



February 24, 2015

Ms. Heather Silver
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-03604

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 554499.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received two requests for information submitted in response to the city's request for competitive sealed proposals no. BHZ1404 and the contract between Gila L.L.C. d/b/a Municipal Services Bureau ("Municipal") and the city. You state you have released some of the requested information. Although you do not take any position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted 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

¹The notified third parties are: Linebarger, Goggan, Blair & Sampson, L.L.P. ("Linebarger"); Municipal; Ability Recovery Services, L.L.C. ("Ability"); AllianceOne Receivables Management, Inc. ("AllianceOne"); Penn Credit Corporation ("Penn"); Pioneer Credit Recovery, Inc. ("Pioneer"); and GC Services Limited Partnership ("GC").

exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Municipal and Penn and have 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) of the Government Code 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 Linebarger, Ability, AllianceOne, Pioneer, or GC explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude these third parties have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Linebarger, Ability, AllianceOne, Pioneer, or GC may have in the information.

Municipal and Penn each raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for their information. 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. 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 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. 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).

Municipal and Penn raise section 552.110(a) for portions of their information. Upon review, we find Municipal and Penn have both established their client information constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, to the extent the client information at issue is not publicly available on their respective websites, the city must withhold Municipal’s and Penn’s client information under section 552.110(a).³ However, we find Municipal failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of its remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for

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 for this information, we need not address the remaining argument against its disclosure.

its remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Municipal also raises section 552.110(b) for portions of its information. Upon review, we find Municipal has failed to demonstrate release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[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.”⁴ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the client information at issue is not publicly available on Municipal’s and Penn’s websites, the city must withhold Municipal’s and Penn’s client information under section 552.110(a) 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.

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

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).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Megan G. Holloway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MGH/cbz

Ref: ID# 554499

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Bridget Moreno Lopez
Managing Partner
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson, LLP
2777 North Stemmons Freeway, Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75207
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Conflitti
President
Ability Recovery Services, LLC
One Montage Road
Moosic, Pennsylvania 18507
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Renee B. Linnabary
Senior Vice President
AllianceOne Receivables Management, Inc.
6565 Kimball Drive, Suite 200
Gig Harbor, Washington 98335
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jack Frazier, Jr.
President
Pioneer Credit Recovery, Inc.
26 Edward Street
Arcade, New York 14009
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Linda M. Spellicy
Senior Vice President-Treasury
GC Services Limited Partnership
6330 Gulfton
Houston, Texas 77081
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. A. Lee Rigby
Counsel for Gila L.L.C. d/b/a Municipal
Services Bureau
Smith, Robertson, Elliot & Douglas, L.L.P.
221 West Sixth Street, Suite 1100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rhett Q. Donagher
Manager of Sales and Marketing
PennCredit Corporation
916 South 14th Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17104
(w/o enclosures)