ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 30, 2013

Mr. Ronny H. Wall
Associate General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Texas Tech University System
P.O. Box 42021
Lubbock, Texas 79409-2021

OR2013-15228

Dear Mr. Wall:

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# 498052.

The Angelo State University (the "university") received two requests for information from two different requestors pertaining to request for proposals number 737-CUST. You state the university has released some of the requested information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified ABM Janitorial Services, Inc. ("ABM"); American Facility Services, Inc. ("AFS"); Aztec Facility Management Services ("Aztec"); Member's Building Maintenance, LLC ("MBM"); McLemore Building Maintenance ("McLemore"); Modern Facilities Services ("MFS"); and SBM Management and Services, LP ("SBM") of the requests 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 ABM and Aztec. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the university has not complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Governmental Code in requesting this ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released, unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See id.* § 552.301; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when the information is confidential by law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third-party interests can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will consider whether the information at issue may be withheld on behalf of the third parties at issue.

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 AFS, MBM, McLemore, MFS, or SBM explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude AFS, MBM, McLemore, MFS, or SBM 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 university may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest AFS, MBM, McLemore, MFS, or SBM may have in it.

Aztec generally asserts that some of its information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Aztec has not directed our attention to any law under which any of its information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, we conclude that the university may not withhold the submitted information under that section.

Next, ABM and Aztec claim portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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.[1] *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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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.[2] RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case

---

[1]We understand ABM to assert section 552.110(b) of the Government Code based on its arguments.

[2]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).

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. *See* 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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (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).

Upon review, we find Aztec has established that its customer information constitutes a trade secret. Therefore, the university must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, Aztec has failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Aztec demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, none of Aztec's remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note ABM also argues that the release of its information at issue would have a chilling effect on the university's ability to secure bidders or competitive pricing information. In advancing this argument, ABM appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body's ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) of the

Government Code by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only ABM's interests in its information.

Upon review of ABM and Aztec's arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that ABM and Aztec have established that some of the information they seek to withhold, including ABM's customer information and ABM's and Aztec's pricing information, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the companies substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the university must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that ABM and Aztec have made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of their remaining information would result in substantial damage to each company's competitive position. Thus, ABM and Aztec have not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information at issue. *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). Accordingly, none of ABM's or Aztec's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.[3] Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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." Gov't Code § 552.136. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials 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.

---

[3]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 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.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 498052

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jay H Dushkin
Counsel for Aztec Facility Services, Inc.
Law Offices of Jay H. Dushkin
4615 Southwest Freeway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Donna Robinson Quinn
Regional Sales & Marketing Administrator
ABM Janitorial Services
1450 Regal Row
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rodd Adams
SBM Management Services, LP
5241 Arnold Avenue
McClellan, California 95652
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Hugo Benvenuto
VP, COO
Modern Facilities Services
733 Ridgedale Avenue
East Hanover, New Jersey 07936
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin McCann
American Facility Services, Inc.
1325 Union Hill Industrial Court, Suite A
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Harvey Burger
Member's Building Maintenance, LLC
11363 Denton Drive, #127
Dallas, Texas 75229
(w/o enclosures)