



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 4, 2016

Mr. Richard A. McCracken
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-02746

Dear Mr. McCracken:

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# 596739.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for the rating sheet, pricing, and contract for the winning bidder of RFP 15-0239. The city states it has released some information. Although the city takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the city informs us release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Cypress Care, Inc.; Healthcare Solutions; Kgriff; and York Risk Services Group, Inc. ("York"). Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 York. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has marked some of the submitted information as non-responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

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) of the Government Code 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, we have received comments only from York explaining why the responsive information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties has 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the responsive information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that another statute makes confidential. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 of the Government Code were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"). These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns or emergency management activities does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a claim under the HSA must be accompanied by an adequate explanation of how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). In this instance, although York generally asserts its information is confidential under the HSA, York has not provided any arguments explaining this assertion. *See id.* Consequently, we find York has failed to demonstrate the information at issue is confidential under the HSA. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.101 on that basis.

York states its information is 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 id.* § 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. This office must accept a claim 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 section 552.110(a) 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).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

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

In advancing its arguments, we understand York to rely, in part, on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body's ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d at 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. See *Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only the interest of York in the information at issue.

Upon review, we find York has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the information at issue. See ORD 402. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we also find York has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. 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). We note the pricing information of a winning bidder 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 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 also ORD 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). 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 Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.110(b).

York raises section 552.131 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.131 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) protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “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.* § 552.131(a). This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of York’s claims under section 552.110, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Additionally, we note section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the city does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude no portion of the responsive information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code. As no further arguments against disclosure have been raised, the city must release the responsive 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl_ruling_info.shtml](#), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 596739

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jody A. Moses
Senior Vice President
York Risk Service Group, Inc.
333 City Boulevard, Suite 1500
Orange, California 92868
(w/o enclosures)

Healthcare Solutions
2736 Meadow Church Road, Suite 300
Duluth, Georgia 30097
(w/o enclosures)

Kgriff
1925 Lexington Street
Houston, Texas 77098
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ginger Jones
Manager of State Reporting
Cypress Care, Inc.
2736 Meadow Church Road
Duluth, Georgia 30097
(w/o enclosures)