



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 20, 2013

Ms. Sarah W. Langlois  
Counsel for Harris County Department of Education  
Rogers, Morris & Grover, L.L.P.  
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2013-16351

Dear Ms. Langlois:

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# 499984.

The Harris County Department of Education (the "department"), which you represent, received two requests for the submitted bids for Exterior School Bus Surveillance Violation Detection System and Related Items and Services, and the breakdown of pricing and scoring for all of the submitted bids. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of American Traffic Solutions, Inc. ("ATS"); Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc. ("Redflex"); Bus Shield, L.L.C. ("Bus Shield"); and TexServe d/b/a Dallas County Schools. Accordingly, you state and provide documentation showing, you have notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the circumstances). We have received comments from ATS, Redflex, and TexServe. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the department's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). In this instance, you state the department received the first request for information on June 27, 2013. We understand the department was closed for business on July 4, 2013. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Thus, we find the department's ten-business-day deadline was July 12, 2013. However, the envelope in which the department submitted the request for a ruling and the requested information bears a meter-mark of July 15, 2013. *See id.* § 552.308(a) (deadline under Act is met if document bears post office mark indicating time within deadline period). Consequently, we find the department failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in regards to the first request.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Because third-party interests are at stake in this instance, we will consider whether the information at issue must be withheld under the Act.

Next, we note 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 letter, we have not received arguments from Bus Shield. Thus, Bus Shield has not demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interest in any of 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 department may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Bus Shield may have in the information.

TexServe raises section 552.101 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory,

or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. We note, however, TexServe has not pointed to any law, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of its information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, none of TexServe’s information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

ATS, Redflex, and TexServe raise section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of governmental body in competitive bidding situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions generally). As the department does not argue section 552.104, we conclude none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that 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 § 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. *See id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

ATS, Redflex, and TexServe each claim portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). We note TexServe has published the identities of its customers on its website, making this information publicly available. Thus, we are unable to find that the information TexServe has published on its website constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). Upon review of the information, we conclude ATS, Redflex, and TexServe have failed to establish a *prima facie* case the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have ATS, Redflex, or TexServe demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; 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, and experience not excepted under section 552.110). 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

---

<sup>1</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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

business.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

ATS, TexServe, and Redflex each claim portions of their information constitute commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause each company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find TexServe has established that release of its pricing information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Furthermore, we find ATS has demonstrated release of portions of its information would cause it substantial competitive harm. Therefore, we find the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, as previously noted, TexServe has published the identities of its customers on its website, making this information publicly available. Thus, TexServe has failed to demonstrate that release of the information it has published on its website would cause it substantial competitive injury. Further, we find ATS, TexServe, and Redflex have made only conclusory allegations that the release of their remaining information would result in substantial damage to their competitive position. Thus, we find ATS, TexServe, and Redflex have failed to demonstrate that the release of any of their remaining information would cause them substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b), and none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find the department must withhold the license plate information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup>We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., S.B. 458, § 1 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov’t Code § 552.130(c)). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130(d), (e).

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that “[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). This office has determined that insurance policy are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(a), 552.110(b), 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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](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,



Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 499984

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. George J. Hittner  
General Counsel  
American Traffic Solutions  
1330 West Southern Avenue  
Tempe, Arizona 85282  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert G. Salcido  
Director of Operations  
Redflex Traffic Systems  
23751 North 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 150  
Phoenix, Arizona 85085-1854  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Greg DeLong  
Bus Shields, LLC  
33 Viller Place  
Destrahan, Louisiana 70047  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Maggie K. Murray  
Counsel for TexServe  
Starasburger  
901 Main Street, Suite 4400  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3794  
(w/o enclosures)