



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 1, 2008

Ms. Bertha A. Ontiveros  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of El Paso  
2 Civic Center Plaza 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2008-08862

Dear Ms. Ontiveros:

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# 314476.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information relating to its digital automated red light enforcement program, including the awarded contract and the bidders' technical and cost proposals. You take no position of the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the information may implicate the proprietary interests of American Traffic Solutions ("ATS"), Nestor Traffic Systems, Inc. ("Nestor"), and Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc. ("Redflex"). You notified ATS, Nestor, and Redflex of the request for their information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> We received correspondence from Redflex. We have considered all of the submitted arguments and have reviewed the information you submitted.

We first note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305 of the Government Code 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 decision, this office has received no correspondence from ATS and Nestor. Therefore, because neither ATS nor Nestor has demonstrated that any of the submitted information is proprietary for the purposes of the Act, the city may not withhold any of the information on the basis of any interest that either ATS or Nestor may claim. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999).

---

<sup>1</sup>*See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

Next, we address Redflex's representation that certain pages of its proposal were marked as containing trade secrets. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act by agreement or contract. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information did not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, Redflex's information must be released unless it falls within an exception to disclosure, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Redflex contends that portions of its proposal should be withheld from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision" and (2) "commercial 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(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "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, 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 . . . . [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) (emphasis added); see also *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a 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.<sup>2</sup> See ORD 552 at 5. 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. See Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) 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. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Redflex contends that portions of its proposal contain trade secrets.<sup>3</sup> Having considered the company's arguments and reviewed the information in question, we find that Redflex has not demonstrated that any of its information constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of Redflex's information under section 552.110. See Open Records Decision Nos. 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 was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). With regard to Redflex's pricing information, we note that Redflex was the winning bidder and was awarded a contract with the city. Pricing information pertaining to a specific contract with a governmental body 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." See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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 (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

(1982). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency).

We note that the city may be required to withhold some of the submitted information under section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of an official or employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 that the information be kept confidential. We have marked information that the city must withhold under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee concerned timely requested confidentiality for the information under section 552.024.

We also note that the submitted documents contain Texas motor vehicle information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state.<sup>5</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(2). We have marked Texas license plate numbers that the city must withhold under section 552.130.

Lastly, we note that some of the submitted information appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted information unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information also must comply with copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* A member of the public who wishes to make copies of copyrighted information 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 at 8-9 (1990).

---

<sup>4</sup>Unlike other exceptions to disclosure under the Act, this office will raise section 552.117 on behalf of a governmental body, as this exception is mandatory and may not be waived. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; Open Records Decision No. 674 at 3 n.4 (2001) (mandatory exceptions).

<sup>5</sup>Section 552.130 also is a discretionary exception and may not be waived. Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; ORD 674 at 3 n.4.

In summary: (1) the city must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the employee concerned timely requested confidentiality for the information under section 552.024 of the Government Code; and (2) the Texas motor vehicle information that we have marked must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released. Any information that is protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J.W. Morris, III', with a large circular flourish at the end.

James W. Morris, III  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JWM/ma

Ref: ID# 314476

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Monica Jones  
INPUT  
11720 Plaza America Drive 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Tuton  
American Traffic Solutions  
14861 North Scottsdale Road Suite 109  
Scottsdale, Arizona 84254  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Nigel P. Hebborn  
Nestor Traffic Systems, Inc.  
42 Oriental Street  
Providence, Rhode Island 02908  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert G. Salcido  
Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc.  
15020 North 74<sup>th</sup> Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85260  
(w/o enclosures)