



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 18, 2015

Ms. Sol M. Cortez
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2015-05148

Dear Ms. Cortez:

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# 556700 (Ref. No. 14-1044-409).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified bid solicitation.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code.² You also state you notified Dynamic Security, Inc. ("Dynamic"); G4S Secure Solutions (USA), Inc. ("G4S"); Allegiance Security Group, LLC; ASEZ, Inc.; Mike Garcia Merchant Security, LLC; Ruiz Protective Service, Inc.; Shetler Security Services; US Security Associates, Inc.; and VETS Securing America 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d);

¹You indicate the city sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²Although you do not raise section 552.136 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand the city to assert this exception based on your markings.

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 Dynamic and G4S. We have considered the submitted arguments 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 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from the remaining interested third parties. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining interested third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining interested third parties may have in the information.

Although the city argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, this exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the city's argument under section 552.110. Dynamic and G4S claim portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

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 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.³ 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 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. *See* 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." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Record Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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.*; *see also* Open Records Decision 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).

Dynamic and G4S claim portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Dynamic and G4S have

³The 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).

established a *prima facie* case that their customer information constitutes trade secret information. Therefore, the customer information at issue must generally be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, to the extent any of the customer information Dynamic or G4S seek to withhold has been published on the company's website, such information is not confidential under section 552.110(a). We also conclude Dynamic and G4S have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of their remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Dynamic and G4S have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their remaining information. *See* ORDs 402, 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, none of Dynamic's or G4S's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Dynamic and G4S contend some of their information is commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the company. Upon review, we find G4S has demonstrated some of its information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Dynamic and G4S have not established any of the remaining information constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue on this basis.

Section 552.136(b) 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." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers you have marked, as well as the insurance policy numbers we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent Dynamic's or G4S's customer information is not publicly available on the company's website, the county must withhold Dynamic's and G4S's submitted customer information 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 you have marked, as well as 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 providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 556700

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Grant Arnold
Allegiance Security Group, LLC
8900 Viscount Boulevard, Suite A-N-234
El Paso, Texas 79925
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Lozano
ASEZ, Inc. d/b/a Sterling Security
1716 South San Marcos, Suite 120
San Antonio, Texas 78023
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian D. Stentz
Regional Manager
Dynamic Security, Inc.
1100 Kermit Drive, Suite 100
Nashville, Tennessee 37217
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William Chorba
Corporate Counsel
G4S Secure Solutions (USA), Inc.
1395 University Boulevard
Jupiter, Florida 33458
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Miguel U. Garcia
Mike Garcia Merchant Security, LLC
6000 Welch Avenue, Suite 11
El Paso, Texas 79905
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Roberto Contreras
Ruiz Protective Service, Inc.
5530 East Paisano
El Paso, Texas 79905
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Shetler
Shetler Security Services
1161 Beech Street, Suite D
El Paso, Texas 79925
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Art Juarez
US Security Associates, Inc.
1200 Golden Key Circle, Suite 360
El Paso, Texas 79925
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gerald A. Gregory
VETS Securing America
10100 Reunion Place, Suite 750
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)