



January 20, 2015

Ms. Sara Abbott McEown
Counsel for the Fort Worth Transportation Authority
Jackson Walker, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 6000
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2015-01038

Dear Ms. McEown:

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# 550489.

The Fort Worth Transportation Authority (the "authority"), which you represent, received a request for the winning proposal for request for proposals number 14-T052 for Drug and Alcohol Testing and Physical Examination Services. The authority claims the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The authority also states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Concentra Health Services, Inc. ("Concentra") of the authority's receipt of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *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 correspondence from an attorney for Concentra objecting to the release of Concentra's information under sections 552.101, 552.110, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Concentra contends its employees' home addresses, home telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses are confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note an individual’s name, address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person’s name, address, or telephone number not invasion of privacy). Upon review, we find no portion of Concentra’s information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The authority and Concentra assert the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. However, section 552.110 protects only the interests of the third parties that have provided information to a governmental body, not those of the governmental body itself. Accordingly, we consider only the arguments we received from Concentra under section 552.110. 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 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.¹ 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 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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 Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999).

Concentra seeks to withhold its customer and pricing information as commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the company. Upon review, we find Concentra has demonstrated its customer information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the authority must withhold Concentra’s customer information, to the extent it is not publicly available on the company’s website, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Concentra, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b), and this office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. See Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). See generally Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Accordingly, the authority may not withhold Concentra’s pricing information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

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 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).

Concentra further contends its pricing information constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). However, 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 also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978). Therefore, we find Concentra has failed to establish a *prima facie* case its pricing information meets the definition of a trade secret, and failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its pricing information. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold Concentra’s pricing information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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); *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. Upon review, we find the authority must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information 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 (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 authority must withhold Concentra’s customer information, to the extent it is not publicly available on the company’s website, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The authority must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, the authority may release any information protected by copyright 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.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,



Kristi L. Godden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLG/cz

Ref: ID# 550489

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rachael K. Padgett
Counsel for Concentra Health Services Inc.
McGinnis Lochridge
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

