



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 28, 2006

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

OR2006-08264

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# 255286.

The Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport Board (the "board") received a request for a copy of the winning bid proposal submitted by Innovative Staffing ("Innovative") for contract number 8002032, Contract for Employee Recruitment Services. You claim that the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act but make no arguments and take no position as to whether this information is excepted from disclosure. However, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Innovative, the interested third party, of the request and of its 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 Innovative's comments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the board has not complied with the time periods prescribed by section 552.301(b) and section 552.301(e) of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. When a governmental body fails to comply with the procedural requirement of section 552.301, the information at issue is presumed public. *See Gov't Code* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex.

App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *City of Houston v. Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 673 S.W.2d 316, 323 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). To overcome this presumption, the governmental body must show a compelling reason to withhold the information. See Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock*, 797 S.W.2d at 381. Because the third party interest at issue here can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address Innovative's arguments.

Innovative contends that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. See Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the board does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, the board may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Innovative also 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 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 *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).

Having considered Innovative’s arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we find that Innovative has not established by specific factual evidence that any of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure as either trade secret information under

section 552.110(a) or commercial or financial information the release of which would cause Innovative substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business”); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110(b), business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 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 and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Specifically, we note that some of the information Innovative seeks to withhold includes pricing information. 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). We also note that some of the information Innovative seeks to withhold has been made publicly available by Innovative on its website. Thus, the board may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. As Innovative makes no other arguments against disclosure, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Jaime L. Flores
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLF/krl

Ref: ID# 255286

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert W. Elam
President, Southwest Region
Complex, Inc. (Jobplex)
12377 Merit Drive, Suite 870
Dallas, Texas 75251
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Gail A. Lane
Polk & Associates
P. O. Box 190625
Dallas, Texas 75219
(w/o enclosures)