



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 7, 2019

Mr. Augustin Rivera, Jr.
General Counsel
Del Mar College
101 Baldwin Boulevard
Corpus Christi, Texas 78404-3897

OR2019-28082

Dear Mr. Rivera:

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# 789736.

Del Mar College (the "college") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You state the college is releasing 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 Campus Management Corp. ("CMC"); Collaborative Solutions, LLC.; Ellucian Company L.P.; Jenzabar, Inc. ("Jenzabar"); Navigator Management Partners LLC ("Navigator"); and Oracle America, Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the college notified these third parties 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 CMC, Jenzabar, and Navigator. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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) 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 of the remaining third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of these third parties has 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 college may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in it.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” *Id.* § 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. Jenzabar and Navigator state they have competitors. These third parties also state release of portions of their information at issue would give their competitors an advantage. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find these third parties have established the release of their information at issue, which we marked, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the college may withhold the information we marked pertaining to Jenzabar and Navigator under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.¹

CMC and Jenzabar assert portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 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 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

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Jenzabar’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.² 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.

Upon review, we find CMC and Jenzabar have established a *prima facie* case their customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent CMC's and Jenzabar's customer information at issue, which we marked, is not publicly available on the companies' respective websites, the college must withhold it under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, CMC and Jenzabar have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of their remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. Moreover, we find CMC and Jenzabar have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

²The 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).

CMC and Jenzabar further assert portions of their remaining information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note 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 (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). In addition, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3); ORD 541 at 8. Upon review of CMC's arguments under section 552.110(b), we conclude CMC has established the release of some of its remaining information, which we marked, would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the college must withhold the information we marked pertaining to CMC under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find CMC and Jenzabar have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of their remaining information would cause the companies substantial competitive injury. *See* ORD 319 at 3 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). Therefore, the college may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Jenzabar also asserts some of its remaining information is protected from disclosure under copyright law. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue appears 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 (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 college may withhold the information we marked pertaining to Jenzabar and Navigator under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. To the extent CMC's and Jenzabar's customer information at issue is not publicly available on the companies' respective websites, the college must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The college must withhold the information we marked pertaining to CMC under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The college must release the remaining information; however, the college may only release any information subject to copyright 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 <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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/gw

Ref: ID# 789736

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

6 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)