



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 16, 2007

Mr. Jay Kimbrough
Deputy General Counsel
Texas A&M University System
200 Technology Way
Texas A&M System Building, Suite 2079
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2007-04176

Dear Mr. Kimbrough:

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# 276072.

The Texas A&M International University (the "university") received a request for information regarding a specific custodial services contract award, excluding any information previously requested by the requestor or his company. You state that you will release some of the requested information. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure. You, instead, indicate that the submitted information may be subject to third party proprietary interests. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified the interested third parties of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Impace and have reviewed the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld

¹The third parties notified pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: One Source; ABM Janitorial Services; AHI Facility Services, Inc.; Azetec; Border Maintenance Service, Inc.; BPA Building Services, Inc.; James Enterprise; Impace Building Services, Inc. ("Impace"); I.Q.S. Inc.; McLemore Building Maintenance, Inc.; Maheir Janitorial Services; Services Solutions; Southwestern Services; and Marotta Enterprises, Inc.

from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, the following companies have not submitted comments explaining why their information should be withheld from disclosure: One Source; ABM Janitorial Services; AHI Facility Services, Inc.; Azetec; Border Maintenance Service, Inc.; BPA Building Services, Inc.; James Enterprise; I.Q.S. Inc.; McLemore Building Maintenance, Inc.; Maheir Janitorial Services; Services Solutions; Southwestern Services; and Marotta Enterprises, Inc. Thus, these companies have not demonstrated that any of their information is proprietary for purposes of the Act. *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 submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests that these companies may have in the information.

Impace claims that portions of its information are excepted from public 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). 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* *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); 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 this 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* Open Records Decision No. 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted 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. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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 § 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Impace claims that the staffing and financial sections of its proposal should be generally withheld under section 552.110(a) as a trade secret. However, we find that Impace has not demonstrated that this information meets the definition of a trade secret. Furthermore, Impace has not submitted any arguments demonstrating the factors necessary to establish a trade secret claim. Since Impace has not met its burden under section 552.110(a), the university may not withhold any the information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Impace also seeks to withhold its staffing and financial information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, Impace has only made a generalized allegation that the release of this information would result in substantial damage to the competitive position of the company. Thus, Impace has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that 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 was entirely too speculative). Accordingly, the university may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers which are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. This section 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.” *Id.* § 552.136. Thus, the university must withhold the type of information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue appear 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 protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials protected by copyright, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the university must withhold the type of information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

²We note that the submitted information 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 a decision from this office under the Act.

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/eb

Ref: ID# 276072

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jamie Mendoza
Vice President
Mendoza Manintence Group, Inc.
5303 Springfield Avenue
Laredo, Texas 78041
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Carol Lacy
One Source
320 Garden Oaks Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77018
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Olivier
ABM Janitorial Services
100 Congress, Suite 2000
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Luke Burns
AHI Facility Services, Inc.
625 Yuma Court
Dallas, Texas 75208
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brunell K. Moliere
A.M.E. Services Inc.
23 Barreca Street
Norco, Louisiana 70079
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dannette Heeth
Azetec
11000 South Wilcrest Drive,
Suite 125
Houston, Texas 77099
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Miguel Delgado
Border Maintenance Service, Inc.
2300 West Commerce, Suite 105
San Antonio, Texas 78207
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Birmingham
BPA Building Services, Inc.
9429 Harwin Drive
Houston, Texas 77036
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Darrell James
James Enterprise
605 Cedar Street
Cedar Hill, Texas 75104
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William G. Okeson
Impace Building Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 79611
Houston, Texas 77279-9611
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Vallejo III
I.Q.S. Inc.
113-A Oyster Creek Drive
Lake Jackson, Texas 77566
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Hector Rodriguez
Maheir Janitorial Services
12156 Yvonne Richardson
El Paso, Texas 79936
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Quentin J. Leber
McLemore Building Maintenance,
110 Fargo
Houston, Texas 77006
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Edmondson
Service Solutions
406 Willow Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37915
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Haley Lacy
Services Solutions
1845 Midpark, Suite 201
Knoxville, Tennessee 37921
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John A. Kerbow
Southwestern Services
2500 North Big Spring,
Suite 118-B
Midland, Texas 79705
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert A. Marotta, Jr.
Marotta Enterprises, Inc.
2100 North St. Mary's
San Antonio, Texas 78212
(w/o enclosures)