ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 23, 2007

Mr. Rashaad V. Gambrell
Assistant City Attorney
Legal Department
City of Houston
P. O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2007-02134

Dear Mr. Gambrell:

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#271986.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for fuel flowage reports made by fixed base operators over a specified period of time. Although the city makes no arguments against disclosure of the submitted information, the city believes this information may involve the proprietary interests of third parties.[1] Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the city notified the interested third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments explaining why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (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 in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and considered arguments submitted by Enterprise. We have also considered comments submitted by Wilson stating that it does not object to release of the requested information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304

[1]The interested third parties are Atlantic Aviation ("Atlantic"), Enterprise Jet Center ("Enterprise"), MillionAir, and Wilson Air Center ("Wilson").

(interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, 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, Atlantic and MillionAir have not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the information at issue would affect their proprietary interests. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these companies have a proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pertaining to Atlantic or MillionAir on the basis of any proprietary interest that these companies may have in the information.

Enterprise contends that the fuel flow records pertaining to their company are protected 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.); 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. 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).

After reviewing the submitted information and Enterprise's arguments, we determine that Enterprise has failed to demonstrate that the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We therefore determine that no portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We also find that Enterprise has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of the information at issue would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. Accordingly, we determine that none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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). As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the 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); *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,



Holly R. Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRD/krl

Ref: ID# 271986

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Don Hitt
Ratheon Aircraft Services
8402 Nelms
Houston, Texas 77061
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Loyd Turner
General Manager
FBO Acquisition/Enterprise Air Center, Inc.
8850 Monroe
Houston, Texas 77061
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Roger E. Woolsey
President/CEO
MillionAir
8501 Telephone Road
Houston, Texas 77061
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Cecil Carney, III
Vice President
Wilson Air Center
Fletcher Aviation
9000 Randolph
Houston, Texas 77061
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rhonda Davis
General Manager
Atlantic Aviation
7930 Airport Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77061-4199
(w/o enclosures)