



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 4, 2009

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

OR2009-17204

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 363272.

The Texas A&M University System (the "system") received a request for the Construction Manager at Risk proposals for three specified construction projects. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the system has notified the interested third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 in certain circumstances). Pursuant to section 552.305(d), we have received comments from Turner and SpawGlass objecting to the release of their information. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The notified third parties are: McCarthy Building Companies, Inc.; Bartlett Cocke, L.P.; 3D/I Construction; Hunt Construction Group, Inc.; Templeton Construction; Austin Commercial; Satterfield & Pontikes Construction, Inc.; Ewing Construction Co., Inc.; Gilbane Building Company; Turner Construction Company ("Turner"); Vaughn Construction; SpawGlass; and JEDunn.

Initially, the system acknowledges, and we agree, that it failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the information is public and must be released, unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption *See id.* § 552.302; *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 279 S.W.3d 806, 811 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2007, pet. granted); *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Normally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where an exception designed to protect the interest of a third party is applicable. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider whether or not the submitted information is excepted under the Act.

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, only Turner and SpawGlass have submitted to this office reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, the remaining third parties have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *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. Therefore, the system may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that the remaining third parties may have in this information.

Spawglass asserts that its information is confidential because it was submitted to the system with the understanding that it would not be disclosed. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [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 section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Next, Turner and SpawGlass both assert that portions of their information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the

proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) 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. 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.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 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). We also note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or

²The 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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; *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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.*; ORD 661 at 5-6.

After reviewing the submitted information and the arguments, we determine that Turner and SpawGlass have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that 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 business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORD 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Turner and SpawGlass also seek to withhold portions of their submitted information under section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find that SpawGlass has established that the release of a portion of their submitted information would cause them substantial competitive injury; therefore the system must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). However, we determine that Turner and SpawGlass have made only conclusory allegations that release of Turner’s information and SpawGlass’s remaining information would result in substantial competitive harm to each company and have not provided a specific factual or evidentiary showing to support these allegations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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 was entirely too speculative). Thus, the system may not withhold any of Turner’s submitted information or any of SpawGlass’s remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code, which provides 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.”³ Gov’t

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Code § 552.136(b). Accordingly, the system must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


Finally, 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. 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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the system must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(b) and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, in releasing the information that is copyrighted, the system must comply with applicable 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.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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jonathan Miles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JM/cc

Ref: ID# 363272

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael J. McWay
President
McCarthy Building Companies, Inc.
14131 Midway Road, Suite 630
Addison, Texas 75001-3658
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kirk D. Kistner
Manager of Preconstruction Services
Bartlett Cocke, L.P.
8850 Jameel, Suite 140
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Saul Valentine
Senior Vice President
3D/I Construction
1900 West Loop South, Suite 400
Houston, Texas 77027-3292
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jack E. Sovern
Contract Manager
Hunt Construction Group, Inc.
4099 McEwen, Suite 400
Dallas, Texas 75244
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary McClure
President
Templeton Construction
P.O. Box 3405
San Angelo, Texas 76902
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry Ingram
Managing Director
Director of Construction - Higher Education Sector
55 Waugh Drive, Suite 1150
Houston, Texas 77007-5837
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael McCollum
Austin Commercial
1501 South Mopac, Suite 1150
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Satterfield & Pontikes Construction, Inc.
6617 Flintlock
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Ewing, Jr.
President CEO
Ewing Construction Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 4235
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wendell P. Holmes, III
Senior Vice President and Regional Manager
Gilbane Building Company
1331 North Lamar, Suite 1170
Houston, Texas 77010
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Corbett R. Nichter
Manager Business Development
Turner Construction Company
2001 North Lamar, Suite 100
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd Granato
Manager
Turner Construction Company
4263 Dakoma Street
Houston, Texas 77092
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom Vaughn
President
Vaughn Construction
10355 Westpark Drive
Houston, Texas 77042-5312
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael P. Emmons
Senior Vice President
SpawGlass
13800 West Road
Houston, Texas 77041
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Peter G. Doyle
Chairman and CEO
JEDunn
3500 South Gessner, Suite 200
Houston, Texas 77063
(w/o enclosures)