



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 15, 2005

Mr. Rashaad V. Gambrell
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2005-10307

Dear Mr. Gambrell:

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# 236186.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for proposals submitted by Smart City and Freeman Decorating Company or the Freeman Companies ("Freeman") for electrical and plumbing contracts at the George R. Brown Convention Center. The city takes no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the information that you have submitted implicates the proprietary interests of Smart City and Freeman. You notified Smart City and Freeman of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released.¹ We also received correspondence from an attorney for Smart City. We have considered Smart City's arguments and have reviewed the submitted information. We initially note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from Freeman. Thus, Freeman has not demonstrated that any of the submitted information is proprietary for purposes of the Act. *See Gov't Code* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999).

¹*See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

Next, we consider Smart City's claims under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This exception protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from 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 the governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person 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, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the

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)*.

information meets the definition of a trade secret, and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) 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 also* 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).

Smart City contends that portions of its proposal qualify as trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Smart City also argues that portions of its proposal must be withheld under section 552.110(b). Having considered the company's arguments, we conclude that Smart City has demonstrated that some of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). We have marked the information that the city must withhold. We find that Smart City has not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). Likewise, we find that Smart City has not sufficiently demonstrated, for purposes of section 552.110(b), that the release of any of the remaining information at issue would be likely to cause Smart City substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of the remaining information in Smart City's proposal under section 552.110.

We next note that section 552.101 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the remaining information. Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the common law right to privacy. Common law privacy protects information that is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The common law right to privacy encompasses certain types of personal financial information. This office has determined that financial information that relates only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (identifying public and private portions of certain state personnel records), 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). We have marked personal financial information that the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy.

We also note that section 552.136 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the remaining information. This exception provides as follows:

(a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or

(2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov’t Code § 552.136. We have marked information that the city must withhold under section 552.136.

Lastly, we note that some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted information unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information also must comply with copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* A member of the public who wishes to make copies of copyrighted information 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 at 8-9 (1990).

In summary: (1) the city must withhold the marked information relating to Smart City that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code; (2) the city must withhold the marked information that is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy; and (3) the city must withhold the marked information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136. The rest of the submitted information must be released. In releasing information that is protected by copyright, the city must comply with copyright law.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/sdk

Ref: ID# 236186

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ross Conner
Harper Wood Electric Company
P.O. Box 941087
Houston, Texas 77094-8087
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ian Kerry
Freeman
901 East South Street
Anaheim, California 92805
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Snook
Smart City
1001 Avenida De Las Americas
Houston, Texas 77010
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher B. Gilbert
Bracewell & Giuliani LLP
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002-2770
(w/o enclosures)