



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 6, 2011

Ms. Barbara Smith Armstrong  
General Counsel  
Harris County Purchasing Department  
1001 Preston, Suite 670  
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2011-12832

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 428845 (C.A. File 10GEN2851).

The Harris County Purchasing Agent (the "county") received a request for information related to an agreement between the county and Motorola Solutions, Inc. ("Motorola") for public-safety Long Term Evolution ("LTE") equipment.<sup>1</sup> You state the county has withheld Port of Houston sensitive security information ("SSI") pursuant to regulations in title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Although the county takes no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Motorola. Accordingly, you notified Motorola of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its 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); *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 in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from an attorney on behalf of Motorola. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note Motorola seeks to withhold information the county has withheld as SSI. This ruling does not address information beyond what the county has submitted to us for review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from

---

<sup>1</sup>As you did not submit a copy of the request, we take our description from your brief.

attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the county submitted as responsive to the request for information. *See id.*

We next address the county's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), the governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). As of the date of this letter, the county has not submitted a copy of the written request for information. Consequently, we find the county failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of the Act 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. *Id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential by law. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider Motorola's arguments.

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 information that another statute makes confidential. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"). These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. Section 418.181 provides:

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

*Id.* § 418.181; *see also id.* § 421.001 (defining critical infrastructure to include "all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, and functions vital to the state or the nation"). The fact that information may relate

to a governmental body's security measures does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a claim under section 418.181 must be accompanied by an adequate explanation of how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

Motorola raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code, this office asked the county to provide assertions regarding the applicability of section 418.181 to the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines that information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). As of this date, we have received no comments from the county in response to our request.

In this instance, the submitted information consists of Motorola's contract with the county to design, develop, and implement a communication network based on LTE technology. Motorola states that the information contained in specified portions of its proposal provides the technical details that could allow a terrorist to identify particular vulnerabilities of the county's communications system. Motorola further states that this information must be withheld from public disclosure to prevent the public from being placed at risk from a potential terrorist attack. Upon review, we find that the county and Motorola have failed to establish that releasing the submitted information would reveal the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Accordingly, the submitted information is not subject to section 418.181 of the Government Code and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980).

Motorola also claims that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 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); 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).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[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). This exception to disclosure 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. *Id.* § 552.110(b); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

In advancing its arguments, Motorola appears to rely, in part, on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. However, section 552.110(b) has been amended since the issuance of *National Parks*. Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard for excepting from disclosure confidential information. The current statute does not incorporate this aspect of the *National Parks* test; it now requires only a specific factual demonstration that release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). Thus, the ability of a governmental body to obtain information from private parties is no longer a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Motorola’s interests in its information.

Having considered Motorola’s arguments, we determine that it has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a), nor has Motorola demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We also find that Motorola has not made the specific factual and evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of the submitted information would cause it substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. *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). As the county raises no other exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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](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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 428845

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James V. Leito IV  
Fulbright & Jaworski, L.L.P.  
Attorney for Motorola Solutions, Inc.  
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(w/o enclosures)