



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

October 1, 2008

Mr. Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2008-13401

Dear Mr. Bounds:

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# 325907.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for building permit and construction documents pertaining to specified projects.¹ You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. You also state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the following third parties of the receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor: Admiral Linen and Uniform Services; American Oilfield; Architec TKO; Ewing Construction Company; GPM Engineering; Naismith Engineering; Teal Construction Co. ("Teal"); and Western Steel Company. *See* 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). Teal asserts that some of its information is excepted under sections 552.110 and 552.131 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note the city previously submitted information responsive to this request, and we addressed that information in Open Records Letter No. 2008-08937 (2008), issued on July 2, 2008. The information at issue in the instant ruling, however, was discovered by the city and submitted to this office as responsive to the original request after we issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-08937; therefore, this ruling is limited to the documents that the city discovered and submitted to us after the issuance of Open Records Letter No. 2008-08937.

Initially, the city acknowledges, and we agree, that you failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. A governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can be overcome by demonstrating that the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Because section 552.137 and the interests of third parties can provide compelling reasons to overcome this presumption, we will consider whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public," but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137.

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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Teal is the only interested third party that has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of any of the remaining interested third parties, and the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* 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, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

Teal asserts that the information at issue is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code.² Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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.³ Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b. This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors

²Teal informs us that it does not object to the release of “that which is ordinarily open records of the [city], i.e., the permit and the plans which were filed with the Application.”

³The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 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).

have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[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.” 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 requested information. *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).

Having considered Teal’s arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that Teal has not shown that any of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. We also find that Teal has made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Thus, none of the information at issue may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110.

Teal also raises section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Section 552.131(a) relates to economic development information and provides the following:

Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information 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 and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (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 § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” and “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.” *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because Teal has not demonstrated that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, nor has it made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release

of the information at issue would result in substantial competitive harm, we conclude that none of the information at issue may be withheld pursuant to section 552.131(a).

To conclude, the city must withhold the information marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/ma

Ref: ID# 325907

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jeri L.S. Morey
711 North Carancahua, #518
Corpus Christi, Texas 78475
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eddie Knovicka
Admiral Linen and Uniform Services
2030 Kipling
Houston, Texas 77098-9869
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terry K. Orf
Architec TKO
3430 South Alameda
Corpus Christi, Texas 78411
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Underbink
Naismith Engineering
4501 Golihar Road
Corpus Christi, Texas 78411
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. R.S. Pitzer
GPM Engineering
5440 Old Brownsville Road
Corpus Christi, Texas 78417
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry Jolly
Western Steel Company
105 Villa Drive
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Ewing, Jr.
Ewing Construction Company
P.O. Box 4235
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenneth Martin
American Oilfield
4826 Santa Elena Street
Corpus Christi, Texas 78405
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Hogue
Teal Construction Co.
5110-B IH 37
Corpus Christi, Texas 78407
(w/o enclosures)