



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2014

Ms. Heather Stebbins  
Kerr County Attorney  
County of Kerr  
700 Main Street, Suite BA-103  
Kerrville, Texas 78028

OR2014-15065

Dear Ms. Stebbins:

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# 534503.

The Kerr County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for (1) all proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposal; (2) scoring documents pertaining to the same request for proposal; (3) any communications, including e-mails, letters, and faxes pertaining to the determination of the award; and (4) a copy of the winning contract.<sup>1</sup> You state you do not have some information.<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Securus Technologies ("Securus"), City Tele-Coin Company, Inc., Legacy Inmate

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the sheriff's office sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Communications, and Infinity Networks. Accordingly, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of each company's 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 Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Securus. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks information created after the date the request was received. It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the present request consists of information the sheriff's office maintained or had a right of access to as of the date it received the request.

Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect the interests of a governmental body in certain competitive situations, including competitive bidding. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Moreover, section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). Generally, section 552.104 does not except bids from disclosure after bidding is completed and the contract has been executed. *See id.*

You state release of the information would give an advantage to a competitor or bidder. You further state the entity requesting the documents would gain an unfair advantage. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how release of the submitted information would specifically harm the sheriff's office interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

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 only received comments from Securus explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *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. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in the information.

We note Securus argues against disclosure of information not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the sheriff's office has submitted to us for our review. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit a copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the sheriff's office submitted as responsive to the request for information.

The sheriff's office argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. However, this section is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the sheriff's office's arguments under section 552.110. However, Securus argues portions of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Therefore, we will discuss Securus's arguments. 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 *id.* § 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 ORD 552. 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>3</sup> 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* 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* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Securus argues portions of its information consist of trade secrets. Upon review, however, we find Securus has failed to demonstrate any of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Thus, none of Securus’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of Securus’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we find Securus has not demonstrated the release of its information at issue would result in substantial damage to the company’s competitive position. *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,

---

<sup>3</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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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 Securus's information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note portions 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. Thus, the sheriff's office must release the submitted information, but may only release any information that is protected by copyright 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,



Lauren Dahlstein  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LMD/som

Ref: ID# 534503

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew M. Jones  
Corporate Counsel  
Securus Technologies  
14651 Dallas Parkway, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75254-8815  
(w/o enclosures)

Legacy Inmate Communications  
c/o Heather Stebbins  
Kerr County Attorney  
County of Kerr  
700 Main Street, Suite BA-103  
Kerrville, Texas 78028  
(w/o enclosures)

City Tele-Coin Company, Inc.  
c/o Heather Stebbins  
Kerr County Attorney  
County of Kerr  
700 Main Street, Suite BA-103  
Kerrville, Texas 78028  
(w/o enclosures)

Infinity Networks  
c/o Heather Stebbins  
Kerr County Attorney  
County of Kerr  
700 Main Street, Suite BA-103  
Kerrville, Texas 78028  
(w/o enclosures)