



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 3, 2009

Mr. Eric D. Bentley
Assistant General Counsel
University of Houston System
311 East Cullen Building
Houston, Texas 77204-2028

OR2009-04384

Dear Mr. Bentley:

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# 339070.

The University of Houston (the "university") received a request for a copy of the bid tabulation sheet pertaining to a specified proposal.¹ Although you raise no exception to disclosure of the requested information on behalf of the university, you state that the requested records may contain proprietary information. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the university notified, Facility Interiors Inc., McCoy, Office Furniture Innovations, LLC, Corporate Express, The Luck Company, LLC ("Luck"), and Jimenez Contract Services, Ltd., the interested third parties, of the request for information and of each company's right to submit arguments explaining why the requested information should not be released. *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) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain

¹You state that the university asked for and received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 663 (1999) (discussing tolling of deadlines during period in which governmental body is awaiting clarification).

circumstances). 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have received comments only from Luck. None of the remaining third parties have submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their submitted information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information pertaining to these remaining companies constitutes the proprietary information of these companies, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3.

Luck raises section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret 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.1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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. The 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; 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 Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980). 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).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Among other things, Luck appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). *See also* *Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial

information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held that *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. See *Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of Gov't Code § 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only the interests of Luck in withholding its respective information.

Having considered Lucks arguments, we conclude it has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information constitutes a trade secret. Thus, the university may not withhold any portion of Luck's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Luck, however, has established that release of some of its information would cause it substantial competitive injury; therefore, the university must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As to the remaining information at issue, we find Luck has made only conclusory allegations that release of this information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, Luck has not demonstrated substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any the remaining information at issue. See ORD 661 (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). Accordingly, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/eeg

Ref: ID# 339070

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Ms. Sherry Scott
Facility Interiors, Inc.
7110 Old Katy Road, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77023
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Blake Blazek
Jimenez Contract Services, Ltd.
1246 Silber Road
Houston, Texas 77055
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Selina Rozacky
McCoy
6869 Old Katy Road
Houston, Texas 77024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jere Luck
The Luck Company, LLC
520 West Clay, Suite 1
Houston, Texas 77016
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jayne Edison
Office Furniture Innovations, Inc.
7026 Old Katy Road, Suite 264
Houston, Texas 77024
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jamie Moritz
Corporate Express
6400 Hollister
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)