



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 15, 2014

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman  
Counsel for the City of Frisco  
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2014-22689

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 547906 (Ref. No. G001573-100114).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the submitted proposals for request for qualifications 1407-075 and information from any and all parties that requested a copy and/or to review the proposal submitted by State Tax Group, L.L.C. We understand the city does not have information responsive to the second portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> Although the city takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, it states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of MuniServices, L.L.C. ("MuniServices"). Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified MuniServices of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

circumstances). We have received comments from MuniServices. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

MuniServices asserts its 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects 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 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 . . . . 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 776 (Tex. 1958). 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> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim

---

<sup>2</sup>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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

MuniServices argues its information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find MuniServices has established a *prima facie* case the information we have marked constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a). However, we find MuniServices has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of MuniServices’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

MuniServices further argues its remaining information consists of commercial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find MuniServices has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of its remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *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 substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Therefore, none of MuniServices’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

MuniServices also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for its remaining information. However, MuniServices has not pointed to any statutory confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of its remaining information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1

(1992) (common-law privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 547906

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

MuniServices  
c/o Ms. Melissa A. Mihalick  
Bracewell & Giuliani  
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300  
Houston, Texas 77002-2770  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brad Embree  
Associate Corporate Counsel  
Portfolio Recovery Associates  
140 Corporate Boulevard, Suite 100  
Norfolk, Virginia 23502  
(w/o enclosures)