



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2009

Mr. Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2009-10764

Dear Mr. Bounds:

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# 351369.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for all proposals submitted in response to Request For Proposals BI-0227-08. You state the city has provided some of the requested information to the requestor. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted proposals, you indicate their release may implicate the proprietary interests of Houston Spraying & Supply, Inc. ("HSS"), North Star Helicopters, Inc. ("NSH"), and Herrmann's Fish Farm ("HFF"). Accordingly, you state, and have provided documentation showing, you notified these companies of the request and of each company's 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) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from HSS, NSH, and HFF. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

NSH and HFF assert their information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. Section 552.104, however, 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). As the city does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find section 552.104 is not applicable to NSH's and HFF's information. See ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

HSS, NSH, and HFF claim portions of their submitted proposals are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision," and (2) "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 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 a single or ephemeral event 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 *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). This office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the

exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable 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.¹ Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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 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 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Among other things, HFF indicates the release of its information could deter vendors such as HFF from competing for government contracts, so as to lessen competition for such contracts and deprive governmental entities in future procurements. In advancing this argument, HFF 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*. *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

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 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).

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 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 section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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 HFF's interests in its information.

HSS, NSH, and HFF claim some of their information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find HSS, NSH, and HFF have established their respective customer information, which we have marked, constitutes a trade secret, and must be withheld under section 552.110(a). However, we find HSS, NSH, and HFF have not demonstrated how the remaining information each company seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of these companies' remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

HSS, NSH, and HFF also claim the remaining information each company seeks to withhold, including personnel, insurance, financial, and general company information, as well as the pricing information of NSH and HFF, constitutes commercial information that, if released, would cause substantial competitive harm to the company. After reviewing each company's arguments and the information at issue, we find NSH and HFF have established release of their pricing information would cause them substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). We find, however, that HSS, NSH, and HFF have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing release of their remaining information would cause them substantial competitive injury. See Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information HSS, NSH, and HFF seek to withhold under section 552.110(b).

We note HFF's remaining information contains tax return information, which may be excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² 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 information

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

made confidential by other statutes. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms), 226 (1979) (W-2 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as "a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of . . . income, payments, . . . tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Internal Revenue Service] with respect to a return or . . . the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, . . . or offense[.]" See 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term "return information" expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer's liability under title 26 of the United States Code. See *Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff'd in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Thus, we find the city must withhold the Form 1065 tax return information we have marked in HFF's remaining information pursuant to federal law.

HSS's and NSH's remaining information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding 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.

Gov't Code § 552.136. We conclude the insurance policy numbers we have marked constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, the city must withhold the marked insurance policy numbers in HSS's and NSH's remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note part of the remaining information appears 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 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). Accordingly, the remaining information must be released to the requestor in accordance with copyright law.

In summary, the city must withhold the marked customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code and the marked pricing information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code; the marked Form 1065 tax return information pursuant to federal law; and the marked insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information 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.

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,



Leah B. Wingerson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LBW/eeg

Ref: ID# 351369

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. George B. Pylant III
Division Manager
Houston Spraying & Supply, Inc.
P.O. Box 920725
Houston, Texas 77292
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Allen Walker
President
North Star Helicopters, Inc.
P.O. box 2010
Jasper, Texas 77018
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott W. Stover
Seale, Stover & Bisbey
P.O. Box 480
Jasper, Texas 75951
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jon Herrmann
Herrmann Fish Farm
4977 County Road 83
Robstown, Texas 78380
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David L. Garrison
Upton, Mickits & Heymann, L.L.P.
Frost Bank Plaza
802 N. Carancahua, Suite 450
Corpus Christi, Texas 78470
(w/o enclosures)