



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 5, 2006

Ms. Pamela Smith
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P. O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2006-00141

Dear Ms. Smith:

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# 239686.

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "DPS") received two requests for information related to the same request for proposal. One request is for certain information relating to the winning bidder's proposal, while the other request asks for information regarding all bids received by the DPS. You state that you will release most of the requested information, but claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. In addition, you assert that the release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Digimarc ID Systems, LLC ("Digimarc") and Viisage Technology, Inc. ("Viisage") of the requests and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office. *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 arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that Viisage seeks to withhold Section II - Part 5 of its proposal, and Digimarc seeks to withhold portions of Section 1 and all of Section 5 and Appendix II of its proposal. None of this information was submitted by the DPS to this office for our review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the

DPS. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

The DPS claims that pages 6-65 through 6-132 of Section 2 of Digimarc's proposal and Appendix VI of Viisage's proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from disclosure "[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if: (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution." Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded that this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department's use of force policy), 508 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution), 211 (1978) (information relating to undercover narcotics investigations), 143 (1977) (log revealing use of electronic eavesdropping equipment). To claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection, however, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement; the determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

The DPS informs us that pages 6-65 through 6-132 of Digimarc's proposal contain detailed information about the security measures to be incorporated into the new drivers' licenses, state identification cards, and concealed handgun licenses that Digimarc will produce. The DPS also informs us that Appendix VI of Viisage's proposal contains similar technical information. The DPS asserts that this information, if released, would make it easier for individuals to defeat these security measures and alter or counterfeit the documents, and thus allow criminals to more easily establish false identities and avoid detection by law enforcement. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that the DPS has established that the release of pages 6-65 through 6-132 of Digimarc's

proposal and Appendix VI of Viisage's proposal would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Thus, the DPS may withhold this information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.¹

Turning to the remaining information, Digimarc responded to the section 552.305 notice by asserting that page 7-135 of Section 2 and all of Section 3 of its proposal are confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. However, Digimarc does not cite to any specific statute, nor are we aware of one, that makes the information at issue confidential. Accordingly, neither page 7-135 of Section 2 nor any of Section 3 may be withheld under section 552.101. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality requires express language making certain information confidential or stating that information shall not be released to the public).

Digimarc also claims that page 7-135 of Section 2 and all of Section 3 should be withheld from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the DPS does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, neither page 7-135 of Section 2 nor any of Section 3 may be withheld pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Digimarc also claims section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 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

¹Because we find that the DPS may withhold pages 6-65 through 6-132 of Digimarc's proposal and Appendix VI of Viisage's proposal, we do not address either companies arguments for these sections.

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* Open Records Decision No. 232 (1979). 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Digimarc claims that Section 3 of its proposal, which contains the company’s pricing information, is protected as a trade secret under section 552.110. However, we note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Thus, Section 3 of Digimarc’s proposal may not be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Digimarc also seeks to withhold page 7-135 of Section 2 and all of Section 3 from disclosure under section 552.110(b). However, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). We therefore find that neither page 7-135 of Section 2 nor any of Section 3 is excepted from disclosure.

In summary, the DPS may withhold pages 6-65 through 6-132 of Section 2 of Digimarc’s proposal and Appendix VI of Viisage’s proposal under section 552.108. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



José Vela III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JV/krl

Ref: ID# 239686

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Paul B. Starr
Germer Gertz Beaman & Brown, L.L.P.
301 Congress Avenue, Suite 1700
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Corrie MacLaggan
Austin American-Statesman
305 S. Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas 787074
(w/o enclosures)

Robert M. O'Boyle
Strasburger & Price LLP
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 1600
Austin, Texas 78701-3248
(w/o enclosures)