



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 25, 2014

Ms. Ana Vieira  
Attorney and Public Information Coordinator  
Office of the General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2014-21512

Dear Ms. Vieira:

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# 544887 (OGC #158094).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for the information our office found must be released in Open Records Ruling No. 2014-15200. 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 CaCo Architecture LLC; Crenshaw Consulting; Dekker/Perich/Sabatini; Fokus on Architecture, Inc.; GA Architecture, Inc.; In\*Situ Architecture, PLLC; Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.; McCormick; Omniplan, Inc.; Page Sutherland Page, Inc.; Parkhill Smith & Cooper, Inc.; PhiloWilke Partnership; QS Tech, LLP; SmithGroup JJR, and WestEast Design Group, LLC. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from In\*Situ, Omniplan, and Parkhill objecting to the release of some of the information at issue. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and information.

We note an interested 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, only In\*Situ, Omniplan, and Parkhill have submitted to this office any reasons

explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of the remaining third parties, and the system 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, 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.

In\*Situ raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure information that, if released, would give an advantage to a competitor or bidder. Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). The system did not assert section 552.104. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to that section. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.104).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110. 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." *See id.* § 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office 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 section 552.110(a) applies 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. *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, 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 release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find In\*Situ, Omniplan, and Parkhill have not shown any of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). We also find In\*Situ, Omniplan, and Parkhill have failed to establish release of the information at issue would cause these third parties substantial competitive injury. *See id.* § 552.110(b). Therefore, the system may not withhold any of the information pursuant to section 552.110.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>2</sup> *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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

---

<sup>1</sup>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; (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).

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *See 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 found that personal financial information not related to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is intimate and embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 523 (1989), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). We note the submitted information contains business ownership percentages. Upon review, we find the information we have indicated satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the system must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the system must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The system must release the remaining information.

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](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,



Lauren Dahlstein  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LMD/som

Ref: ID# 544887

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick J. Sullivan  
QS Tech, LLP  
8501 Hickory Creek Drive  
Austin, Texas 78735  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. A. Bradley Woodman  
SmithGroup JJR  
455 North 3rd Street, Suite 250  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Myriam E. Camargo  
Caco Architecture LLC  
921 North Riverfront Boulevard,  
Suite 500  
Dallas, Texas 75207  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William C. Helm II  
In\*Situ Architecture, PLLC  
123 West Mills Avenue, Suite 410  
El Paso, Texas 79901  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Alexander  
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc  
777 Main Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Sabatini  
Dekker/Perich/Sabatini  
7601 Jefferson NE, Suite 100  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher Kimm  
WestEast Design Group, LLC  
200 East Grayson Street, Suite 207  
San Antonio, Texas 78215  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Edward McCormick  
McCormick  
550 South Mesa Hills, Suite D2  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dana A. Wilke  
PhiloWilke Partnership  
221 North Kansas Street, Suite 820  
El Paso, Texas 79901  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel S. Hart  
Parkhill Smith & Cooper  
1700 West Wall Street, Suite 100  
Midland, Texas 79701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gerardo Gutierrez  
GA Architecture, Inc.  
1000 East Yandell Drive  
El Paso, Texas 79902  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eckhard K. Fennig  
Fokus on Architecture, Inc.  
57588 North Mesa Street  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James W. Wright  
Page Sutherland Page, Inc.  
1100 Louisiana, Suite One  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. D. Wilkes Alexander  
Counsel for Omniplan  
Fisk Fielder Alexander  
2720 North Stemmons Fwy, 400 South  
Tower  
Dallas, Texas 75207  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Vickie Crenshaw  
Crenshaw Consulting  
1475 North Main Street, Suite E  
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001  
(w/o enclosures)