



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 15, 2015

Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2015-26403

Dear Ms. Tynan:

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# 590738.

The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center (the "university") received a request for specified categories of information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You state you do not have information responsive to some categories of the request.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² You also state you notified Epic Systems Corporation ("Epic") and Computer Financial Consultants, Inc. ("Computer") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Epic. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²Although you failed to timely raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, this provision constitutes a compelling reason to withhold information, and we will consider your argument under this exception. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301, .302.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from Computer. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Computer has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. See *id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 university may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Computer may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party's property interest, a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. Epic states it has competitors. Epic also states release of its information at issue would benefit competitors by allowing them to copy Epic's software capabilities, features, and functionality. Epic further states release of the information at issue would enable competitors to underbid Epic's pricing, thus giving the competitors an advantage. In addition, Epic states it seeks to withhold pricing information in its information at issue. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). See generally *Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview*, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d 831, at 831, 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Epic has established the release of some of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may withhold the information we have marked and indicated under

section 552.104(a).³ However, we find Epic has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.104(a).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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). 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.⁴ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim that

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁴The 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular 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.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Record Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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 (1990).

Epic claims its remaining information at issue constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find Epic has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Epic has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORDs 402, 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, none of Epic’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Epic argues some of the remaining information consists of commercial or financial information the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Epic has not established any of the remaining information constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, none of Epic’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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.”⁵ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find

⁵The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

the university must withhold the bank account and routing numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university may withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The university must withhold the bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information.

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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 590738

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Donald R. Stroud III
Attorney
Epic Systems Corporation
1979 Milky Way
Verona, Wisconsin 53593
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Parrish
President
Computer Financial Consultants, Inc.
56 Top Gallant Road
Stamford, Connecticut 06902
(w/o enclosures)