



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2009

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2009-10765

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 351035.

The University of Texas System (the "university") received a request for information related to a request for qualifications pertaining to project 802-227. You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You do not take a position as to whether the remaining requested information is excepted under the Act; however, you state that release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary rights of certain third parties. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified Jacobs Carter Burgess ("JCB"); SHW Group, L.L.P. ("SHW"); Omniplan, Inc. ("Omniplan"); and 3D/International, Inc. ("3D") of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted proposals 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 correspondence from SHW and Omniplan. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received correspondence from JCB or 3D explaining why their information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information pertaining to these third parties constitutes proprietary information, and the university may not withhold any portion

of their 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, 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 (1990).

Omniplan asserts that a portion of the submitted information may not be disclosed because the information at issue has been made confidential by agreement or assurances. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

SHW and Omniplan each raise section 552.110 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. 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. *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.¹ 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 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 § 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.

Having considered the claims of SHW and Omniplan, we conclude that they have failed to demonstrate that any portion of their respective information fits within the definition of a trade secret. SHW and Omniplan have also not sufficiently established any of the trade secret factors with respect to their information. Thus, no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we further determine that SHW and Omniplan have made only conclusory allegations that release of their information would cause substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110; ORD Nos. 661 at 5-6 (business entity must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, experience, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under

¹The 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).

statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, we conclude that none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We understand Omniplan to claim that its audited financial statements are confidential pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82.

This office has generally found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). We note, however, that common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporations and other types of business organizations. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); see also *U. S. v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy). Thus, Omniplan's information is not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld on that basis under section 552.101.

Next, we address Omniplan's contention that its information is excepted from disclosure by section 552.131 of the Government Code.² Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that

²Although Omniplan references section 552.121 of the Government Code, we note that section 552.131 is the correct exception.

disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "commercial 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." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Omniplan has failed to explain how its information relates to economic development negotiations involving the company and the university. *See id.* § 552.131. Accordingly, we conclude that the university may not withhold any portion of Omniplan's information pursuant to section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we note that section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interest of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the university does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude that no portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been claimed, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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, 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 at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/eeg

Ref: ID# 351035

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Gustaf
Jacobs Carter Burgess
P.O. Box 901058
Fort Worth, Texas 76101-2058
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Don Hensley
SHW Group, LLP
5717 Legacy Drive, Suite 250
Plano, Texas 75024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Darrell Comeaux
3D/International, Inc.
1900 West Loop South, Suite 400
Houston, Texas 77027-3292
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Henry
Omniplan, Inc.
1845 Woodall Rodgers Freeway, Suite 1500
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stephanie Garcia
SHW Group
5717 Legacy Drive, Suite 250
Plano, Texas 75024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. D. Michael Hellinghausen
Omniplan
1845 Woodall Rodgers Freeway, Suite 1500
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)