



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 11, 2016

Mr. Jeffrey W. Giles
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2016-05693

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 601438 (GC No. 22927).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for all contracts and five specified categories of information pertaining to a specified bid invitation number. You state you do not have information responsive to part of the request.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you notified Allied Barton Security Services ("Allied"); Andy Frain Services, Inc. ("Frain"); Dynamic Security ("Dynamic"); Norred & Associates, Inc.; Ruiz Protective Service, Inc.; S.E.A.L. Security Solutions, LLC ("SEAL"); Securitas Security Service; and Universal Protection Service 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); *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 Allied, Frain, Dynamic, and SEAL. We have considered

¹The Act 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).

the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which you state is a representative sample.²

Initially, Frain contends its information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to “public information.” *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines “public information” as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). *But see* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 4 (1995) (Gov’t Code § 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Frain states its information is not public information because it is not a governmental body or a publicly supported entity. However, Frain submitted the information to the city in response to a solicitation for services for the city. Upon review, we find the information at issue is information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by the city in connection with the transaction of official business. Thus, Frain’s information is subject to the Act and must be released unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act.

²We 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.

Next, we note Frain objects to disclosure of information the city has not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the city and is limited to the information the city has submitted for our review.³ See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

We note the city has only submitted information responsive to the portion of the request for five specified categories of information pertaining to a specified bid invitation number. To the extent any contracts responsive to the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume you have released it. See Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

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 *id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have only received comments from Allied, Frain, Dynamic, and SEAL. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining interested third parties have 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.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the

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

privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. See *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. See *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the information you have indicated consists of communications between attorneys for the city, representatives of the city’s attorneys, and employees of the city that were made for the purpose of providing professional legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find most of the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have not explained or otherwise demonstrated the remaining information at issue, which we have marked for release, consists of confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Therefore, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information at issue, and it may not be withheld under section 552.107(1).

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking

functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You seek to withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees and officials of the city regarding broad policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. Allied and SEAL state they have competitors. In addition, Allied states disclosure of its information at issue would cause substantial competitive harm to the company and give competitors an advantage over Allied. SEAL states it is in a highly competitive industry, and release of its information at issue would give competitors an unfair advantage over SEAL in future bidding opportunities. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Allied and SEAL have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Dynamic and Frain 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.⁴ 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

⁴The 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).

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 Frain assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude both Dynamic and Frain have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of their information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find both Dynamic and Frain have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their 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 Frain’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Dynamic and Frain contend some of their information is commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the companies. Upon review, we find both Dynamic and Frain have demonstrated some of their 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 Frain has not established any of its remaining information at issue 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.”⁵ *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.

⁵The 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).

Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, except for the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104 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 in the remaining information 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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 601438

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Peter R. Haas
Vice President and General Mgr.
Allied Barton Security Services
161 Washington Street, Suite 600
Conshohocken, PA 19428
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Banta
Regional Vice President
Dynamic Security
1102 Woodward Avenue
Muscle Shoals, Alabama 35661
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rob Minnis
Ruiz Protective Service, Inc.
2646 Andjon Drive
Dallas, Texas 75220
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Keane
Securitas Security Service
20465 State Hwy. 249, Suite 400
Houston, Texas 77070
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James L. Stephenson
General Counsel
Andy Frain Services, Inc.
761 Shoreline Drive
Aurora, Illinois 60504
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeff Bohling
Norred & Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 82352
Atlanta, Georgia 30354
(w/o enclosures)

S.E.A.L. Security Solutions, LLC
c/o Mr. Herrick L. Sovany
Sovany Law, PLLC
2418 Sunset Boulevard, Suite B
Houston, Texas 77005
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Claton
Universal Protection Service
1551 North Tustin Avenue, #650
Santa Ana, California 92705
(w/o enclosures)