



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2010

Mr. Hans P. Graff
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Independent School District
4400 West 18th Street
Houston, Texas 77092-8501

OR2010-11784

Dear Mr. Graff:

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# 389211.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the JOC RFPs for four specified contractors. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state you have notified certain third parties of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (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 comments from KBR. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that an interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, 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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received arguments from KBR. We, thus, have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information pertaining to the non-briefing third parties constitutes proprietary information, and the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of the non-briefing third parties' proprietary interests. *See id.*

¹The interested third parties are Kellogg Brown & Root Services, Inc. ("KBR"); Fort Bend Mechanical Ltd.; RJH-JOC, Inc.; and Jamail & Smith Construction.

§ 552.110; 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.

KBR argues that portions of its proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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 it was obtained. Gov't Code § 552.110. 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

²The 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).

necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note that 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 (1939); *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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.* § 552.110(b); *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

KBR argues that portions of its proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude KBR has demonstrated that a portion of its proposal, which we have marked, constitutes trade secret information. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find KBR has failed to establish how any of its remaining information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business"). Thus, no portion of its remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

KBR also argues that portions of its remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, upon review of KBR's remaining information, we find KBR has made only general conclusory allegations that release of its remaining 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; Open Records Decision 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), 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 is too speculative), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, experience, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110).

Furthermore, we note that the contract related to the requested job order was awarded to KBR by the district. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted 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, 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). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers and account numbers that are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are “access device” numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers and account numbers we marked in the submitted proposals under section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁴

Finally, we note that some of the remaining information at issue is 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1978). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with federal copyright law.⁵

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).

⁴We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an insurance policy number under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

⁵We note the information being released contains a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

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/jb

Ref: ID# 389211

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Hazel Scalia
KBR
2451 Crystal Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard Jackson
RHJ-JOC, Inc.
7641 South Freeway
Houston, Texas 77021
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sharon Medford
Fort Bend Mechanical, Ltd.
13625 Stafford Road
Stafford, Texas 77477
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregory Smith, PE
Jamail & Smith Construction
16875 Diana Lane
Houston, Texas 77058
(w/o enclosures)