



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 7, 2007

Mr. Paul J. Stewart
Assistant County Attorney
Fort Bend County
301 Jackson Street, Suite 728
Richmond, Texas 77469-3108

OR2007-05357

Dear Mr. Stewart:

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# 277762.

The Fort Bend County Purchasing Department (the "county") received a request for copies of proposals submitted to the county in response to RFP 06-067, as well as proposal evaluations and pricing. The county states that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.136 and that the remaining requested information may be subject to the proprietary interests of third parties. The county explains, and provides documentation showing, that it notified ISECUREtrac Corporation ("ISECURE"), Pro Tech Monitoring, Inc. ("Pro Tech"), Satellite Tracking of People LLC ("Satellite"), SecureAlert ("Alert"), and Sentinel Offender Services ("Sentinel") of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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 circumstances). Sentinel has responded to the notice and argues that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure. We have considered the arguments submitted by the county and Sentinel and reviewed the submitted information.

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from ISECURE, Pro Tech, Satellite, or Alert explaining why their requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the requested proposal information constitutes these parties' proprietary information protected under section 552.110, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

Sentinel raises sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Sentinel does not cite to any specific law, and we are not aware of any, that makes any portion of its proposal confidential under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential or stating that information shall not be released to public). Therefore, we conclude that the county may not withhold any portion of Sentinel's submitted information under section 552.101 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 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 id.* § 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 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.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 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 Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted 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. 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). We also 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).

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 (1999).

Sentinel asserts that the manuals and other specific information included in its proposal constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). After reviewing Sentinel’s arguments and the submitted information, we agree that Sentinel has presented a *prima facie* showing that the manuals included in its proposal qualify as trade secrets under section 552.110(a). We have received no arguments that rebut Sentinel’s trade secret claims as a matter of law. We therefore conclude that the county must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a).

We understand Sentinel to assert that some of its remaining information constitutes protected commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b). Upon review of the remaining information which Sentinel argues is protected in the submitted proposal, we find that Sentinel has not made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of this information would cause substantial competitive harm. Sentinel has made a conclusory assertion that the requestor should not have access to this information at issue. Thus, the county may not withhold any part of this information under section 552.110(b).

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 county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked.

In summary, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136. The remaining 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kara A. Batey". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "K".

Kara A. Batey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/mcf

Ref: ID# 277762

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Dawn Means
BI Incorporated
6400 Lookout Road
Boulder, Colorado 80301
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William P. Jetter
ISERCUREtrac Coporation
5078 South 111th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68137
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Chapin
Pro Tech Monitoring, Inc.
2549 Success Drive
Odessa, Florida 33556-3401
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregg Ulterback
Satellite Tracking of People L.L.C.
4801 Woodway Drive, Suite 110W
Houston, Texas 77056-1828
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Randy Olshen
SecureAlert
150 West Civic Center Drive, Suite 400
Sandy, Utah 84070
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alan Velasquez
Sentinel Offender Services
220 Technology Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, California 92618
(w/o enclosures)