



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 15, 2006

Ms. Lisa Calem-Lindstrom
Public Information Coordinator
Texas Building & Procurement Commission
P.O. Box 13047
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2006-13547

Dear Ms. Calem-Lindstrom:

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# 264720.

The Texas Building & Procurement Commission (the "commission") received a request for all information pertaining to RFQ 303-6-10787. You state that some of the requested information will be released to the requestor. You also state that the commission will withhold social security numbers from the requested information pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ Although you take no position with respect to the submitted information, you state that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the commission notified the interested third parties, Yancey-Hausman Interests, Inc. ("Yancey-Hausman"), CB Richard Ellis, Inc. ("CB"), and Equis Corporation ("Equis"), of the commission's receipt of the request and of their right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted information 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 under the Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted arguments from Equis and the submitted information.

¹Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

Initially, we note that in your letter dated September 25, 2006, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that the requestor modified his request to exclude financial information for Yancey-Hausman. This information, which we have marked, is thus not responsive to the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the commission is not required to release that information in response to the request.

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 that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, CB has not submitted comments explaining why its information should be withheld from disclosure. Thus, CB has failed to demonstrate that any of its information is proprietary for purposes of the Act. *See id.* § 552.110; 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). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests that CB may have in the information.

We next address the submitted arguments. First, Equis raises 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. Section 552.104, however, protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). As the commission does not raise section 552.104, this section is not applicable to Equis' information. *Id.* (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body).

Next, Equis claims that some of its information is 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. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted 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 at 5-6 (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.* § 552.110(b); *see also*

National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

The information at issue consists of a financial summary for Equis and excerpts from consulting reports completed by Equis for another client. Upon review, we find that Equis has failed to explain how this information meets the definition of a trade secret. We therefore determine that no portion of the highlighted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Further, we find that Equis has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of this information would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. Accordingly, we determine that none of Equis' information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 (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). Thus, the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

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,



Shelli Egger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SE/sdk

Ref: ID# 264720

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Brian Talley
Vice President
Johnson Controls
111 Congress Avenue, 4th Floor
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rick Kessler
Senior Vice President
CB Richard Ellis, Inc.
5430 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75240
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig R. Hausman
President
Yancey Hausman Interests, Inc.
13333 Northwest Freeway, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry F. York
Counsel to Equis Corporation
York Keller and Field
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1670
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)