



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 4, 2010

Mr. David Daugherty
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2010-15062

Dear Mr. Daugherty:

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# 395588 (C.A. File: 10GEN1434).

The Harris County Purchasing Agent's Office (the "county") received a request for copies of the proposals that were selected by the county for the Evening Reporting Center, Juvenile Tracking, and Functional Family Therapy. You state you have made some of the information available to the requestor. Although the county raises no exceptions to disclosure of the requested information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Southwest Key Programs ("Southwest") and Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. ("YAP"). You inform us that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the county has notified Southwest and YAP of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from Southwest and YAP. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge, and we agree, that the county failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in seeking an open records decision from this

office. See Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). A governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. See *id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); see also Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome by demonstrating that the 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). Because the interests of a third party can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider Southwest's and YAP's arguments.

We understand YAP to assert that some of its submitted information is confidential because the company requested confidentiality for this information. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information 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 overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[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). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Southwest raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for its submitted information. 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. See *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); see also Open Records Decision No. 552 (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 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 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) 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 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show

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 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).

by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Southwest claims portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review of the submitted arguments, we conclude Southwest has failed to demonstrate that any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Southwest demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that 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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find that Southwest has made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury. *See* ORD 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show 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). Furthermore, we note that pricing information of a winning bidder, as Southwest is in this case, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a company contracting with a governmental body 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). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the county must release the submitted information.

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 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,



Andrea L. Caldwell
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALC/eeg

Ref: ID# 395588

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Claudia C. Morgan
Southwest Key Programs, Inc.
6002 Jain Lane
Austin, Texas 78721
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Russ Burke
Youth Advocate Programs, Inc.
2007 North 3rd Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17102
(w/o enclosures)