



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 17, 2022

Ms. Aliceson Cotton  
Counsel for the City of Frisco  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75069

OR2022-14072

Dear Ms. Cotton:

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# 948067 (ORR# G055112).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of Mister Sweeper, LP ("Mister Sweeper"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city notified Mister Sweeper of the request for information and of its 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 submitted by Mister Sweeper. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor asks the city to answer questions. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer factual questions, conduct legal research, or create new information in responding to a request. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990),

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the city 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) (holding that when 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).

555 at 1-2 (1990). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to any responsive information that is within its possession or control. Open Records Decision Nos. 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 102. We assume the city has made a good-faith effort to do so.

Mister Sweeper raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for some of its 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 Mister Sweeper’s argument under section 552.104.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states “information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See* Gov’t Code § 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). Mister Sweeper argues some of its information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find Mister Sweeper 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, to the extent the customer information is made available to the public by Mister Sweeper, including but not limited to on its website or social media accounts, it may not be withheld under 552.110(b).<sup>2</sup> Further, we find Mister Sweeper 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 remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(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). Mister Sweeper asserts disclosure of some of its information would reveal an individual approach to staffing and give advantage to a competitor. Upon review, we find Mister Sweeper has demonstrated the applicability of section 552.1101(a) to some of the information at issue. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1101(a) of the Government Code.

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.”<sup>3</sup> *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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the customer information is made available to the public by Mister Sweeper, including but not limited to on its website or social media accounts, it may not be withheld under 552.110(b). The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1101(a) 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.

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 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,

Joseph Hoggatt  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JWH/jxd

Ref: ID# 948067

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)