



Office of the Attorney General  
State of Texas

DAN MORALES  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

January 7, 1998

Mr. John Steiner  
Division Chief  
City of Austin  
Law Department  
P.O. Box 1546  
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR98-0078

Dear Mr. Steiner:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 111485.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for all information the city obtained as a result of request for proposal number LI97300120. You have released some of the information to the requestor. However, you claim that the remaining portions of the bid proposals are excepted from public disclosure by section 552.110 of the Government Code. You have submitted the information at issue to this office for review.

Since the property and privacy rights of third parties are implicated by the release of the requested information here, this office notified Ronald Luke & Associates, Inc. ("Luke") and the Joseph Ivy Company ("Ivy") of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances).

Ivy failed to respond to the notice. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that Ivy's information is excepted from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 639 (1996) at 4 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure), 552 (1990) at 5 (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 (1990) at 3. The requested information pertaining to Ivy must, therefore, be released to the requestor.

Luke raises sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 as exceptions to disclosure of the requested information. Section 552.104 excepts information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). As the city does not raise section 552.104, this section is not applicable to the requested information. *Id.* (Gov't Code § 552.104 may be waived by a governmental body).

Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of "trade secret" from the Restatement of Torts, section 757, 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the "trade secrets" branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a prima facie case for exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990) at 5.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: "(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 (1982) at 2, 306 (1982) at 2, 255 (1980) at 2.

In Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996), this office announced that it would follow the federal courts' interpretation of exemption 4 to the federal Freedom of Information Act when applying the second prong of section 552.110 for commercial and financial information. In *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974), the court concluded that for information to be excepted under exemption 4 to the Freedom of Information Act, disclosure of the requested information must be likely either to (1) impair the Government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future, or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained. *National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). A business enterprise cannot succeed in a *National Parks* claim by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996) at 4. To prove substantial competitive harm, the party seeking to prevent disclosure must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure. *Id.*

After reviewing Luke's arguments and the information its seeks to withhold, we conclude that most of the information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.110. We have marked the information not excepted by section 552.110.

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Yen-Ha Le  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

YHL/rho

Ref: ID# 111485

Enclosures: Marked documents

cc: Ms. Diana Rollinson-Hamilton  
President  
Willis-Rollinson, Inc.  
2777 Stemmons Fwy., Suite 1530  
Dallas, Texas 75207-2276  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ronald Habitzreiter  
Attorney at Law  
1208 West Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

The Joseph Ivy Company  
9420 Research Blvd.  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(w/o enclosures)