



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 13, 2011

Ms. Anne M. Constantine  
Legal Counsel  
Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport  
P.O. Box 619428  
DFW Airport, Texas 75261-9428

OR2011-00700

Dear Ms. Constantine:

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# 405830.

The Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Board (the "board") received a request for the responses, scoring methodology, and results related to a specified request for proposals. You claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. In addition, you state some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you have notified DLT Solutions ("DLT"); RFD & Associates, Inc. ("RFD"); SAP Public Services, Inc. ("SAP"); Mythics, Inc. ("Mythics"); and Noetix Corporation ("Noetix") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released to the requestor. *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 DLT and Noetix. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter,

we have not received any arguments from RFD, SAP, or Mythics. Thus, we have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information pertaining to these companies constitutes proprietary information, and the board may not withhold any portion of their information on that basis. *See id.* § 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.

DLT and Noetix argue that their information marked as confidential when submitted to the board should be withheld as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Noetix claims its information is excepted from disclosure under 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. In this instance, Noetix does not present any arguments against disclosure under that section nor has Noetix directed our attention to any law under which any of its information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. *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 addition, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2000), 575 at 2 (1990). Accordingly, none of Noetix’s information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

DLT and Noetix argue their submitted information is 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: 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 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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 § 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

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

We understand DLT and Noetix to assert that their submitted information constitutes trade secrets that are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find DLT and Noetix have failed to demonstrate how their information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have DLT and Noetix demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Consequently, the board may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110(a).

DLT and Noetix also claim their information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find Noetix has established release of its pricing information would cause it substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the board must withhold the pricing information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find DLT and Noetix have made only conclusory allegations that release of their remaining information would result in substantial damage to their competitive positions and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* ORD 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); *see also* ORD 319 at 3 (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). Accordingly, we determine none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." Gov't Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* ORD 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You contend that the submitted score sheets are subject to section 552.111 because they were "created by [b]oard personnel, in a deliberative process aimed at providing advice, opinion and recommendation." You argue that disclosure of the information at issue would have a chilling effect on the deliberative process by inhibiting free discussion among board staff. Upon review, we agree the information at issue represents the advice, opinion, and recommendations of the board concerning matters of policy. Accordingly, the board may withhold the scoring sheets under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information includes information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.136 provides, "[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). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the board must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

---

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

<sup>3</sup>We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general

We note some of the remaining information 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). 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 board must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The board may withhold the scoring sheets under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The board must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but only 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](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,



Sarah Casterline  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SEC/eeg

---

decision.

Ref: ID# 405830

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Edward T. Jones  
DLT Sloutions  
13861 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 400  
Herndon, Virginia 20171  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Anne Davison  
RFD & Associates, Inc.  
401 Camp Craft Road  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard Wuest  
SAP Public Services, Inc.  
3999 West Chester Pike  
Newtown Square, Pennsylvania 19073  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Scura  
Mythics, Inc.  
1439 North Great Neck Road  
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Ruggiero  
Noetix Corporation  
5010 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Suite 100  
Redmond, Washington 98052  
(w/o enclosures)