



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 18, 2007

Mr. Kent A. Brown  
Assistant Nueces County Attorney  
901 Leopard, Room 207  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401-3680

OR2007-07723

Dear Mr. Brown:

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# 282479.

The Nueces County Sheriff's Department (the "sheriff") received a request for "all proposals submitted in response to the RFP [for jail commissary cart services,] corresponding scoring sheets[, and] a copy of the contract once it is released." You state that there are no scoring sheets, and the contract "did not exist at the time this request was received." The Act applies only to information in existence at the time it is requested, and 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 dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. You take no position regarding the public availability of the remaining requested information, but state that release of the submitted information may implicate third party proprietary interests. Thus, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified the interested third parties of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records

---

<sup>1</sup>The third parties that received notice pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: Aramark Correctional Services, Inc. ("Aramark"); Correctional Food Services, L.P. ("CFS"); Keefe Commissary Network, Inc. (Keefe); Mid-America Services, Inc. ("MAS"); Premiere Management Enterprises ("PME"); and Swanson Services Corporation ("Swanson").

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 under the Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

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 Aramark or Swanson 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).

CFS, Keefe, MAS, and PME each contends that portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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 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). 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. 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).

Upon review, we find that CFS, Keefe, MAS, and PME have each made a *prima facie* case that portions of each company's information are protected as trade secrets. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut these claims as a matter of law. Thus, we have marked the information that the sheriff must withhold pursuant to section 552.110(a). We note, however, that some of the customer information that MAS and PME seek to withhold pertains to customers that are acting as references for the companies. We find that MAS and PME have not established that this customer information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Further, we find that none of the third parties has presented a *prima facie* claim that any of the remaining information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business"). Thus, no portion of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Keefe, MAS, and PME also seek to withhold portions of their information under section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find that MAS and PME have demonstrated that the release of some of each company's commercial or financial information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Thus, the sheriff must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As to the remaining information, however, Keefe, MAS, and PME have only made generalized allegations that the release of this information would result in substantial damage to the competitive position of each company. Thus, none of these companies has demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of the remaining information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative), 319 (1982). Accordingly, the sheriff may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

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 sheriff must withhold the insurance policy numbers you have marked. MAS seeks to also withhold insurance coverage levels and sample insurance certificates under section 552.136. We find, however, that insurance coverage levels and sample insurance certificates do not consist of a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body. *See id.* Therefore, we determine that section 552.136 is inapplicable to those records.

Finally, we note that portions of the submitted information have a notice of copyright protection. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In

making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the sheriff must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The sheriff must withhold the insurance policy numbers you have marked under section 552.136. The remaining information must be released; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the sheriff must comply with copyright law.

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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 282479

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Adrienne O'Keefe  
Investigator  
4131 Spicewood Springs Road, Suite J-2  
Austin, Texas 78759-8600  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terry Schroeder  
Regional Vice President  
Keefe Commissary Network, Inc.  
3101-200 Marquis Drive  
Garland, Texas 75042  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marc H. Richman  
Attorney at Law  
Legal Arts Center  
304 South Record Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202-4738  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kelly Swanson  
President  
Swanson Services Corporation  
1133 Pennsylvania Street  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Annie Harbison  
Vice President  
Premiere Management Enterprises  
116 Luke Street  
Lafayette, Louisiana 70506  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tonya B. Webber  
Porter, Rogers,  
Dahlman & Gordon, P.C.  
One Shoreline Plaza  
800 North Shoreline, Suite 800  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Austin  
President, CEO  
Mid-America Services, Inc.  
4928 Beeman Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75223  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christine Powers  
Hiersche, Hayward,  
Drakeley & Urbach, P.C.  
15303 Nueces Parkway, Suite 700  
Addison, Texas 75001  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry Hanson  
President/CEO  
Correctional Food Services, L.P.  
6319 McCommas Boulevard  
Dallas, Texas 75214  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick Turner  
Regional Sales Director  
Aramark Correctional Services, Inc.  
2300 Warrenville Road  
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515  
(w/o enclosures)