ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 2, 2011

Ms. Susana Carbajal Gonzalez
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin Aviation Department
Austin-bergstrom International Airport
3600 Presidential Boulevard, Suite 411
Austin, Texas 78719

OR2011-12766

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

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# 428793.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for the operating agreement between the city and Austin-Bergstrom International Airport (the "airport") for use of the Distributed Antenna System (the "DAS") installed by Concourse Communications Group, L.L.C. ("Concourse") at the airport, as well as all carrier agreements for use of the DAS. You state the city only maintains one agreement responsive to the request.[1] Although you take no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Concourse and Verizon Wireless ("Verizon"). Accordingly, you have notified Concourse and Verizon of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from Concourse and reviewed the submitted information.

[1]In responding to a request for information under the Act, a governmental body is not required to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice 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, we have not received correspondence from Verizon. Thus, Verizon has not demonstrated that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Verizon may have in the information. However, we will consider Concourse's arguments.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision" 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." Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Supreme Court of Texas 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 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. . . . [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) (emphasis added); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). 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* ORD 552 at 5. We cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable, however, 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. *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." Gov't Code § 552.110(b). 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Concourse contends that its submitted information excepted from disclosure under sections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Having considered Concourse's arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that Concourse has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Concourse also objects to release of the pricing information contained in the submitted agreement under section 552.110(b). However, we note the pricing information of an entity

---

[2]The 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

contracting with a governmental body is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, we find Concourse has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to the company's competitive position. Thus, Concourse has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (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 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, and qualifications and experience), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of Concourse's information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no further exceptions are raised, the submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 428793

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Kim
Director - Business and Legal Affairs
Boingo Wireless, Inc. (Concourse)
10960 Wilshire Boulevard, 8th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90024
(Third party w/o enclosures)

Dallas MTA, L.P.
d/b/a Verizon Wireless
180 Washington Valley Road
Bedminster, New Jersey 07921
(Third party w/o enclosures)