



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 19, 2013

Mr. Glenn Shoemaker  
Records Custodian  
Bell County Communications  
708 West Avenue O  
Belton, Texas 76513

OR2013-22215

Dear Mr. Shoemaker:

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# 509090.

Bell County Communications/9-1-1 (the "county") received a request for specified minutes and agendas of the county Board of Directors and Regulatory Board of Operations Meetings for a specified time period and any information pertaining to the Comprehensive Study and Needs Assessment request for qualifications. You state the county has released some of the requested information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified GeoComm and Mission Critical Partners ("MCP") 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). You have submitted comments from GeoComm and MCP. We have also received arguments from GeoComm. We have considered the submitted comments and reviewed the submitted information.

MCP states its information is confidential and proprietary. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise. As MCP raises no exception to disclosure, the county may not withhold any information on the basis of MCP’s arguments.

GeoComm claims its information is 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(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. See *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); see also Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret). 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.<sup>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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 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) 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 No. 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).

Having considered GeoComm’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine GeoComm has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has GeoComm demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of GeoComm’s submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of GeoComm’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we find GeoComm has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its submitted information would result in substantial damage to GeoComm’s competitive position. Thus, GeoComm has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld

---

<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 also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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). Accordingly, none of GeoComm's submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the materials at issue 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 submitted information must be released, but any information subject to 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,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 509090

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Heather Hoskins  
Controller  
GeoComm  
601 West St. Germain Street  
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Jones, ENP  
Mission Critical Partners  
2920 West Southlake Boulevard, Suite 120  
Southlake, Texas 76092  
(w/o enclosures)