ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 12, 2014

Ms. Cara Leahy White
Counsel for the City of Southlake
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla, Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2014-07989

Dear Ms. White:

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# 522280.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a copy of the proposals submitted in response to the city's request for proposals for the Southlake Community Recreational Center, and a copy of the resulting contract. You state the city released some information to the requestor. You state the city will withhold insurance policy numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.[1] Although you take no position as to the public availability of the submitted information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You state you notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not

[1]Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c); *see also id.* § 552.136(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to withhold information under section 552.136(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.136(c) must provide certain notice to requestor). 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 under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

be released.[2] *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Adolfson, Gallagher, Haydon, Hill, Jordan, SpawGlass, and Robins. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Austin, Bartlett, Clark, Lee, or Turner. Thus, these companies have not demonstrated that they have protected proprietary interests in any of their submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests these third parties may have in their information.

Next, we note Haydon objects to disclosure of information the city has not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the city and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the city. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Gallagher, Robins, and Spaw contend some of their information was "marked" confidential when submitted to the city. However, we note information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See 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. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [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 section 552.110).

---

[2]The third parties notified pursuant to section 552.305 are: Adolfson & Peterson Construction Company ("Adolfson"); Austin Commercial, L.P. ("Austin"); Bartlett Cocke General Contractors, L.L.C. ("Bartlett"); Clark Contractors, L.L.C. ("Clark"); Gallagher Construction Company, L.P. ("Gallagher"); Haydon Building Corporation ("Haydon"); Hill & Wilkinson General Contractors ("Hill"); Jordan Foster Construction, L.L.C. ("Jordan"); Lee Lewis Construction, Inc. ("Lee"); SpawGlass Contractors, Inc. ("SpawGlass"); The Robins & Morton Group ("Robins"); and Turner Construction Company ("Turner").

Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Adolfson asserts some of its information is subject to common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 668. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (1992), 545 (1990), 523 (1989), 373 (1983). However, we note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Upon review, we find Adolfson has failed to demonstrate the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Hill and Jordan raise section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure for their information. This section excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which 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 section 552.104, no portion of Hill's or Jordan's information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* 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 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 . . . . 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 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.[3] RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note 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

---

[3]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 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

Adolfson, Gallagher, Haydon, Robins, and SpawGlass raise section 552.110(a) of the Government Code for some of their information. Upon review, we find Adolfson has established a *prima facie* case its customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on Adolfson's website, the city must withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find the third parties at issue have failed to establish a *prima facie* case the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; 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 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, and experience not excepted under section 552.110). We note 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; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, we find none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Gallagher, Haydon, Hill, Jordan, Robins, and SpawGlass raise section 552.110(b) of the Government Code for some of their information. Upon review, we find Haydon, Hill, and SpawGlass have demonstrated some of their information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). We also find Gallagher and Hill have demonstrated their customer information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, to the extent Gallagher's and Hill's customer information is not publicly available on their company websites, the city must withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(b). However, we find the third parties at issue have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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, 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Thus, we find Gallagher, Haydon, Hill, Jordan, Robins, and SpawGlass have failed to demonstrate that the release of any of their remaining information would cause them substantial competitive harm. Therefore, we find none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). You inform us the city will withhold e-mail addresses in the submitted information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. However, section 552.137 is not applicable to an e-mail address "contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract[.]" *See id.* § 552.137(c)(3). The e-mail addresses you seek to withhold in the submitted information are subject to section 552.137(c)(3). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.137. *See id.* § 552.137(a).

We also note that 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *See id.*; *see also* 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, to the extent Adolfson's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the city must withhold the customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. To the extent Gallagher's and Hill's customer information are not publicly available on their website, the city must withhold the customer information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, but any information protected by copyright 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Britni Fabian

Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/tch

Ref: ID# 522280

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. R. Carson Fisk
Counsel for C.F. Jordan Construction, LLC
Ford, Nassen & Baldwin, P.C.
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1010
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brad W. Gaswirth
Counsel for Gallagher Construction Company, LP
Canterbury, Gooch, Surratt, Shapiro, Stein & Gaswirth, PC
5005 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75244
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Wall
Robins & Morton Group
Suite 100
6900 North Dallas Parkway
Plano, Texas 75024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Timothy D. Matheny
Counsel for Hill & Wilkinson Construction Group, Ltd.
Ford, Nassen & Baldwin, P.C.
Suite 1600, LB 65
8080 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75206
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Franklin D. Dodge
Counsel for Haydon Building Corporation
Ryan Rapp & Underwood PLC
Suite 1600
3200 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2424
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregory M. Cokinos
Counsel for SpawGlass Contractors, Inc.
Cokinos, Bosien & Young, PC
16th Floor
1221 Lamar Street
Houston, Texas 77010
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Colbie Brazell
Counsel for Adolfson & Peterson Construction
Slates Harwell, LLP
1700 Pacific, Suite 3800
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Raftery
Turner Construction Company
Suite 100
2001 Lamar Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Fullington
Lee Lewis Construction, Inc.
17177 Preston Road, Suite 160
Dallas, Texas 75248
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William Clark
Clark Contractors, LLC
1701 West Northwest Highway, Suite 100
Grapevine, Texas 76051
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steven McCleskey
Bartlett Cocke General Contractors, LLC
1750 Valley View Lane, Suite 335
Farmers Branch, Texas 75234
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Penson
Austin Commercial, LP
Suite 300
3535 Travis Street
Dallas, Texas 75204
(w/o enclosures)