



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 9, 2010

Mr. Steven J. Blanco
Blaco Ordoñez & Wallace, P.C.
5715 Cromo Drive
El Paso, Texas 79912

OR2010-16992

Dear Mr. Blanco:

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# 399583.

The Lower Valley Water District (the "district") received a request for the prequalification documents submitted by Red Cliff, Inc. ("Red Cliff") for the Town of Clint Sanitary Sewer Lift Station Facilities. You state the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Red Cliff. Accordingly, you have notified Red Cliff of this request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and considered comments submitted by Red Cliff.

Red Cliff asserts its information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (statutory confidentiality). However, Red Cliff has not directed our attention to, and we are not aware of, any law under which any of its information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, we conclude that the district may not withhold Red Cliff's information under section 552.101 on this basis.

Red Cliff also raises section 552.102(a) 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). Section 552.102(a) protects information relating 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). Section 552.102 only applies to information in a personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. The information Red Cliff seeks to withhold is not contained in the personnel file of a governmental employee. Thus, we determine that section 552.102 does not apply to any of Red Cliff’s information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Red Cliff also raises section 552.110, which protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and (2) “[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(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court 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 a single or ephemeral event 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless the party claiming this exception has shown that the

information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret and has demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim.¹ *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).

Upon review of Red Cliff's arguments and the information at issue, we find Red Cliff has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its information at issue constitutes a trade secret protected by section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (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).

Red Cliff also seeks to withhold its information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. After reviewing its arguments and the information at issue, we find Red Cliff has made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(b).

We note the remaining information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states 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."² Gov't Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes

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).

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception, such as section 552.136, on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³

Finally, we note that some of the remaining information at issue appears to 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 district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released 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.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,



Tamara H. Holland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

THH/em

³We note that this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Ref: ID# 399583

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Nathan Mcgrand
President
Red Cliff, Inc.
3800 Doniphan
El Paso, TX 79922
(w/o enclosures)