



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 20, 2005

Ms. Anne Constantine
Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport
Legal Department
P.O. Box 619428
DFW Airport, Texas 75261-9428

OR2005-05413

Dear Ms. Constantine:

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# 226482.

The Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport Board (the "board") received a request for (1) copies of the bid packages submitted by Clear Channel Airports ("Clear Channel") and JCDecaux Airport, Inc. ("JCDecaux") for the Advertising Concession at DFW Airport; and (2) a copy of the executed contract between Clear Channel and the board. You state that you have provided the requestor with a portion of the requested information. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining requested information, you claim that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you have notified the interested third parties of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office. *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 section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). 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).

Initially, Clear Channel asserts that all of the information submitted in response to this specific request for proposals was considered to be confidential. Clear Channel specifically

notes that it submitted a portion of the information at issue in a separate “Confidential Information” envelope. We note, however, that 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 section 552.110). Consequently, unless the requested information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Both Clear Channel and JCDecaux raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of their proposals. 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a). A “trade secret”

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its competitors];
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (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).

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.*

Upon review of the submitted briefs and the proposals at issue, we determine that neither Clear Channel nor JCDecaux has demonstrated that any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990); *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if 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”). We therefore determine that no portion of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

We find, however, that both Clear Channel and JCDecaux have made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that the release of a portion of the information at issue, which we have marked, would cause their companies substantial competitive harm. Thus, this marked information must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b). We conclude, however, that both Clear Channel and JCDecaux have failed to demonstrate that any other portion of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause their companies substantial competitive harm. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (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 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Additionally, we note that although Clear Channel argues confidentiality for its pricing terms, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, the board must withhold only those portions of the information at issue that we have marked. The remaining submitted information must be released.*

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 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 226482

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steve Moody and Mr. Kenneth W. Rickert
Corey Airport Services, Inc.
225 Corey Center, South East, Suite 1
Atlanta, Georgia 30312
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William Samuel Hart
Clear Channel Airports
875 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 1450
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas P. White
Schiff Hardin, LLP
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stacy Ferris
JCDecaux North America
3 Park Avenue, 33rd Floor
New York, New York 10016
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Michelle Simpkins
Winstead, Sechrest & Minick
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)