



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 22, 2008

Mr. William L. Fly
University Attorney
Texas State University
601 University Drive
San Marcos, Texas 78666-4615

OR2008-11599

Dear Mr. Fly:

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# 320254.

Texas State University (the "university") received a request for information related to the university's Request for Qualifications ("RFQ") Number 758-08-09006 for the baseball and softball complex enhancements, to specifically include (1) a copy of each proposal submitted in response and (2) a copy of the final negotiated contract to be awarded. You inform us the university has no information responsive to the second category of information as the university has not yet awarded a final negotiated contract.¹ Although you take no position as to the disclosure of the remaining requested information, you state the information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You state, and provide documentation showing, you have notified Vaughn Construction ("Vaughn"), Journeyman Construction ("Journeyman"), Flintco Construction ("Flintco"), Spaw Glass ("Spaw"), and AUI Contractors ("AUI") of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *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

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

to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). A representative from AUI has submitted comments to our office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Vaughn, Journeyman, Flintco, and Spaw have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these companies, and the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. See 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 (1990).

AUI asserts some of its information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law.² See Gov't Code § 552.101; Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). The doctrine of common-law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). AUI asserts some of its information contains highly intimate facts, release of which would be highly objectionable to AUI, and the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. We note, however, that AUI is a business entity. Common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); see also *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy). Therefore, we conclude the university may not withhold any of AUI's information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

²Section 552.101 provides that "information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101.

Next, AUI claims portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that 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).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Having considered AUI's arguments, we conclude AUI has established a *prima facie* case that pages 11-13, 24, and 32-43 constitute trade secrets. Therefore, the university must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, AUI has failed to demonstrate that the information on page 6 constitutes a trade secret. *See* ORD 552 at 5-6. Thus, page 6 may not be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Further, we find AUI has not made the specific factual and evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of the information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (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), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of AUI's remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note, however, that some of the remaining information is 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A

governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the university must withhold pages 11-13, 24, and 32-43 of AUI's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can challenge that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Katherine M. Kroll
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KMK/eeg

Ref: ID# 320254

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Anna Obek
Bates Investigations, Inc.
4131 Spicewood Springs Road, #J2
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Scott MacQuaid
Harrison Steck, P.C.
1100 Sinclair Building
512 Main Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom Vaughn
Vaughn Construction
10355 Westpark Drive
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sam Kumar
Journeyman Construction
7701 North Lamar Boulevard, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78752
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Martin
Flintco Construction
5316 Highway 290 West, Suite 480
Austin, Texas 78735
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joel Stone
Spaw Glass
1111 Smith Road
Austin, Texas 78721
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tony Rader
AUI Contractors
4775 North Freeway
Fort Worth, Texas 76106
(w/o enclosures)