



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 25, 2010

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

OR2010-04242

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 373631 (OGC# 123096).

The University of Texas at Arlington (the "university") received a request for the individual tally (scoring) sheets for RFQ# FM2010-006 and the proposals of TD Industries ("TDI") and Decker Mechanical, Inc. ("DMI"). You state that the university is releasing the requested tally sheets. The university takes no position on whether the submitted proposals are excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of DMI and TDI. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified DMI and TDI of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). You state that TDI has informed you that it does not object to the release of its proposal. Accordingly, you state the university will release TDI's proposal to the requestor. We have received correspondence from a representative of DMI. We have considered the submitted arguments and have reviewed DMI's submitted information.

DMI asserts that pages 11 and 13 of its proposal were marked proprietary and confidential. However, information is not made 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), cert. denied 430 U.S. 931 (1977); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 479 (1987) (information is not confidential under the Act simply because party submitting it anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential), 203 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by individual

supplying information does not properly invoke section 552.110). Consequently, DMI's information may not be withheld unless it falls within an exception to disclosure.

DMI claims that pages 11 and 13 of its proposal are excepted 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 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 (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 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

¹The 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 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).

Having considered DMI’s arguments, we find that DMI has failed to demonstrate that any of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has DMI demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 402. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of DMI’s arguments and its information at issue, we find that DMI has established that the information we have marked on pages 11 and 13 of its proposal constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the university must withhold the marked information on pages 11 and 13 in DMI’s proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find DMI has made only conclusory allegations that the release of the remaining information it seeks to withhold would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, DMI has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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). Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b). As no exceptions against the disclosure of the remaining information are raised, it must be released to the requestor.²

²We note the remaining information contains a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147.

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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/jb

Ref: ID# 373631

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Klip Weaver
Vice President
DMI Entegral Solutions
809 Office Park Circle, Suite 100
Lewisville, Texas 75057
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John H. Taylor
Vice President - Solutions Group
TD Industries
P.O. Box 819060
Dallas, Texas 75381-9060
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Barry Whaley
TD Industries
13850 Diplomat Drive
Dallas, Texas 75234
(w/o enclosures)