



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 24, 2012

Ms. Susana Carbajal Gonzalez
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin Aviation Department
Austin-Bergstrom International Airport
3600 Presidential Boulevard, Suite 411
Austin, Texas 78719

OR2012-01104

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

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# 443466.

The City of Austin, Department of Aviation, (the "city") received a request in the form of questions for certain information, as follows: (1) "do you have paid parking facilities?"; (2) "are they currently a management contract, lease or concession?"; (3) "what is the parking (contract/lease/concession) date of inception?"; (4) "what is the date of the parking (contract/lease/concession) termination?"; (5) "does the parking (contract/lease/concession) have any options? If so, what is the length of the options?"; (6) "what are the estimated annual gross revenues of the parking facilities?"; (7) "what are the total number of parking spaces within the airport's parking facilities?"; (8) "can we obtain a copy of the most recent parking contract between the parking company and the airport?"; (9) "can you provide us with the results of the most recent parking audit?"; and (10) "can you provide us with the most current two years of financial and ticket reports, including the current twelve months, relating to the parking operation?" You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. You state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of AMPCO System Parking, Inc. ("AMPCO"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified AMPCO of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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 received

comments from AMPCO. We have reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the requestor has asked the city to answer questions. In responding to a request for information under the Act, a governmental body is not required to answer factual questions, conduct legal research, or disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information that is within its possession or control. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). You inform us the city has made a good-faith effort to do so.

Next, we note you did not submit information responsive to the portion of the request in questions 1-5 & 7. To the extent the city was able to relate these items of the request to information that existed and was maintained by the city on the date the city received the request for information, we presume the city has released it. If not, the city must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to the requested information, it must release the information as soon as possible).

We must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state that the city received the present request for information on October 31, 2011. Therefore, the ten-business-day deadline for the present request was November 15, 2011. The envelope in which the city submitted its request for a ruling from this office bears a postmark date of November 16, 2011. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301(b) 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 the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists 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

¹We assume the "representative sample" of information submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than those submitted to this office.

S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although you raise section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure of portions of the submitted information, this is a discretionary exception that protects only a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.104), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). As such, section 552.104 does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information for purposes of section 552.302. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether any of the submitted information may be withheld on the basis of AMPCO's interests.

AMPCO submits arguments against disclosure of portions of the submitted information 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. Gov't Code § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure 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 a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

[A]ny 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) (citation omitted); *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.² *See* 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 for exemption is made 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) 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); 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).

AMPCO argues portions of the submitted information constitute trade secrets. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” *See* Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Upon review, we find that AMPCO has failed to demonstrate that the information for which it asserts section 552.110(a) meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the city

²There are six factors the Restatement gives as indicia of 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 the 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 at 2, (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

AMPCO also argues release of portions of the submitted information, including pricing information, could cause substantial competitive harm to the company. Upon review, we find AMPCO has made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause it substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b). Furthermore, we note the pricing information of winning bidders of a government contract, such as AMPCO, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* ORD 514. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the city must release the submitted information.

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, 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,



Sean Opperman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SO/dls

Ref: ID# 443466

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ade Lawal
ABM Industries Incorporated
8101 West Sam Houston Parkway South, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77072
(w/o enclosures)