



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 16, 2014

Ms. Heather Silver
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2014-06311

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 520099 (Ref. No. 14-00033154).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for (1) any documents relating to all communications involving a named city employee or other Parks and Recreation Department employees and a named individual or FJ Fuller & Associates ("Fuller") relating to the Elm Fork Athletic Complex or request for proposals number BLZ1312 and (2) the proposals submitted by Fuller and Frisco Stadium, L.L.C. ("Frisco") in response to the request for proposal. You state the city will release some of the requested information. You state the city will redact personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) from the information the city will release.¹ 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 Fuller and Frisco. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Fuller and Frisco of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See*

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

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 a representative of Fuller. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Frisco explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Frisco has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Frisco may have in the 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. Fuller claims its information is protected as confidential financial information under section 552.101 of the Government Code pursuant to judicial decision and cites to *Lunsford v. Morris*, 746 S.W.2d 471, 473 (Tex. 1988) and *Walker v. Packer*, 827 S.W.2d 833 (Tex. 1992). However, upon our review, we find these cases do not determine the confidentiality of any information for purposes of the Act. Therefore, we find that none of Fuller's information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with either of these two judicial decisions.

Fuller raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 552.104. We note section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (purpose of section 552.104 is to protect governmental body's interest in competitive bidding situation). As the city does not argue section 552.104 is applicable, we will not consider Fuller's claim under this section. *See id.* (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Fuller contends some of 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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim 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* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is

²The 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).

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).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

Fuller argues some of its information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find Fuller has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of Fuller’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Fuller also argues the release of some of its information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find Fuller has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of its information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *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 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 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). We, therefore, conclude the city may not withhold any of Fuller’s information under section 552.110(b). As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released.

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/akg

Ref: ID# 520099

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Smith
Frisco Stadium, LLC
9200 World Cup Way, Suite 202
Frisco, Texas 75033
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Frank Shor
For F.J. Fuller & Associates
Law Offices of Frank Shor
1620 East Belt Line Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006
(w/o enclosures)