



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 23, 2012

Ms. Jacqueline E. Hojem  
Public Information Coordinator  
Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County  
P.O. Box 61429  
Houston, Texas 77208-1429

OR2012-05705

Dear Ms. Hojem:

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# 451290 (MTA No. 2012-0132).

The Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County (the "authority") received a request for documents submitted to the authority by CAF USA, Inc. ("CAF") during a specified time period.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position on the public availability of the submitted

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the authority sought and received clarification of the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if a large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date the request is clarified or narrowed).

information, you state the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of CAF. Accordingly, you submit documentation showing you notified CAF of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted 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 submitted by CAF. We have also received comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

CAF submits arguments against disclosure of its information 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. *Id.* § 552.110. 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. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

[A]ny 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) (citation omitted); *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.<sup>2</sup> See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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. ORD 552 at 5-6. 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 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

CAF contends some of the submitted information constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). Upon review of the arguments and the submitted information, we find CAF has established a *prima facie* case the submitted design drawings are trade secrets. See *Taco Cabana Int’l v. Two Pesos, Inc.*, 932 F.2d 1113, 1123-25 (5th Cir. 1991), *aff’d*, 505 U.S. 763 (1992); see also *Ecolaire Inc. v. Crissman*, 542 F. Supp. 196, 206 (E.D. Pa.1982) (drawings, blueprints, and lists constitute trade secrets because such information could be obtained, through other than improper means, only with difficulty and delay); *American Precision Vibrator Co. v. Nat’l Air Vibrator Co.*, 764 S.W.2d 274, 278 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988, no writ) (blueprints, drawings, and customer lists constitute trade secrets). As such, the authority must withhold the design drawings we have marked under

---

<sup>2</sup>There are six factors the Restatement gives as indicia of 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 the 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 Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2, (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

section 552.110(a). However, CAF has not demonstrated how any of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim). Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

CAF also contends the remaining information is commercial or financial information, release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to CAF. Upon review, we find CAF has made only conclusory allegations release of its remaining information would cause it substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b). As such, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

CAF generally asserts release of some of its remaining information “could be used against public safety.” However, CAF has not cited any law and has not demonstrated how the remaining information is excepted from disclosure. *See id.* 552.305(d)(2)(B). Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining information must be withheld.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person 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.

In summary, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The authority must release the remaining information, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jennifer Burnett". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Jennifer Burnett  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/dls

Ref: ID# 451290

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

CAF USA, Inc.  
c/o Mr. Greg R. Wehrer  
Squire Sanders (US), L.L.P.  
600 Travis Street, Suite 6200  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)