprietary information. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified Accenure, Bearing Point, Inc. ("Bearing"), CedarCrestone, Exeter Group, Inc. ("Exeter"), Fujitsu Consulting, Inc. ("Fujitsu"), Huron Consulting Group ("Huron"), IBM, LSI Consulting ("LSP"), NaviSite, Inc. ("NaviSite"), Oracle USA, Inc. ("Oracle"), and SITA Corp. ("SITA") 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 requestor.¹ *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

¹We note that the requestor has a right of access to his own response. Therefore, the information relating to CIBER, Inc. must be released to the requestor.

applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). Representatives from Bearing, Exeter, and Huron have submitted comments to our office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that 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, Accenture, CedarCrestone, Fujitsu, IBM, LSI, NaviSite, Oracle, and SITA have not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to them 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 these third parties would implicate their proprietary interests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret).

Exeter asserts that its employee information is protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Upon review of the information at issue, we determine that no portion of Exeter's information is protected by common-law privacy and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Bearing and Exeter assert that portions of the submitted information may not be disclosed because it is confidential by designation or agreement. 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). Consequently, unless the submitted information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Bearing, Exeter, and Huron each raise 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. *Id.* § 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. 1957); *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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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 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).

²The 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) 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.* § 552.110(b); *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

After reviewing the submitted information and the arguments of Bearing, Exeter, and Heron, we find that Bearing and Heron have made *prima facie* cases that some of their information is protected as trade secret information. We note, however, that Bearing publishes the identities of some of its current and past clients on its website. In light of Bearing’s own publication of such information, we cannot conclude that the identities of these clients qualify as trade secrets. Furthermore, we determine that Bearing, Exeter, and Heron 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 university 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.

Exeter and Huron seek to withhold portions of their information under section 552.110(b). Upon review of the arguments and the information at issue, we find that release of Exeter’s and Huron’s client lists, references, and pricing, which we have marked, would cause them each substantial competitive harm. We find, however, that Exeter and Huron have not demonstrated that any portion of their remaining information is excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (business entity must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exeter’s or Huron’s responses under section 552.110(b).

We note that IBM’s response contains insurance policy numbers.³ Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides:

³The 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).

(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 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 insurance policy numbers that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note that some of the submitted information appears to 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The marked insurance policy numbers must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 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.

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,



Jordan Johnson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJ/jb

Ref: ID# 305207

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Craig Gooch
BearingPoint, Inc.
167 Lamp & Lantern Village, #284
Chesterfield, Missouri 63017
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terrell Warnberg
Senior Executive
Accenture
5221 North O'Connor Boulevard, Suite 1400
Irving, Texas 75039
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Somers, Ph.D.
Business Development Manager
CedarCrestone
1255 Alderman Drive
Alphaaretta, Georgia 30005
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brett J. Miller
Client Development Executive
Ciber, Inc.
3200 Park Center Drive, 9th Floor
Costa Mesa, California 92626
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eric Stine
Vice President
Exeter Group, Inc.
One Canal Park
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Naphtali Ben-Meir
Account Executive
Fujitsu Consulting, Inc.
343 Thornall Street, Suite 630
Edison, New Jersey 08837
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Peter Eschenbach
Managing Director
Huron Consulting Group
550 West Van Buren Street
Chicago, Illinois 60607
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Manuel "Buddy" Ramos
Higher Education Practice
Ciber, Inc.
25640 West 127th Street
Olathe, Kansas 66061
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph Varrone
Consulting Sales Director
NaviSite, Inc.
400 Minuteman Road
Andover, Massachusetts 01810
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Art Dowd
Oracle USA, Inc.
222 West Las Colinas Boulevard, Suite 100
Irving, Texas 75039
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chuck Weir
SITA Corp.
50 Cragwood Road, Suite 128
South Plainfield, New Jersey 07080
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bruce S. Bellemore
Director, Sales & Marketing
LSI Consulting (Labyrinth Solutions, Inc.)
1400 Main Street
Waltham, Massachusetts
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Burge
Associate Partner
IBM
Two Riverway, Suite 1500
Houston, Texas 77056-1949
(w/o enclosures)