



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

March 8, 2010

Ms. Janis Kennedy Hampton  
Bryan City Attorney  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2010-03338

Dear Ms. Hampton:

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# 372219.

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for "all planning and development and zoning files, documents, communications and correspondence regarding the Bryan Towne Center Subdivision and all individual properties located therein." The city takes no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties, including Lusk Architecture ("Lusk").<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, you inform us that you notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from Lusk. You represent that the other third parties whose information is at issue do not object

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us the other third parties are as follows: Mr. C. Barbu; CASCO; Mr. Henry S. Cowart; Charles K. Goode, Architect; Hargis Engineers, Inc.; Mr. Norman L. Herman; KKE Architects, Inc.; PAEP Architecture Engineering, P.C.; Tennessee Design and Engineering; VAA, LLC; and W.C. Scarmardo Architect.

to the release of their information.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the submitted comments and reviewed the information you submitted pertaining to Lusk.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes 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(e), within fifteen business days of receiving the request, the governmental body must submit to this office a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, if the information is voluminous. Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D). You state that the city received the request at issue on December 10, 2009. However, the information required by section 552.301(e)(1)(D) was not deposited in the mail until February 3, 2010. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Accordingly, we find that the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the 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 id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential by law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake, we will address whether the submitted information must be withheld to protect Lusk's interests.

Lusk asserts that its information may not be disclosed because Lusk's clients expect the information will be kept confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”); 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110).

---

<sup>2</sup>Since you inform us that the other third parties do not object to the release of their information and you have not submitted any of the other third parties' information for our review, we assume you have released that information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Lusk raises 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 trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 (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.<sup>3</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case

---

<sup>3</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors 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 other 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).

for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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. *See* 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* 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).

Having considered Lusk’s arguments, we find that Lusk has failed to demonstrate that any of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Lusk demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 402. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Further, we find Lusk has made only conclusory allegations that the release of the submitted information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, Lusk has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Finally, Lusk informs us that most 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. 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). Accordingly, the submitted information must be released to the requestor in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Laura Ream Lemus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LRL/jb

Ref: ID# 372219

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Lusk  
Lusk Architecture  
35 North 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 350  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. C. Barbu  
201 North Main Street  
Bryan, Texas 77803  
(w/o enclosures)

CASCO  
10877 Watson Road  
St. Louis, Missouri 63127  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Henry S. Cowart  
11530 Conestoga Lane Court  
Houston, Texas 77066  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles K. Goode  
Charles K. Goode Architect  
245 East Broad Street  
Statesville, North Carolina 28677  
(w/o enclosures)

Hargis Engineers, Inc.  
600 Stewart Street, Suite 100  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
(w/o enclosures)

KKE Architects, Inc.  
300 First Avenue North  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401  
(w/o enclosures)

Tennessee Design and Engineering  
5105 Maryland Way, Suite 200  
Brentwood, Tennessee 37027  
(w/o enclosures)

VAA, LLC  
2955 Xenium Lane North, Suite 10  
Plymouth, Minnesota 55441  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Norman L. Herman  
2100 West Littleton Blvd., Suite 200  
Littleton, Colorado 80120  
(w/o enclosures)

PAEP Architecture Engineering, P.C.  
1811 Four Mile Road North East  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49525  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Scarmardo  
W.C. Scarmardo Architect  
3200 Crane Avenue  
Bryan, Texas 77801  
(w/o enclosures)