



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 30, 2014

Ms. Criselda Palacios
City Attorney
City of Edinburg
P.O. Box 1079
Edinburg, Texas 78540

OR2014-19684

Dear Ms. Palacios:

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#541509.

The City of Edinburg (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of All Pro Security Services; Amtex Security, Inc.; Chambers Protective Services, Inc.; International Security Agency; U.S. Security Associates, Inc.; and Vets Security America ("VSA"). Accordingly, you state you notified these parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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). We have received comments from VSA. We have considered the submitted comments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). The city received the request for information on July 31, 2014. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by August 14, 2014. Moreover, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(e) by August 21, 2014. However, the envelope in which the city provided the information required by sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) was postmarked August 25, 2014. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* ORD 630. Because third-party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome this presumption, we will address whether the submitted information may be withheld on that basis.

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 only received comments from VSA. Thus, the remaining interested third parties have failed to demonstrate they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1990) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is

trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

VSA claims some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 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 trade secrets obtained from a person that are privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

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); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). 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 RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a

²The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other 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; *see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).*

prima facie case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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 note 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.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; 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 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6.

VSA asserts some of its information is confidential under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find VSA has established a *prima facie* case its customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent VSA’s customer information is not publicly available on its website, the city must withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.³ However, we find VSA has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has VSA demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

VSA also claims some of its information is protected under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find VSA has demonstrated its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, we find VSA has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would likely result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (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 is too speculative), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception under the Act). Therefore, the city may

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.136 states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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 id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Therefore, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. 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 VSA’s customer information is not publicly available on its website, the city must withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, but may only release any copyrighted information in accordance with copyright law.⁵

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.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁵We note the information being released contains social security numbers; however, we are unable to determine whether this information pertains to actual living individuals or fictitious individuals created as samples for purposes of responding to the city’s request for proposal. As such, to the extent this information pertains to living individuals, section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/cbz

Ref: ID# 541509

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gerald A. Gregory
President & Chief Executive Officer
Vets Securing America
10100 Reunion Place, Suite 750
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Amtex Security Inc.
4814 Neptune Street
Corpus Christi, Texas 78405
(w/o enclosures)

International Security Agency
2110 West Sixth Street
Weslaco, Texas 78596
(w/o enclosures)

U.S. Security Associates, Inc.
1200 Golden Key Circle, Suite 360
El Paso, Texas 79925
(w/o enclosures)

All Pro Security Services
17356 West 12 Mile Road, Suite 201
Southfield, Michigan 48076
(w/o enclosures)

Chambers Protective Services, Inc. dba
Border Security & Investigations
P.O. Box 552
Los Fresnos, Texas 78566
(w/o enclosures)