



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 27, 2014

Mr. Vic Ramirez
Associate General Counsel
Lower Colorado River Authority
P.O. Box 220
Austin, Texas 78767-0220

OR2014-01480

Dear Mr. Ramirez:

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# 512253.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "authority") received a request for four categories of information related to the authority's request for proposals number 8636. You state the authority has released some information to the requestor. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state release of the information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the authority has notified Looram & Associates, L.L.C. ("Looram"); Catapult Business Training; the University of Texas at Austin Center for Lifelong Engineering Education; the University of Texas at Austin McCombs School of Business; and the Professional Development Center of the University of Texas at Austin of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why this 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 comments from Looram. 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any third party other than Looram explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *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, 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), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of the remaining third parties.

We understand Looram to assert some of its information is excepted from disclosure 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. Gov't Code § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure information that is trade secrets obtained from a person and information that is privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. Section 757 provides a trade secret to be as follows:

[A]ny 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) (citation omitted); *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 *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. 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) 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); ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Looram seeks to withhold information pertaining to its program designs under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find Looram has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Looram demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim). Therefore, the

¹There are six factors the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

authority may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Looram claims information related to its active clients and its pricing constitutes commercial information that, if released, would cause it substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find Looram has demonstrated its pricing information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the authority must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note, however, Looram has made its customer information publicly available on its website. Because Looram has published this information, it has failed to make the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of its customer information would cause it substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 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). Consequently, the authority may not withhold any of Looram's remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue appear 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1978). 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 authority must withhold Looram's pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The authority must release the remaining information, but any copyrighted information 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl_ruling_info.shtml](#), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 512253

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. James Loram
President
Loram & Associates, L.L.C.
634 West End Avenue, Suite 4
New York, New York 10024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Seale
Catapult Business Training
P.O. Box 171256
Austin, Texas 78717
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Slaughter
Business Development Director
University of Texas at Austin
Center for Lifelong Engineering Education
2613 Speedway, Stop A2800
Austin, Texas 78712
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mickey D'Armi
Assistant Director, Custom Programs
Texas Executive Education
McCombs School of Business
2110 Speedway
Austin, Texas 78712-1750
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Maureen Schwartz
University of Texas at Austin
Professional Development Center
P.O. Box 7518
Austin, Texas 78713-7518
(w/o enclosures)