



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

June 24, 2008

Ms. Jacqueline Cullom Murphy
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Civil Section
300 Dolorosa, Suite 4049
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2008-08545

Dear Ms. Murphy:

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# 313766.

Bexar County (the "county") received a request for copies of the proposals submitted in response to the RFP for commissary services issued at the end of 2007, the score sheets, and the contract awarded to the successful bidder. Although you take no position regarding the public availability of the requested information, you state it may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code we understand you to have notified Aramark, Swanson Services Corporation ("Swanson"), and Mid-America Services, Inc. ("Mid-America") 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(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from Mid-America and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the county's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, the governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general 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

¹We note that the requestor has a right of access to its own proposal.

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* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). The county received this request on April 1, 2008. Accordingly, you were required to request a ruling from our office no later than April 15, 2008. However, you did not request a ruling until April 16, 2008. Further, you were required to submit the items enumerated under section 552.301(e) to us no later than April 22, 2008. You did not send the required information until May 7, 2008. Consequently, we find that the county failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

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 the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because the proprietary interests of a third party can provide a compelling reason against the presumption of openness we will consider whether any of the submitted information can be withheld on that basis.

Next, we note that Aramark and Swanson have not submitted arguments to this office. 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, neither Aramark nor Swanson have submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Thus, we thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information pertaining to Aramark or Swanson constitutes the proprietary information of those companies, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *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 (1990).

Mid-America raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of its proposal. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde*

Corp. v. Huffines, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (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 . . . [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.

Restatements of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776.

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as 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 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 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980). 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. 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). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid

under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990).

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.* § 552.110(b); *See also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Mid-America argues that its competitors would be able to more easily recruit Mid-America’s employees, smear or defame Mid-America’s reputation, and model themselves after Mid-America. It further alleges that releasing this information could lead entities to “mistakenly evaluate whether or not to conduct business with Mid-America based on the confidential financial information submitted[.]” Additionally, Mid-America informs us that it keeps its pricing and marketing strategies confidential, and that this information would not be easily recreated or discovered by its competitors. Having considered Mid-America’s arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that Mid-America has failed to establish that the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. In addition, it has not satisfied the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Accordingly, we conclude that the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Further, we find that Mid-America has not made the specific factual and evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of the information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *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 that 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 (1982) (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 county may not withhold the requested information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Mid-America also raises section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. The county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Mid-America also seeks to withhold insurance coverage levels and sample insurance certificates under section 552.136. However, section 552.136 applies only to credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device numbers that are collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body. Therefore, section 552.136 does not apply to the insurance coverage levels and sample insurance certificates, and this information may not be withheld on that basis.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted materials are copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released. Information that is subject to copyright must be released in accordance with that law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can challenge that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Lauren Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jb

Ref: ID# 313766

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Blake Massey
Keefe Commissary Network
3101 Marquis Drive, Suite 200
Garland, Texas 75042
(w/o enclosures)

Swanson Services Corporation
233 North Pecos, Suite 320
San Antonio, Texas 78207
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christine Powers
Hiersche, Hayward, Drakely & Urbach, P.C.
15303 Dallas Parkway, Suite 700
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick Turner
Aramark Correctional Services
2300 Warrenville Road
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515
(w/o enclosures)