



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 2, 2009

Ms. Cary Grace
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2009-01297

Dear Ms. Grace:

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# 333710.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for a contract for emergency environmental remediation services, including pricing from 2006. You take no position on the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the information may implicate the proprietary interests of TAS Environmental Services, L.P. ("TAS"). You notified TAS of this request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.¹ We received correspondence from an attorney for TAS. We have considered all of TAS's arguments and reviewed the information you submitted.

We first note, and you acknowledge, that the city did not comply with the deadlines prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). The requested information is therefore presumed to be subject to required public disclosure and must be released, unless there is a compelling reason to withhold any of the information. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797

¹*See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). This statutory presumption can generally be overcome when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Therefore, we will determine whether the city must withhold any of the submitted information to protect TAS's interests.

TAS claims exceptions to disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" Gov't Code § 552.102(a). This exception is applicable only to information related to public officials and employees. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (addressing statutory predecessor). Thus, because TAS claims this exception for information relating to its own employees, section 552.102(a) is not applicable in this instance. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.102 of the Government Code.

Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as TAS. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). Moreover, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that a governmental body may waive and does not provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 592 at 8 (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.104 subject to waiver). In this instance, the city did not raise section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. Furthermore, in otherwise failing to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code, the city waived section 552.104 and may not withhold any of the submitted information under that exception.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision" and "commercial 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(a)-(b).

The Supreme Court of Texas has adopted the definition of a "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, *as, for example, the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees . . .* 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) (emphasis added); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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 necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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 information at issue. *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).

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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

TAS claims section 552.110 for portions of the submitted documents that contain information relating to the company's pricing and costs; customers; key employees; subcontractors; business organization; and "procedures and protocol used by TAS in response to various spill scenarios." We understand TAS to contend that this information constitutes the company's trade secrets under section 552.110(a) and also falls within the scope of section 552.110(b). TAS argues that disclosure of the information at issue would, among other things, "damage not only TAS, but the ongoing competitive bidding process throughout Texas" and "result [in] fewer bidders, higher costs, and a decrease in the quality of services." In submitting these arguments, TAS appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). See also *Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held that *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. See *Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of Gov't Code § 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only TAS's interests in withholding the submitted information.

Having considered all of TAS's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we have marked customer information that the city must withhold under section 552.110(a). We find that TAS has not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We also find that TAS has not provided the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would cause TAS substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110. See Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 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 was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing).

With specific regard to TAS's cost and pricing information, we note that TAS has an ongoing contractual relationship with the city. 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." See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Likewise, the pricing aspects of a contract with a governmental entity are generally not excepted from disclosure 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 at 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information relating to TAS's costs and pricing under section 552.110.

We note that section 552.136 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the remaining information.³ Section 552.136(b) provides 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"). We have marked insurance policy numbers that the city must withhold under section 552.136.

In summary, the city must withhold the information that we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released.


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

³ Unlike other exceptions to disclosure under the Act, this office will raise section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, as this exception is mandatory and may not be waived. See Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; Open Records Decision No. 674 at 3 n.4 (2001) (mandatory exceptions).

information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James W. Morris, III". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/cc

Ref: ID# 333710

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Douglas R. Hudman
Holland, Johns, Schwartz & Penny, L.L.P.
306 West Seventh Street Suite 500
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-4982
(w/o enclosures)