



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 17, 2005

Ms. Zandra L. Pulis
Legal Services Division
City Public Service
P. O. Box 1771
San Antonio, Texas 78296-1771

OR2005-02283

Dear Ms. Pulis:

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# 220437.

The San Antonio City Public Service (the "service") received two requests for the winning proposal, bid evaluations, and contracts related to a specified request for proposals. You state that some of the requested information has been released. You do not take a position on the public availability of the remaining information at issue, but you state that release of some of the information may implicate the proprietary interests of Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola").¹ You inform us that you have notified the interested third party of the service's receipt of the request for information and of its 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) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). Motorola responded to the notice and argues that the requested information is excepted under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

We begin by noting that some of the submitted documents are not responsive to the instant request for information. We have marked these documents, which the service need not

¹You have provided this office with a copy of a clarification of the initial request which excludes information related to third party Nextel Communications.

release in response to this request and this ruling will not address that information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

Motorola argues that the portion of the submitted information pertaining to the January 31, 2002 contract between that company and the service is not responsive to the instant request. The Act requires a governmental body to release only information that it believes to be responsive to a request. However, in determining whether information is responsive, a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate the request to information that it holds. Open Records Decision No. 590 at 1 n.1 (1991). We have reviewed the information at issue and conclude that it is responsive to the request. We will therefore address whether the exceptions that Motorola claims apply.²

Motorola claims that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). Section 552.104 excepts information from disclosure if a governmental body demonstrates that the release of the information would cause potential specific harm to the governmental body's interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). The service has not argued that the release of the submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, Motorola's information may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Motorola also argues that its information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects the property interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (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.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is the following:

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

²We note that Motorola seeks to withhold information that the service has not submitted to this office for review, specifically pages II-18 and II-19 in section II-E of Motorola's proposal. This ruling does not address the arguments submitted by Motorola pertaining to information that has not been submitted for our review by the service. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body seeking attorney general's opinion under Act must submit copy or representative samples of specific information requested).

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). 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. *Id.*³ This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must 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 argument is submitted 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) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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." 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 requested information. *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).

After reviewing the information at issue and the arguments of the interested third party, we conclude that Motorola has established a *prima facie* case that the information we have marked, including customer lists, is a trade secret; therefore, the service must withhold this information under section 552.110(a). However, we find that Motorola has neither shown that any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret nor

³The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are the following: (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).

demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Thus, we are unable to conclude that section 552.110(a) applies to any of the remaining information, and it may not be withheld on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402.

In addition, we find that Motorola has established that some information within the submitted documents, which we have marked, would cause substantial competitive injury if released; therefore, the service must withhold this information under section 552.110(b). However, we find that Motorola has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b).⁴

Finally, we note that 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

To summarize, the service must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor in accordance with applicable copyright laws for any information protected by copyright.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

⁴We note that 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* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision No. 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company).

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/krl

Ref: ID# 220437

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sharee D. Varelas
Atty for Dailey & Wells
3440 East Houston
San Antonio, Texas 78219
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Lendennie
Nextel Communications
4700 W. Sam Houston Pkwy N.
Suite 200
Houston, Texas 77041
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeffrey W. Kemp
Fulbright & Jaworski, L.L.P.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
(w/o enclosures)

Ms Nancy Wehrung
Motorola, Inc.
2175 State Highway 46 West
Spring Branch, Texas 78070
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Doug Lunenfeld
Nextel Communications
2001 Edmund Halley Drive - A4152
Reston, Virginia 20191
(w/o enclosures)