



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 24, 2017

Ms. Jennifer Burnett  
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator  
The University of Texas System  
Office of General Counsel  
201 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2017-08659

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 654609 (OGC# 173736 & OGC# 173941).

The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (the "university") received two requests for the evaluations of the requestors' companies, a ranking of respondents, and all submitted documents for a specified request for proposals. You state you have released some information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Amtech Solutions; Conley Group ("Conley"); Crenshaw Consulting Group, LLC; Hollon Cannon Group; Slay Architecture; Terracon; Walker Restoration; Walter P. Moore; West East Design Group; and Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. ("WJE"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the requests for information and of their rights 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 Conley, Terracon, and WJE. 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 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 Amtech Solutions; Crenshaw Consulting Group, LLC; Hollon Cannon Group; Slay Architecture; Walker Restoration; Walter P. Moore; or West East Design Group. Thus, we have no basis to conclude these third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 Amtech Solutions; Crenshaw Consulting Group, LLC; Hollon Cannon Group; Slay Architecture; Walker Restoration; Walter P. Moore; or West East Design Group 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). 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. Conley and Terracon state they have competitors. In addition, Conley states release of its information at issue would allow competitors to undercut its bids and disadvantage it on future projects. Terracon states that release of its information at issue would negate its competitive advantage over other companies and give competitors and undue advantage. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Conley and Terracon have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may withhold the marked information under section 552.104(a).<sup>1</sup>

Conley and WJE also assert portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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. 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* ORD 552. Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.<sup>2</sup> 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 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

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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).

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* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Conley and WJE contend some of their information is commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the companies. Upon review, we find Conley has demonstrated some of its information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the university must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Conley and WJE have not established any of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue on this basis.

WJE seeks to withhold some of its remaining information under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we conclude WJE has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of its information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find WJE has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its 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 WJE’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

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.”<sup>3</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining materials at issue 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

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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).

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 may withhold the marked information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The university must withhold the marked information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The university must withhold the marked insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Emily Kunst  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EK/eb

Ref: ID# 654609

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

10 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)

