



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 11, 2008

Ms. Lona Chastain
Texas Workforce Commission
101 East 15th Street
Austin, Texas 78778-0001

OR2008-01919

Dear Ms. Chastain:

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# 304157.

The Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission") received a request for all responses to RFP No. 2007-0611. You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however, in correspondence to this office, the interested third parties Lockheed Martin Integrated Systems, Inc. ("Lockheed") and Northrop Grumman ("Northrop") assert that their information is excepted under sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted arguments and information.

Initially, we must address the commission's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. You inform us that the commission received the request for information on December 11, 2007, and that the commission was closed from December 24-26, 2007; however, you did not request a decision from this office until January 2, 2008. *See* Gov't

Code § 552.301(b). Thus, the commission failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). As the interests of Lockheed and Northrop are at stake, we will consider whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Lockheed asserts that some of its information is confidential under the federal Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), chapter 552 of title 5 of the United States Code. However, in Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979), this office determined that FOIA does not apply to records held by a Texas agency or its political subdivision. Furthermore, this office has stated in numerous opinions that information in the possession of a governmental body of the State of Texas is not confidential or excepted from disclosure merely because the same information is or would be confidential under one of FOIA's exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 496 at 4 (1988), 124 at 1 (1976). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with FOIA.

Lockheed also argues that some of its information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. We note that section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that 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 commission does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, we find this section does not apply to the submitted information. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104). Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.104.

Both Lockheed and Northrop assert that some of their information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from

disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him 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. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] 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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement’s definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement’s list of six trade secret factors.¹ Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[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.”

¹The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret: (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of the company; (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 its competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by the company in developing the information; (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 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

We find Lockheed and Northrop have established that the release of some of the information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury; therefore, the commission must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). But we find that Lockheed and Northrop have made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause either company substantial competitive injury, and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Lockheed and Northrop have also failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the remaining information is a trade secret. *See* ORD 402. Finally, we note that both Lockheed and Northrop have made customer information publicly available on their websites. Because Lockheed and Northrop themselves published this information, we are unable to conclude that such information is proprietary. Thus, the commission may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.110, but instead must release it 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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 L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 304157

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Chris M. Chandler
Unisys
101 East 15th Street, Room 0300
Austin, Texas 78778
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William M. Castonguay
c/o John Lux
Lockheed Martin Integrated Systems, Inc.
305 West 13th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tommy E. Johnson
Northrop Grumman
7745 Chevy Chase Drive
Building V, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78752-21508
(w/o enclosures)