ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 28, 2011

Ms. Dana Gibson
President
Sam Houston State University
P.O. Box 2026
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2026

OR2011-17438

Dear Ms. Gibson:

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# 437206.

Sam Houston State University (the "university") received a request for all correspondence, plans, drawings, and information related to funding pertaining to the restoration of a named building. You state you are releasing some of the requested information to the requestor. Although you take no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Dudley Construction, Ltd. ("Dudley"); Volz & Associates, Inc. ("Volz"); Alpha Building Corporation ("Alpha"); Merriman Associates/Architects, Inc. ("Merriman"); and Conley Group, Inc. ("Conley"). Accordingly, you have notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from Volz and Merriman. 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 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 decision, we have not received correspondence from Dudley, Alpha, or Conley. Thus, Dudley, Alpha, and Conley have not demonstrated that they have protected proprietary interests in any of their 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Dudley, Alpha, and Conley may have in the information.

We understand Volz argues its submitted information is confidential because it was marked as "confidential" when submitted to the university. We note information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W. 2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 protects information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Volz and Merriman appear to raise the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The types of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Prior decisions of this office have determined personal financial information not related to a transaction between an individual and a governmental body generally meets the first prong of the common-law privacy test. *See generally* ORD 600. However, whether financial information is subject to

a legitimate public interest and not protected by common-law privacy must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983). We further note 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). Upon review, we find no portion of Volz's or Merriman's information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information about an individual. Accordingly, no portion of this information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Furthermore, Volz and Merriman have not directed our attention to any other law under which any of their information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. We therefore conclude that the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Volz and Merriman each assert some of the submitted information is protected by section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See 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. A "trade secret"

> may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as, for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as, for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978). There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

> (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
>
> (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 to [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* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption 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 that 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).

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.* § 552.110(b); *see also* ORD 661 at 5 (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).

Volz and Merriman have each raised section 552.110(a) for portions of their information. Upon review, we find Volz has made a *prima facie* case that portions of its customer information constitute trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we have marked in Volz's

proposal under section 552.110(a). However, we note Volz has made some of its client information publicly available on its website. Because Volz has published this information, it has failed to demonstrate how this information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). In addition, we find Volz and Merriman have not demonstrated the remaining information they seek to withhold constitutes trade secrets for purposes of section 552.110(a). *See* ORD 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). Thus, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Volz and Merriman also raise section 552.110(b) for portions of their information. Upon review, we find Volz and Merriman have not established by a factual or evidentiary showing that release of the remaining information they seek to withhold would cause substantial competitive injury for purposes of section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Merriman also raises section 552.113 of the Government Code, which protects certain geological, geophysical, and other information regarding the exploration or development of natural resources. Gov't Code § 552.113; *see generally* Open Records Decision No. 627 (1994). Because Merriman has not demonstrated that this exception is applicable to any of the remaining information at issue, the university may not withhold any information under section 552.113 of the Government Code.

Volz claims portions of its remaining information are confidential under section 552.128 of the Government Code. Section 552.128 is applicable to "[i]nformation submitted by a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business under a local, state, or federal certification program[.]" Gov't Code § 552.128(a). However, Volz does not indicate it submitted its proposal in connection with an application for certification under such a program. Moreover, section 552.128(c) states that

> [i]nformation submitted by a vendor or contractor or a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship, a specific contract, or an application to be placed on a bidders list, including information that may also have been submitted in

> connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business, is subject to required disclosure, excepted from required disclosure, or confidential in accordance with other law.

Id. § 552.128(c). In this instance, Volz submitted its proposal to the university in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship with the university. We therefore conclude the university may not withhold any portion of Volz's information under section 552.128 of the Government Code.

Next, Merriman asserts its information is excepted under section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides in part:

> (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:
>
> > (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
> >
> > (2) commercial 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.
>
> (b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Id. § 552.131. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "commercial 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." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of Merriman's claims under section 552.110, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

We note section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the university does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude that no portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information 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 university must withhold the information we have marked section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information that is protected by 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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/ag

Ref: ID# 437206

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Dudley
Dudley Construction, Ltd.
11370 State Highway 30
College Station, Texas 77845
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Volz
Volz & Associates, Inc.
1105 West 42nd Street
Austin, Texas 78756
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard Booher
Executive Vice President
Alpha Building Corporation
24850 Blanco Road
San Antonio, Texas 78260
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerald R. Merriman
Merriman Associates/Architects, Inc.
300 North Field Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Greg Walterscheid
Conley Group, Inc.
5800 Campus Circle, Suite 250
Irving, Texas 75603
(w/o enclosures)