



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 4, 2005

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

OR2005-02838

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# 221609.

The Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Board (the "board") received a request for a copy of the "Food and Beverage proposal" submitted by DFW Scoops, LLC ("Scoops"), which was awarded the contract, and the grading/scoring of that proposal and the proposal submitted by the requestor. You inform us you have released most of the requested information. You also indicate that the submitted information may be excepted under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code, but take no position as to whether this information is excepted under either section. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Scoops of the board'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 to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (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). Scoops, in its response to this notice, asserts that portions of its proposal are excepted under sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Scoops asserts that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. This section protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). As the board does not raise section 552.104, this section is not applicable to the requested information. *Id.* (section 552.104 may be waived by

governmental body). Therefore, the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.104.

Scoops asserts that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common law privacy but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 373 (1983). For example, information related to an individual's mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history is generally protected by the common law right to privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 545, 523 (1989); see also Open Records Decision No. 600 (finding personal financial information to include choice of particular insurance carrier). The submitted documents contain the personal financial information of individuals, and we do not believe that the public has a legitimate interest in this information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993), 600 (1992). Thus, we conclude that this financial information, which we have marked, is confidential under common law privacy, and the board must withhold it pursuant to section 552.101.

Finally, Scoops asserts that some of the remaining information is excepted 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." 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 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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). 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).

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." 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 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 (1939); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, having considered Scoops's arguments and reviewed the information at issue we conclude Scoops has not established a *prima facie* case that the pricing information at issue is a trade secret because the information is specific to this contract only. *See* Open

¹The 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; (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).

Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We also find that Scoops has not established a *prima facie* case that any of the other submitted information is a trade secret. Thus, the board may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(a).

We find that Scoops has demonstrated that disclosure of some of the submitted information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the board must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). But we find that Scoops has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. We note that 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). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision No. 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). Therefore, the board may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

To conclude, the board must withhold (1) under section 552.101 the marked financial information that is confidential under common law privacy and (2) the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). It must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the

Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,


James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/seg

Ref: ID# 221609

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael C. Laferney
Laferney Ventures II, Inc.
5939 Bonnard Drive
Dallas, Texas 75230
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kat Tidd
Law Office of Kat Tidd, P.C.
14232 Marsh Lane, #484
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)