



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 8, 2010

Ms. Lesli R. Fitzpatrick
Public Information Officer
Administrative Law Section
Texas General Land Office
P.O. Box 12873
Austin, Texas 78711-2873

OR2010-15366

Dear Ms. Fitzpatrick:

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# 396158.

The Texas General Land Office (the "GLO") received a request for evaluation materials and solicitation responses for the Restoration of Intertidal Marsh and Estuarine Habitat in West McAllis Point Galveston County. You state you have released the evaluation materials to the requestor. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state you notified the following third parties: Apollo Environmental Strategies, Inc. ("Apollo"); JND Thomas Co., Inc. ("JND"); King Fisher Marine Service, LP ("King"); Paul Howard Construction Co., Inc. ("PHC"); and Sullivan Land Services ("Sullivan") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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). We have received comments from Apollo. 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 under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from JND, King, PHC, or Sullivan explaining why each third party's submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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 GLO may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of JND, King, PHC, or Sullivan.

Apollo asserts that the resumes of its employees and officers are excepted from disclosure under constitutional 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 constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. ORD 455 at 4. The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* at 7. The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find Apollo has not demonstrated how any of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the GLO may not withhold any of Apollo's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Next, we address Apollo's arguments under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); see also ORD 552 at 2. 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. 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

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 (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Apollo contends portions of its proposal, including its customer information, consist of trade secrets excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find Apollo has established a *prima facie* case that some of its customer information constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, the GLO must withhold the information we have marked in Apollo’s proposal under section 552.110(a). We note, however, that Apollo has made some of the customer information it seeks to withhold publicly available on its website. Because Apollo has published this information, it has failed to demonstrate that this information is a trade secret, and none of it may be withheld under section 552.110(a). Additionally, we find Apollo has failed to demonstrate how any of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret or shown the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* ORD 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, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Record Decision Nos. 319 at 3, 306 at 3 (1982). Therefore, Apollo has failed to establish that any portion of its remaining information constitutes a protected trade secret under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, and none of its remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

Apollo claims portions of its remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). We note that Apollo was the winning bidder in this instance. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, 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). Upon review, we find Apollo has failed to demonstrate release of any of the remaining information at issue would result in substantial competitive harm to its interests. *See* ORD 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at

issue), 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), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, none of Apollo's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Next, we note some of the remaining information is subject to common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (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.² *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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that personal financial information not related to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is intimate and embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 523 (1989), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). We note the remaining information contains business ownership percentages. This personal financial information is intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the GLO must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1978). 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 GLO must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The GLO must withhold the personal financial information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As there are no further arguments against the disclosure of the remaining information, it must be released, but any information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 of the Government Code on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/tp

Ref: ID# 396158

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bruce A. Mickle
King Fisher Marine Services, LP
P.O. Box 108
Port Lavaca, Texas 77979
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William T. Yates
Paul Howard Construction Co., Inc.
P.O. Box 35227
Greensboro, North Carolina 27425
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William Sullivan
Sullivan Land Services
P.O. Box 131486
Houston, Texas 77219
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian A. Mills
Creighton, Fox, Johnson & Mills, PLLC
P.O. Box 5607
Beaumont, Texas 77726
(w/o enclosures)