



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 2, 2012

Mr. Wm. Hulse Wagner
McLeod, Alexander, Powel & Apffel
Three Post Oak Central
1990 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 120
Houston, Texas 77056

OR2012-01687

Dear Mr. Wagner:

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# 444260.

The Port of Galveston (the "port"), which you represent, received a request for all proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Alliant Insurance Services, Inc. ("Alliant").¹ Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Alliant of the 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); *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 Alliant. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

¹Although you initially raised sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.110, 552.113, and 552.131 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments to support any of these exceptions. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim these sections apply to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Alliant raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information that is considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. However, Alliant has not pointed to any statutory confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of the submitted information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, 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 the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Alliant argues its information is marked “confidential” and supplied with the expectation of confidentiality. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Next, Alliant argues portions of its information are protected by section 552.131 of the Government Code, which relates to economic development information and provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) 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.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131(a), (b). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” 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.” *Id.* We note section 552.131(a) is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). 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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade

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

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 section 552.131(a)(1) is applicable unless it has been shown 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 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); see also *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

Section 552.131(a)(2) of the Government Code 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) (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).

Alliant asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.131(a)(1) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Alliant has not demonstrated it is a business prospect that the port seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the port for purposes of section 552.131(a). Moreover, we find Alliant has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Alliant has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for any portion of its information. See ORD 402. Therefore, none of Alliant’s information may be withheld under section 552.131(a)(1).

Alliant further argues portions of its information consists of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.131(a)(2) of the Government Code. As noted above, we find Alliant has not demonstrated it is a business prospect that the port seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the port for purposes of section 552.131(a). Upon review, we further find Alliant has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. 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), 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 is too speculative), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Furthermore, we note the contract at issue was awarded to Alliant. 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 552.131(a)(2). *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 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, 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); ORD 541 at 8. Accordingly, none of Alliant's information may be withheld under section 552.131(a)(2).

We note section 552.131(b) of the Government Code is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the port does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude no portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

We note the submitted documents include information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136 provides, "[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." *Id.* § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines "access device" as "a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument." *Id.* § 552.136(a). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the port must withhold the insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue 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 (1977). 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.

³The 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).

In summary, the port must withhold the marked insurance policy number under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/agn

Ref: ID# 444260

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cindi Heffernan, CPCU
First Vice President
Alliant Insurance Services, Inc.
720 Olive Way, Suite 1700
Seattle, Washington 98101
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Blair C. Fensterstock
Fensterstock & Partners, L.L.P.
30 Wall Street
New York, New York 10005
(w/o enclosures)