



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 15, 2013

Mr. Jeffrey W. Giles
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2013-19980

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 505878 (City GC No. 20797).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for the statement of qualifications submitted by Briones Consulting and Engineering, Ltd. ("Briones"). Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Briones. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Briones 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 Briones. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Briones raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. However, Briones has not pointed to any statutory confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of its information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality).

Therefore, the city may not withhold any of Briones' information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Briones raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure for its information. This section excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which 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 city does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, no portion of Briones' information may be withheld on this basis.

Briones claims 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 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, which holds a trade secret to be:

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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. See Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular 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." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; see also *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255, 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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.*; see also Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1991) (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).

Upon review, we conclude Briones has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Briones has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. See ORD 402. Therefore, none of Briones' information may be withheld under section 552.110(a). Furthermore, we find Briones has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. See Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under

¹The 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; see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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), 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), 319 at 3. Accordingly, none of Briones' information may be withheld under section 552.110(b). 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/tch

Ref: ID# 505878

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rolando H. Briones, Jr., P.E.
President
Briones Consulting & Engineering, Ltd.
8118 Broadway
San Antonio, Texas 78209
(w/o enclosures)