



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 28, 2005

Ms. Ashley D. Fourt
Assistant District Attorney
Tarrant County Courthouse
401 West Belknap
Fort Worth, Texas 76196-0201

OR2005-03633

Dear Ms. Fourt:

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# 222797.

The Tarrant County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") received a request for seven categories of information pertaining to a contract, bids, and audit reports since January 1, 2003, for the Tarrant County Justice System Commissary and Food Services. You indicate that some responsive information will be provided to the requestor. Although you make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified the following interested third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor: Canteen Correctional Services ("Canteen"); Aramark; Keefe Supply Company ("Keefe"); and Mid-States Services, Inc. ("Mid-States"). *See Gov't Code § 552.305* (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

You state that a portion of the requested information is subject to a previous ruling by this office. *See Open Records Letter No. 2004-8538 (2004)*. The facts and circumstances surrounding that ruling do not appear to have changed. Therefore, to the extent that the requested records consist of the same information that was at issue in Open Records Letter

No. 2004-8538, the district attorney must comply with our prior ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (criteria of previous determination regarding specific information previously ruled on). To the extent the requested information is not subject to our prior ruling, we address the submitted arguments.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Canteen and Aramark have not submitted comments to this office in response to the section 552.305 notice; therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these companies have a proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, we conclude that the district attorney may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pertaining to Canteen or Aramark on the basis of any proprietary interest that either company may have in the information.

Keefe and Mid-States have each submitted comments to this office contending that portions of their bid proposals are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets 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.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

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). 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.¹ *Id.* This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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) of the Government Code exempts 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 information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Keefe argues that certain portions of its commissary proposal are confidential under section 552.110. Upon review, we find that Keefe has neither shown that any of the information at issue in its proposal meets the definition of a trade secret nor demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Thus, none of the information in Keefe's proposal may be withheld under section 552.110(a). Further, we find

¹The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

(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).

that Keefe has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining submitted information would cause the company substantial competitive injury and has not provided specific factual evidence to support this allegation. Therefore, none of the information in Keefe's proposal may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Mid-States argues that all of its "financial information including . . . balance sheets and income statements" is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). We find, however, that Mid-States has made only conclusory allegations that release of that company's information would cause it substantial competitive injury and has not provided specific factual evidence to support this allegation. Therefore, none of Mid-State's information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. The district attorney must, therefore, withhold the policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent that the requested records consist of the same information that was at issue in Open Records Letter No. 2004-8538, the district attorney must comply with our prior ruling. Insurance policy numbers must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the

Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/krl

Ref: ID# 222797

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kelly Abendroth
3123 South University, No. 11
Fort Worth, Texas 76109
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Susan B. Kober
Canteen Correctional Services
828 Tenderfoot Drive
Larkspur, Colorado 80118
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel E. Jameson
Aramark
1801 S. Meyers Road, Suite 300
Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois 60181
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Harbin
Mr. Blake R. Massey
Keefe Supply Company
3101-200 Marquis Drive
Garland, Texas 75042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John F. Sammons, Jr.
Mid-States Services, Inc.
860 Airport Freeway West, Suite 200
Hurst, Texas 76054
(w/o enclosures)