



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 15, 2010

Mr. Erik A. Eriksson
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Port of Houston Authority
P.O. Box 2562
Houston, Texas 77252-2562

OR2010-18815

Dear Mr. Eriksson:

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# 402966.

The Port of Houston Authority (the "port") received a request for information submitted by AMX International, Inc. ("AMX") as a bid on a specified project. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state that AMX's proprietary interests might be implicated. Accordingly, you provided notice to AMX of the request and its 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 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 AMX. We have considered its arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

AMX asserts its information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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. However, AMX has not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any of this information is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1

(1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the port may not withhold any of AMX's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

AMX also asserts that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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, 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 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 776 (Tex. 1958). 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

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

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* 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). 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).

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 (1999).

We understand AMX to assert trade secret protection for its customer information, pricing information, and employee information under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find AMX has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that this information constitutes a trade secret. 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 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, 306 at 3. Thus, the port may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

AMX also contends that release of its customer information, pricing information, and employee information would cause the company substantial competitive injury and should be withheld under section 552.110(b). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Upon review, we find AMX has established the customer information we have marked in the submitted information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. We note, however, that AMX has made some of the customer information it seeks to withhold publicly available on its website. Because AMX has published this information, it has failed to demonstrate that release of this information would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). We also note 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* Dep’t of Justice Guide

to the Freedom of Information Act 344–45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). As AMX submitted the winning bid and has executed a contract with the port, none of AMX's pricing information may be withheld under section 552.110(b). Furthermore, we find AMX has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of its employees' resumes would result in substantial competitive harm to its interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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, the port must withhold the customer information we have marked under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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; *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). The submitted information contains insurance policy numbers that are subject to section 552.136. The port must withhold these marked numbers under section 552.136.³

In summary, the port must withhold the customer information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code and the insurance policy numbers we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining 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,

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

³We note this office has 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.

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,



Neal Falgoust
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NF/dls

Ref: ID# 402966

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Jarin O. Hammer
Beard, St. Clair, Gaffney
For AMX International, Inc.
2105 Coronado Street
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83404
(w/o enclosures)