



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 21, 2016

Mr. Julian W. Taylor, III
Counsel for the City of Freeport
The Law Office of Wallace Shaw, P.C.
P.O. Box 3073
Freeport, Texas 77542-1273

OR2016-14063

Dear Mr. Taylor:

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# 615272.

The City of Freeport (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents related to services, technology, or equipment acquired by the city from any of five specified vendors during a specified time frame. You state the city will rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-12012 (2013) as a previous determination for some of the requested information.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (discussing criteria for first type of previous determination)). You state the city will release some responsive information with redactions pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Selex ES, Inc. ("Selex"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Selex of the request for

¹In Open Records Letter No. 2013-12012, we determined the city may not release any of the information at issue under the Act, and instead must allow the Transportation Security Administration and the Coast Guard to make a determination concerning disclosure.

²Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c).

information and of its 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 Selex. We have also received comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This exception encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 418.181 of the Government Code. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. Section 418.181 provides:

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

Id. § 418.181; *see generally id.* § 421.001 (defining critical infrastructure to include "all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, economy, or morale of the state or the nation"). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security measures does not make the information *per se* confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a claim under section 418.181 must be accompanied by an adequate explanation of how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301 (e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the submitted information shows the type of equipment installed in the city's security system, as well as the placement of security cameras and other security devices in city facilities that constitute critical infrastructure. You further state "[t]he information . . . includes details of potential vulnerabilities that if released would make it easy for terrorists and criminals to circumnavigate the federally assisted security system installed to protect [the city]." Based on your representations and our review, we agree some of the submitted information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate

the applicability of section 418.181 to any of the remaining information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Selex raises section 552.108(a) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). By its terms, section 552.108 applies only to a law enforcement agency or prosecutor. Selex is not a law enforcement agency. Therefore, we do not address Selex’s argument under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

However, we do address the city’s argument under section 552.108(b), which excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department’s use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984). Upon review, we find the city has not established the release of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1).

Selex asserts its information is protected 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 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, 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 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.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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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).

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

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).

§ 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 No. 661 at 5 (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).

Upon review, we find Selex has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, and has failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information. *See* ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We further find Selex has failed to demonstrated the release of the remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code, which provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.⁴ *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Selex also asserts the remaining information is protected by copyright. However, we note copyright law does not make information confidential under the Act. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 660 at 5 (1999) (Federal Copyright Act does not make information confidential, but rather gives copy right holder exclusive right to reproduce his work, subject to another person's right to make fair use of it). Furthermore, upon careful review of the remaining information, we find no evidence of copyright protection.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The

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).

city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Brian E. Berger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BB/akg

Ref: ID# 615272

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)