



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 23, 2011

Ms. Jenny A. Urquhart
Assistant General Counsel
University of North Texas System
1155 Union Circle, #310907
Denton, Texas 76203-5017

OR2011-08977

Dear Ms. Urquhart:

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# 421810 (UNT PIR No. 11-077).

The University of North Texas (the "university") received a request for copies of bids submitted to the university pertaining to a specified bid number. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of The Princeton Review ("TPR"). You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the university has notified TPR of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office explaining why its 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 circumstances). We have received arguments from TPR. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

TPR raises section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) "[a]

trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “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).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be

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). 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); *see also* ORD 232. This

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).

office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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) of the Government Code exempts 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). 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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

TPR contends portions of its proposal constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Having considered TPR's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find TPR has established a *prima facie* case that its customer information and syllabus and homework schedules, which we have marked, constitute trade secret information and must be withheld under section 552.110(a).

TPR also contends that release of its pricing information would result in substantial competitive harm. However, we note pricing information of a winning bidder, as TPR is in this case, 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; thus, the pricing information of a company contracting with a governmental body is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Therefore, we find TPR has failed to demonstrate that release of any of the remaining information at issue would cause it substantial competitive harm. Consequently, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding 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.”² Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are “access device” numbers for purposes of section 552.136. We note the requestor has a right of access to her company’s own insurance policy numbers. *See id.* § 552.023 (person or person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person’s privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987). Thus, the university may not withhold the requestor’s company’s insurance policy numbers from her. Accordingly, the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers pertaining to TPR, which we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code.³

Finally, TPR notes that some of the remaining information may 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information, but any information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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

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).

³We note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sarah Casterline', with a large circular flourish at the end.

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/eb

Ref: ID# 421810

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Susan Hansen
The Princeton Review, Inc.
10830 North Central Expressway, Suite 252
Dallas, Texas 75231
(w/o enclosures)