



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 6, 2020

Ms. Mary Kay Fischer
City Attorney
City of Friendswood
910 South Friendswood Drive
Friendswood, Texas 77546

OR2020-12784

Dear Ms. Fischer:

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# 826512 (W012178-021820).

The City of Friendswood (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to requests for proposals for janitorial services during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified American Janitorial Services, Ltd. ("AJS"); A Veterans Touch, LLC; Federal Building Services, Inc.; FJH Custodial Services LLC; GMW Quality Cleaning Solutions; Kemp and Son's General Services; Lim Service Industries; and Maintenance of Houston, Inc. 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). We have received comments from AJS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you only submitted information pertaining to request for proposals 2016-06. Thus, to the extent any additional responsive information existed when the present request was received, we assume it has been released. If such information has not been released, then it must be released at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302;

see also Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the remaining third parties at issue explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties at issue have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties at issue may have in it.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that a governmental body demonstrates, if released, 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). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.104 to the information at issue. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.104(a).

AJS also raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for portions of its information. As noted above, 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*, 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 AJS's arguments under section 552.104.

Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

(c) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, 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 is [excepted from required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). We understand AJS to argue some of its information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). However, we find some of the submitted information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(c). Additionally, we find AJS has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating 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 submitted 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.* § 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). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). We understand AJS to argue some of its remaining information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(b). Additionally, we find AJS has 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 submitted information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

AJS also argues its information fits the definition of a trade secret found in section 134A.002(6) of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code of the Texas Uniform Trade Secrets Act (the “TUTSA”). Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 134A.002(6) provides:

- (6) “Trade secret” means all forms and types of information, including business, scientific, technical, economic, or engineering information, and

any formula, design, prototype, pattern, plan, compilation, program device, program, code, device, method, technique, process, procedure, financial data, or list of actual or potential customers or suppliers, whether tangible or intangible and whether or how stored, compiled, or memorialized physically, electronically, graphically, photographically, or in writing if:

(A) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and

(B) 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.

Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 134A.002(6). We note the legislative history of TUTSA indicates it was enacted to provide a framework for litigating trade secret issues and provide injunctive relief or damages in uniformity with other states. Senate Research Center, Bill Analysis, S.B. 953, 83rd Leg., R.S. (2013) (enrolled version). Section 134A.002(6)'s definition of trade secret expressly applies to chapter 134A only, not the Act, and does not expressly make any information confidential. *See* Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 134A.002(6); *see also id.* § 134A.007(d) (TUTSA does not affect disclosure of public information by governmental body under the Act). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998), 478 at 2 (1987), 465 at 4-5 (1987). Confidentiality cannot be implied from the structure of a statute or rule. *See* ORD 465 at 4-5. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of AJS's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 134A.002(6) of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining submitted information.

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.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 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,

Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/gw

Ref: ID# 826512

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)