OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

December 3, 2003

Mr. Ken Johnson
Assistant City Attorney
P.O. Box 2570
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2003-8621

Dear Mr. Johnson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191980.

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for records "which show the rate charged and total amount paid for electricity by the [c]ity for the Mount Carmel Water Treatment Plant from September 2002 through August 2003." You claim that the information you have submitted is not responsive to the request because the city "does not have monthly statements. . . or other documents, which show the rate charged and total amount paid for electricity by the [c]ity *only* for the Mount Carmel Water Treatment Plant. . .". In the alternative, you take no position regarding whether the submitted information is proprietary, but have notified Texas Commercial Energy ("TCE") of the request for information and its opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). In its brief to this office, TCE claims that the requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered all claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we address your contention that the submitted information is not responsive to the request. Based upon our careful review of your representations and the submitted

information, we agree that some of the submitted information is not responsive because it does not reflect the information specified in the request in relation to the Mount Carmel Water Treatment Plant. This decision does not address the arguments made against disclosure of the non-responsive information, which the city need not release. However, we find that all submitted information pertaining to "the rate charged and total amount paid for electricity" by the city for the Mount Carmel Water Treatment Plant during the specified time interval is responsive to the request. Therefore, we will address the claimed exceptions with respect to this information.

We next note that the submitted responsive documents comprise information that falls within the purview of section 552.022(a)(3). Section 552.022(a)(3) provides that information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body is not excepted from required disclosure unless they are made expressly confidential by law. The documents at issue consist of information in an account and a contract relating to the expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body as contemplated by section 552.022(a)(3), and are therefore public information not excepted from public disclosure, unless the information is expressly made confidential under other law. As TCE raises section 552.110 of the Government Code, which is considered "other law" for purposes of section 552.022, we will address this exception.

TCE first argues that the submitted information has been designated as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Public Information Act (the "Act") simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). 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 No. 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."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

We now turn to TCE's arguments under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

> may consist of any 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); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining 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 this 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 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). 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. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton,* 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); 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 reviewed the submitted brief, we conclude that TCE has not demonstrated that any portion of its information qualifies as a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We also find that TCE has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of its information would likely result in substantial competitive harm to them. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that 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 was entirely too speculative). Accordingly, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110. The submitted responsive information must be released to the requestor in its entirety.
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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, 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

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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 appeal 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 191980

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. R. John Cullar
Mills, Cullar & McLeod
Wells Fargo Tower
801 Washington Avenue, Suite 217
Waco, Texas 76701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael G. Shirley
Texas Commercial Energy
501 West Bethany, Suite 300
Allen, Texas 75013
(w/o enclosures)