



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 11, 2014

Mr. R. Brooks Moore
Managing Counsel, Governance
The Texas A&M University System
301 Tarrow Street, Sixth Floor
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2014-11958

Dear Mr. Moore:

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# 528786 (TAMU ID# 14-289).

Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for nine categories of information pertaining to roof replacement projects at the university. You state you will release some information. You also state you do not have information responsive to portions of the requested information.¹ 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 Atlas Universal; CS ADVANTAGE USAA, INC.; Liqua Tech; P2MG; Petersendean; PRC Roofing Co., Inc.; Rain Seal Master Roofing & Sheet Metal; Reliable Commercial Roofing Services, Inc.; RYCARS Construction; Sea-Breeze Roofing Inc.; and John A. Walker Roofing Co., Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 a representative of Liqua Tech. We have

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *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), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from an interested third party and the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released).

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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from Liqua Tech explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Next, we note Liqua Tech argues against disclosure of information not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the university has submitted to us for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit a copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the university submitted as responsive to the request for information.

Liqua Tech argues portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under 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. *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 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 (1980), 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.

Liqua Tech asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Liqua Tech failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Liqua Tech has not demonstrated the necessary factors to

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).

establish a trade secret claim for its information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of Liqua Tech's information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Liqua Tech further argue portions of its information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Liqua Tech has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the university must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Liqua Tech has not demonstrated that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."³ 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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(2). Accordingly, the university must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Upon review, the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers you marked and the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information 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 marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the insurance policy numbers you marked and the additional insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information; however, 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,



Kenny Moreland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJM/tch

Ref: ID# 528786

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Anthony L. Laporte
Mr. Ciro J. Samperi
Counsel for Ligua Tech, Inc.
Hanszen Laporte
11767 Katy Freeway, Suite 850
Houston, Texas 77079
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Helene Hardy Pierce
Vice President of Technical Services,
Codes and Industry Relations
GAF
1361 Alps Road
Wayne, New Jersey 07470
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Schoeneman
Atlas Universal
735 West Tidwell Road
Houston, Texas 77091
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Oscar Galvan
CS Advantage USAA, Inc.
P.O. Box 12407
College Station, Texas 77842
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Nelson
P2MG
Suite 330
5450 Northwest Central Drive
Houston, Texas 77046
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas Kader
Petersendean
5050 Timber Creek Drive
Houston, Texas 77017
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Delgado
PRC Roofing Co., Inc.
3714 Osage
Houston, Texas 77063
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ryan Burks
RYCARS Construction
P.O. Box 370
Kenner, Louisiana 70063
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ronald Howard
Sea-Breeze Roofing, Inc.
1927 Ahrens
Houston, Texas 77017
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. J. Ramon Lozano, Sr.
Rain Seal Master Roofing & Sheet Metal
2306 Port Lavaca Drive
Victoria, Texas 77901
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel McLaughlin
Reliable Commercial Roofing Services,
Inc.
4560 West 34th Street, Suite H
Houston, Texas 77092
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John A. Walker, III
John A. Walker Roofing Co., Inc.
P.O. Box 2880
Texas City, Texas 77592-2880
(w/o enclosures)