



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 9, 2019

Ms. Claudene Marshall  
Assistant General Counsel  
The Texas A&M University System  
301 Tarrow Street, 6th Floor  
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2019-25184

Dear Ms. Marshall:

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# 784955 (PIR# C001333-061819).

The Texas A&M University System (the "system") received a request for evaluation documents, proposal responses, oral presentation materials from the awarded vendor, and the final executed contract, including best and final offer, pertaining to a specified request for proposals. Although the system takes no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, the system informs us its release may implicate the proprietary interests of the following: Asysco, Inc. ("Asysco"); ExperSolve, Inc. ("ExperSolve"); Inventive Works, LLC; and Resource Data, Inc. Accordingly, the system states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office. *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 Asysco and ExperSolve. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the portion of the request seeking evaluation documents. To the extent any information responsive to this portion of the request existed on the date the system received the request, we assume the system has released it. If the system has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note 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) of the Government Code 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 only received comments from Asysco and ExperSolve explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude 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, 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. Therefore, the system may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

We note the submitted contract is subject to section 2261.253 of the Government Code. Section 2261.253 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) For each contract for the purchase of goods or services from a private vendor, each state agency shall post on its Internet website:

(1) each contract the agency enters into, including contracts entered into without inviting, advertising for, or otherwise requiring competitive bidding before selection of the contractor, until the contract expires or is completed[.]

...

(b) A state agency monthly may post contracts described by Subsection (a) that are valued less than \$15,000.

...

(e) A state agency that posts a contract on its Internet website as required under this section shall redact from the posted contract

(1) information that is confidential under law; [and]

(2) information the attorney general determines is exempted from public disclosure under [the Act.]

...

(f) The redaction of information under Subsection (e) does not exempt the information from the requirements of Section 552.021 or 552.221.

Gov't Code § 2261.253(a)(1), (b), (e)(1)-(2), (f). The contract at issue is between the system, a state agency, and Asysco, a private vendor, for the purchase of goods or services. We note the contract is valued at more than \$15,000 and has not expired nor been completed. Asysco raises sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code for the contract at issue; however, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not generally apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). The 85th Legislature amended section 2261.253; pursuant to the amendments, state agencies shall redact from contracts subject to section 2261.253 information that is confidential under law or information the attorney general determines is excepted from public disclosure under the Act. Gov't Code § 2261.253(e)(1)-(2); *see also id.* § 2261.253(f). We note the amendments “apply only in relation to a contract for which a state agency first advertises or otherwise solicits bids, proposals, offers, or qualifications on or after [September 1, 2017].” Act of May 29, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 556, § 17(c), 2017 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 1535, 1540. Upon review, we find the contract at issue is subject to the amendments; therefore, we will consider Asysco’s arguments under sections 552.104 and 552.110 for the contract at issue.

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. Upon review, we find Asysco failed to demonstrate release of its information at issue will give an advantage to a competitor. Therefore, no portion of Asysco’s information may be withheld under section 552.104 of the Government Code. ExperSolve indicates it has competitors. In addition, ExperSolve explains release of the information it indicated would “give an unfair advantage to a competitor.” After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find ExperSolve has established the release of the information at issue, which we marked, would give an advantage to a competitor or bidder. Accordingly, we conclude the system may withhold ExperSolve’s information we marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets obtained from a person 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, 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 him an opportunity to obtain an advantage

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address ExperSolve’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. 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 Records Decision Nos. 255, 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* ORD 661 at 5-6.

---

<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).

Asysco claims some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find Asysco failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has the company demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the information at issue. *See* ORDs 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), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, the system may not withhold any of Asysco's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Asysco also claims some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find Asysco failed to demonstrate the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *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 costs, 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). Furthermore, we note the information at issue relates to a contract awarded to Asysco. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder 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). The terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Therefore, the system may not withhold any of Asysco's information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information 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 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 system may withhold ExperSolve's information we marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining information;

however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.<sup>3</sup>

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



James M. Graham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JMG/

Ref: ID# 784955

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: 4 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note the information being released contains social security numbers. 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).