



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 8, 2020

Ms. Ashley Smith
Office of Procurement Services
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, 3FN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-10561

Dear Ms. Smith:

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# 818068 (ORR# C000067).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for a specified contract, including pricing and proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of American Facility Services, Inc.; Andrew's Building Services, Inc.; Diverse Facility Solutions, Inc.; Facility Services Group, Inc.; Member's Building Maintenance, LLC ("Member's"); Oriental Building Services, Inc. ("Oriental"); RAS Services, Inc.; and UBM Enterprise, Inc. ("UBM"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the requests 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). We have received comments from Member's, Oriental, and UBM. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 ruling, we have not received comments from the remaining third parties. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in 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 city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Oriental and UBM raise section 552.104 of the Government Code for portions of their information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information “if a governmental body demonstrates that release of the information would harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a) (emphasis added). In *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015), the Texas Supreme Court held section 552.104 does not preclude third parties from raising section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. *See Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 842. However, the Eighty-sixth Legislature has amended section 552.104 since the issuance of *Boeing*. *See* Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3. Section 552.104 now expressly limits the protections of section 552.104 to governmental bodies. Gov’t Code 552.104(a). Therefore, we do not address Oriental’s or UBM’s arguments under section 552.104.

Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “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[.]” *Id.* § 552.110(c). Member’s, Oriental, and UBM also argue some of their information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find Oriental and Member’s have demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to their respective companies. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information pertaining to Oriental we marked and the customer information pertaining to Member’s under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the customer information of Member’s and Oriental is publicly available on the companies’ websites, the city may not withhold such information under section 552.110(c).¹ However, we find Member’s and UBM have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states, “[e]xcept as provided by [s]ection 552.0222, information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See id.*

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

§ 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

- (1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and
- (2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). Member's, Oriental, and UBM argue some of their information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find Oriental has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute trade secrets. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Member's, Oriental, and UBM have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1101 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

- (a) . . . [I]nformation submitted to a governmental body by a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor in response to a request for a bid, proposal, or qualification is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor that the information relates to demonstrates based on specific factual evidence that disclosure of the information would:
 - (1) reveal an individual approach to:
 - (A) work;
 - (B) organizational structure;
 - (C) staffing;
 - (D) internal operations;
 - (E) processes; or
 - (F) discounts, pricing methodology, pricing per kilowatt hour, cost data, or other pricing information that will be used in future solicitation or bid documents; and
 - (2) give advantage to a competitor.

Id. § 552.1101(a). Member's and UBM assert disclosure of some of their information would reveal an individual approach to their work, organizational structure, operations, staffing, and methodology and give advantage to a competitor. However, upon review, we find Member's and UBM have failed to provide the specific factual evidence necessary to withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.1101(a), and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[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."² *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining 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 city must withhold the information pertaining to Oriental we marked and the customer information pertaining to Member's under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the customer information of Member's and Oriental is publicly available on the companies' websites, the city may not withhold such information under section 552.110(c). The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open

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

Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/eb

Ref: ID# 818068

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

7 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)