



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 28, 2009

Mr. David M. Swope
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
101 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2009-12177

Dear Mr. Swope:

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# 353897.

The Harris County Purchasing Agent (the "county") received a request for "the winning Technical and Cost Proposal as well as the evaluation scoring" related to Job No. 09/0108. You state that the county has no information responsive to the portion of the request for evaluation scoring.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state that the request may implicate the privacy or proprietary interests of a third party. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you state you have notified the interested third party of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 allows a governmental body to rely on an interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of the exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). This office has received comments from the third party, Camp Dresser & McKee Inc. ("CDM"). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

The county indicates that the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 262.030 of the Local Government Code. 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 protected by other statutes. Section 262.030(c) of the Local Government Code provides a competitive proposal procedure for the purchase of high technology items by a county, and states in pertinent part:

(c) If provided in the request for proposals, proposals shall be opened so as to avoid disclosure of contents to competing offerors and kept secret during the process of negotiation. All proposals that have been submitted shall be available and open for public inspection after the contract is awarded, except for trade secrets and confidential information contained in the proposals and identified as such.

Local Gov't Code § 262.030(c). In general, section 552.101 only excepts information from disclosure where the express language of a statute makes certain information confidential or states that information shall not be released to the public. Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987). The plain language of section 262.030(c) does not expressly make bid proposals confidential. Section 262.030(c) only requires a governmental body to take adequate precautions to protect bid proposals from competing bidders. Accordingly, we determine that the submitted information is not confidential pursuant to section 262.030(c). Thus, the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 262.030 of the Local Government Code.

Although the county argues that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we will only address CDM's arguments under section 552.110. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm.

Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." Gov't Code § 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, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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. This office must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under the trade secret branch of section 552.110 if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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). 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 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; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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

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;
- 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 Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

§ 552.110(b). 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 requested information. *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). We note that the pricing information of a company contracting with a governmental body is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning 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).

CDM seeks to withhold portions of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Upon review of the submitted information and arguments, however, we find that CDM has made only generalized allegations and has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. In addition, CDM has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. Accordingly, we find that none of the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We also find that CDM has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of the submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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). Thus, we conclude that the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) states 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.”³ Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded that insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


Finally, although the county raises section 552.101 in conjunction with copyright law, we note copyright law does not make information confidential under this section. *See* Open Records Decision No. 660 at 5 (1999). However, a custodian of public records must comply with 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. *See* ORD 660 at 5 (Federal Copyright Act does not make information confidential, but rather gives copyright holder exclusive right to reproduce his work, subject to another person's right to make fair use of it.). 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 county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor, but any copyrighted information may only 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 353897

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher Canonico, P.E.
Client Service Manager
Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.
3050 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 300
Houston, Texas 77056
(w/o enclosures)