



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 13, 2009

Mr. James Downes
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County Attorney's Office
2525 Holly Hall Suite 190
Houston, Texas 77054

OR2009-09619

Dear Mr. Downes:

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# 349335 (CA File No. 09HSP0478).

The Harris County Purchasing Agent (the "county") received a request for information relating to a specified job number, including the bid tabulation, the final contracts, and the proposals of the winning bidders. You take no position on the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the submitted information may implicate the interests of Cardon Healthcare Network, Inc. ("Cardon") and Resource Corporation of America ("Resource"). You notified Cardon and Resource of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.¹ We received correspondence from attorneys for Cardon and Resource. We have considered their arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We assume that the county has released any other information that is responsive to this request, including the requested contracts, to the extent that such information existed when the county received the request. If not, then any such information must be released

¹See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

immediately.² See Gov't Code §§ 552.221, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

We first note that Resource raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). In this instance, Resource has not directed our attention to any law under which any of its information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of Resource's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

We also note that both Resource and Cardon raise section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as Resource and Cardon. See Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the county did not claim an exception to disclosure under section 552.104. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Both Resource and Cardon also raise section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision" 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." Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Supreme Court of Texas has adopted the definition of a "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,

²We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. 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), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

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 [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebatès 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) (emphasis added); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.³ *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Resource contends that pricing and other "industry information" in its proposal constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a) and also is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). Likewise, Cardon claims that its proposal contains both trade secrets and information protected by section 552.110(b).⁴ Cardon also contends that public disclosure

³The 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

⁴We note that although Cardon claims section 552.101 for information that it seeks to have withheld as trade secrets, the applicable exception is section 552.110(a).

of information provided to governmental bodies by potential vendors such as itself will result in "vague, generalized" proposals and ultimately "corrupt the [bidding] process as a whole[.]" In submitting these arguments, Cardon appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). *See also Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held that *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of Gov't Code § 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Cardon's interests in withholding its information.

Having considered the parties' other arguments, we conclude that the county must withhold some of Cardon's information under section 552.110(a). We also conclude that other information contained in Cardon's proposal must be withheld under section 552.110(b). We have marked the information that the county must withhold. We find that neither Cardon nor Resource has demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We also find that neither Cardon nor Resource has made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would cause either of the parties substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing).

With specific respect to Resource's claim for its pricing information, we note that both Resource and Cardon were awarded contracts by the county. 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." *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3

(1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Likewise, the pricing aspects of a contract with a governmental entity are generally not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview at 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Therefore, the county may not withhold any of Resource's or Cardon's pricing information under section 552.110.

We note that the submitted proposals also contain insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides that "[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."⁵ *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). The county must withhold the highlighted insurance policy numbers in Resource's and Cardon's proposals under section 552.136.

We also note that some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted information unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information also must comply with copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* A member of the public who wishes to make copies of copyrighted information 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 at 8-9 (1990).


In summary: (1) the county must withhold the information that we have marked in Cardon's proposal under section 552.110 of the Government Code; and (2) the highlighted insurance policy numbers in both proposals must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released. Any information that is protected by copyright must 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.

⁵Unlike other exceptions to disclosure under the Act, this office will raise section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, as this exception is mandatory and may not be waived. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; Open Records Decision No. 674 at 3 n.4 (2001) (mandatory exceptions).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James W. Morris, III', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/cc

Ref: ID# 349335

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles W. Kable, Jr.
Cardon Healthcare Network, Inc.
25231 Grogan's Mill Road
The Woodlands, Texas 77380
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bryan Haye
Resource Corporation of America
1120 Marina Bay Drive
Clear Lake Shores, Texas 77565
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lawrence S. Rothenberg
Attorney at Law
9525 Katy Freeway Suite 300
Houston, Texas 77024
(w/o enclosures)