



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 14, 2004

Mr. Jesús Toscano, Jr.
Administrative Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2004-5799

Dear Mr. Toscano:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 205110.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the city's dealings with Spectrum Properties, Ltd. ("Spectrum"), and the minutes from a specified TIF board meeting. You state that you have provided the requestor with some of the requested information. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining requested information, you claim that portions of the requested information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the city notified the interested third party, Spectrum, of the city's receipt of the request and of their right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* §552.305(d); *see also* 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 under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered all arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.¹

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from

¹ We note that Spectrum seeks to withhold additional information that the city did not submit to this office for review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the city. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “commercial 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(a)-(b). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “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 a single or ephemeral event 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party’s claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.² *See Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990)*. However,

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 (1939); *see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980)*.

the private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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. *See* 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). After carefully reviewing the arguments presented to us by Spectrum and the information at issue, we find that Spectrum has not adequately demonstrated that any portion of the submitted information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We find, however, that the company has made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that the release of certain portions of the submitted information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. This information, which we have marked, must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b). With respect to the remaining information Spectrum seeks to withhold, however, we determine that Spectrum has only provided conclusory statements that release of this information would harm its competitive interests, and has not provided specific factual evidence to substantiate the claim that release of this information would result in competitive harm to the company. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under 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 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110).

Spectrum also asserts that portions of the submitted information are excepted under section 552.131. This exception protects “information [that] relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body.” Gov’t Code § 552.131. Because Spectrum has not explained, and the submitted documents do not reflect, that the city was negotiating with Spectrum or any other party to “locate, stay, or expand in or near the [city’s] territory” or that the submitted information relates to such negotiations, we find that section 552.131 does not apply in this instance.

Finally, we note that some 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 (1987). 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).

In summary, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released, in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/seg

Ref: ID# 205110

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. William Lyle Burgin
Brook Partners, Inc.
301 North Market Street, Suite 250
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeff W. Dorrill
Hughes Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/enclosure)