ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 24, 2006

Ms. Anne M. Constantine
Legal Counsel
Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport
P.O. Box 619428
DFW Airport, Texas 75261

OR2006-04095

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# 247355.

Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport ("DFW") received a request for the winning proposal and subsequent contract for project #8001919. You state that DFW will be releasing some of the requested information.[1] DFW takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Schiff Consulting Group, Ltd. ("Schiff"). Accordingly, you inform us that you notified Schiff of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

[1]Because DFW does not object to the release of this information, it must be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Initially, we note that Schiff seeks to withhold some information that was not submitted to this office by DFW. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by DFW. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Schiff contends that portions of the submitted information are 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 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 id.* § 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. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 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 No. 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. *See id.*; *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton,* 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review of Schiff's submitted brief and the information at issue, we find that Schiff has established a *prima facie* case that some of the information it seeks to withhold constitutes trade secret information or commercial and financial information, the release of which would cause it substantial competitive harm. DFW must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110 of the Government Code. However, we determine that Schiff has not demonstrated that any portion of the remaining information constitutes trade secret information or commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause it substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5-6 (1990), 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); *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"). Specifically, we note that the information Schiff seeks to withhold includes customer lists and pricing information. Generally, we find that the release of customer lists would cause substantial competitive harm to a company. In this instance, however, the customer lists have been made publicly available by Schiff on its website. Thus, we find that release of the customer list in this instance would not cause Schiff substantial competitive harm. Furthermore, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). Therefore, pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code, DFW must withhold only those portions of the submitted information that we have marked.

Next, we note that some of the submitted information 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).

In summary, DFW must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. DFW must release the remaining information, but in doing so, the information must be released 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 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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,

James A. Person III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JAP/sdk

Ref: ID# 247355

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Onivia
Attn: FOIA Request Coordinator
1260 Mercer Street
Seattle, Washington 98109
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert D. Katz
Attorney for Schiff Consulting Group
Cooper & Dunham
1185 Avenue of the Americas, 23rd Floor
New York, New York 10036
(w/o enclosures)