



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 16, 2012

Ms. Melissa Garcia  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2012-18546

Dear Ms. Garcia:

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# 471665 (UT OGC #146223).

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for information pertaining to RFP# 2012019MDG. Although you claim no exceptions to disclosure of the submitted information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Mitchell Time and Parking ("Mitchell"), Aparc Systems, Inc. ("Aparc"), and Associated Time and Parking Controls ("Associated Time"). Accordingly, you notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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 the circumstances). We have considered comments received from Aparc and reviewed the submitted information.

We note 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 either Mitchell or Associated Time. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude these companies 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Mitchell or Associated Time may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>1</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses 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. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type 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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). Upon review, we find portions of the submitted information are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Aparc raises sections 552.102 and 552.110 for portions of its information. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). However, section 552.102(a) applies only to information in the personnel file of a government employee. *See id.* Therefore, we find section 552.102 is not applicable to Aparc’s information, and the university may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.102 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 id.* § 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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *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.<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 that 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

---

<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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

§ 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 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Aparc asserts portions of its information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find Aparc has demonstrated portions of its information, which we have marked, constitute trade secrets. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Aparc contends release of some of its remaining information will cause Aparc substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find Aparc has established its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Aparc has not established how any of the remaining information it seeks to withhold constitutes commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 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, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(2). The university must withhold the license plate numbers we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers and partial credit card numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the 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 university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and sections 552.110, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by 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 [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](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,



Kathleen J. Santos  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KJS/dls

Ref: ID# 471665

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(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 an attorney general decision under the Act. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Mr. Robert Ziola  
President and CEO  
Aparc Systems, Inc.  
One Market Street, Suite 3600  
San Francisco, California 94105  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joe Hobbs  
Senior Vice President and Treasurer  
Mitchell Time and Parking  
4806 North IH 35  
Austin, Texas 78751  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick Dolan  
Branch Manager  
Associated Time and Parking Controls  
4020 South Industrial Drive, Suite 150  
Austin, Texas 78744  
(w/o enclosures)