



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 18, 2008

Ms. Susan Quinn
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2008-12872

Dear Ms. Guinn:

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# 322296.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for hard or electronic files of construction plans and plats concerning West Pointe Gardens Subdivision submitted by Gomez-Garcia & Associates, Inc. ("Gomez-Garcia"). You claim that the requested information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act, but make no arguments and take no position as to whether the information is so excepted. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified Gomez-Garcia of the request and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the 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 received correspondence on behalf of Gomez-Garcia. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Initially, we note that Gomez-Garcia does not object to release of the requested hard files to the requestor. Gomez-Garcia claims that the requested electronic files are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets

¹We note that you have not submitted the requested electronic files for our review. Although in this instance we can determine the extent to which this fungible information may be excepted from disclosure, we advise the city in the future to submit for review the information that it seeks to protect from disclosure and for which it seeks a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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. 1958); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 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 ORD 232. 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).

Gomez-Garcia asserts the requested electronic files constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). However, we note that Gomez-Garcia acknowledges the electronic files consist of information developed for the West Pointe Gardens Subdivision project in particular. Thus, we conclude Gomez-Garcia has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that the requested electronic files are trade secrets. See ORD 552 (1990); see also RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if 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”). Accordingly, the requested electronic files may not be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. As no other exceptions to disclosure are raised, the responsive information must be released to the requestor.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/jb

Ref: ID# 322296

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ian Cude
10325 Bandera Road
San Antonio, Texas 78250
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Santos Vargas
Law Offices of Santos Vargas, P.C.
111 Soledad, Suite 1325
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(w/o enclosures)