



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 25, 2014

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2014-04969

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 517846 (Killeen ID# W012315).

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for the proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. You state the city is releasing some of the requested information. You state, although the city takes no position with respect to the remaining requested information, its release may implicate the interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments stating why their information should not be released.¹ 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 statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and the arguments submitted by AMB, EMS, Intermedix, and LifeQuest.

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) of the Government Code to submit its

¹The third parties notified pursuant to section 552.305 are: Ambulance Medical Billing ("AMB"); Digitech; EMS Management & Consultants, Inc. ("EMS"); Intermedix Corporation ("Intermedix"); LifeQuest Services ("LifeQuest"); Med3000, Inc.; Wittman Enterprises, LLC; and Parastar.

reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from the remaining third parties explaining why their information should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude the release of the submitted information would implicate the interests of the remaining third parties, and none of the submitted information may be withheld on that basis. *See id.* § 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.

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. Gov't Code § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure information that is trade secrets obtained from a person and information that is privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. Section 757 provides a trade secret to be as follows:

[A]ny 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) (citation omitted); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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.² See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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. ORD 552 at 5-6. 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. *Id.*; ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

AMB, EMS, Intermedix, and LifeQuest claim some of their information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find EMS and Intermedix have established a *prima facie* case that their client and reference information constitutes trade secrets, and Intermedix has established a *prima facie* case that its rate information constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, to the extent EMS’s and Intermedix’s client and reference information is not publicly available on the companies’ websites, the city must withhold the client and reference information at issue under section 552.110(a).³ The city must also withhold Intermedix’s rate information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a). However, we find AMB, Intermedix, and LifeQuest have failed to demonstrate the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a

²There are six factors the Restatement gives as indicia of 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 the 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address EMS’s remaining argument against disclosure of its information.

trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information on the basis of section 552.110(a).

AMB, Intermedix, and LifeQuest contend some of their information is commercial or financial information, release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the companies. Upon review of the companies' arguments, we conclude AMB, Intermedix, and LifeQuest have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of the remaining information would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We therefore conclude the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states, "Notwithstanding 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(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within AMB's submitted information under section 552.136.⁴

LifeQuest notes, and we agree, some of the remaining information appears to be subject to copyright law. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, to the extent EMS's and Intermedix's client and reference information is not publicly available on the companies' websites, the city must withhold EMS's and Intermedix's client and reference information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The city must also withhold Intermedix's rate information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance

⁴Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact, without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the information described in section 552.136(b). Gov't Code § 552.136(c); *see also id.* § 552.136(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to withhold information under section 552.136(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.136(c) must provide certain notice to requestor).

policy numbers in AMB's submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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, 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,



Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/tch

Ref: ID# 517846

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Pamela S. Krop
Senior Vice President &
General Counsel
Intermedix Corporation
Suite 1000
6451 North Federal Highway
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33308
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Allan Logie
CPO
EMS Management & Consultants, Inc.
Suite 100
2540 Empire Drive
Winston Salem, North Carolina 27103
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael E. Kapp
Special Projects Manager
LifeQuest Services
N2930 State Road 22
Wautoma, Wisconsin 54982
(w/o enclosures)

Digitech
Suite 110 North
555 Pleasantville Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Greg Beauchemin
Parastar
25250 West Eight Mile Road
Southfield, Michigan 48033
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Harrod
Executive Director
Ambulance Medical Billing
100 Fulton Court
Paducah, Kentucky 42001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Culham
Med3000, Inc.
3131 Newmark Drive, Suite 100
Miamisburg, Ohio 45342
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Corrine Wittman-Wong
Wittman Enterprises, LLC
11093 Sun Center Drive
Rancho Cordova, California 95670
(w/o enclosures)