



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 30, 2013

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2013-07077

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 486518.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for the proposal submitted by Premier Magnesia, LLC ("Premier") in response to IFB No. EAD0213. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Premier. Accordingly, the city notified Premier 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 third party with proprietary interest 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 the circumstances). We have considered the comments submitted by Premier and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge, and we agree, the city did not comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from

disclosure. *Id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether any of the submitted information may be excepted under the Act.

Premier asserts its information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies such as the city, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as Premier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). As the city does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Premier also raises section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and (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 § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court 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 a single or ephemeral event 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 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.¹ Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless the party claiming this exception has shown the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret and has demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* 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.*; 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 Premier’s arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find Premier 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 Premier 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. As Premier raises no further exceptions to disclosure, 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.


¹The 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 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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,



Eamon D. Briggs
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EDB/som

Ref: ID# 486518

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Madolora
Premier Magnesia LLC
13325 Kingman Drive
Austin, Texas 78729
(w/o enclosures)