



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 18, 2006

Ms. Veronica Ocañas  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Corpus Christi  
P.O. Box 9277  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2006-05199

Dear Ms. Ocañas:

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# 249472.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for information related to all building projects permitted for construction after a specified date. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you claim that portions of the requested information 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 McGloin-Sween Architects ("McGloin-Sween"), Richter Architects ("Richter"), Watkins Hamilton Ross Architects, Inc., and WKMC Architects ("WKMC") 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 received from 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, we address WKMC's contention that the requested information is not public information subject to disclosure under the Act. The Act is applicable to "public

information.” See Gov’t Code § 552.021. “Public information” is defined as information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body; or
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it.

*Id.* § 552.002(a). Information is generally subject to the Act when it is held by a governmental body and it relates to the official business of a governmental body or is used by a public official or employee in the performance of official duties. See Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995). The holding in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976) makes clear that almost all information in the physical possession of a governmental body is “public information” subject to the Act. In this instance, the information at issue consists of documents for building projects the city has permitted for construction. The city collected and maintains the information at issue for its official business. We therefore determine the information at issue is public information as defined by section 552.002. Gov’t Code § 552.002(a). Thus, the information at issue is subject to the Act and must be released, unless an exception to disclosure is shown to be applicable.

Next, we note that 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) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Watkins Hamilton Ross Architects, Inc. has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why any information pertaining to its company should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the information pertaining to Watkins Hamilton Ross Architects, Inc. constitutes proprietary information, and the city may not withhold any portion of the information pertaining to Watkins Hamilton Ross Architects, Inc. on that basis. See 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, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

Richter contends that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). This section applies to information in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. Since the information at issue is not in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body, we determine that section 552.102 does not apply to this information.

McGloin-Sween and Richter raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for the submitted construction documents. 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.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Upon review of the submitted briefs and the construction documents at issue, we determine that McGloin-Sween and Richter have not demonstrated that any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret and have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We therefore determine that no portion of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). We further find that McGloin-Sween and Richter have not provided specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of their construction documents would result in substantial competitive harm to their companies. Accordingly, we determine that no portion of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (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), 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). As McGloin-Sween, Richter, and WKMC claim no further exceptions to disclosure, their documents must be released.

We note, however, that the majority of the submitted information is 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, the city must release the requested information in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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,



Michael A. Lehmann  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAL/sdk

Ref: ID# 249472

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jeri L. S. Morey  
Architect  
711 North Carancahua #518  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78475  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Richter  
Richter Architects  
201 South Upper Broadway  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken Ross, President  
Watkins Hamilton Ross Architects, Inc.  
1111 Louisiana, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Brooke Sween-McGloin  
McGloin-Sween Architects  
723 North Upper Broadway, Suite 500  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill T. Wilson II, FAIA  
WKMC Architects  
P.O. Box 2941  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403-2941  
(w/o enclosures)