



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2005

Ms. Sharon Alexander
Associate General Counsel
Texas Department of Transportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2005-03486

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 222302.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information relating to a certain request for proposals. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.110. Further, you state that the request may involve third party interests. Accordingly, you indicate and provide documentation showing that, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified ACS State and Local Solutions, Inc. ("ACS"), Washington Group International ("Washington"), and TransCore of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments explaining why the information concerning them should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from ACS and Washington. We have also received correspondence from Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation ("ETC") and W.P. Engineering Consultants ("W.P."), subcontractors under the Washington proposal. We have considered all claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, TransCore has

not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect its proprietary interests. Therefore, TransCore has provided us with no basis to determine that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). We therefore determine the proposal submitted by TransCore is not excepted from disclosure.

We next address ACS's argument that the resumes and "project employee" information submitted with its proposal are excepted under section 552.102 of the Government Code. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). Information is protected under the common law right to privacy when (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. The submitted resumes of ACS employees do not contain information considered highly intimate or embarrassing. In addition, we note that telephone numbers, addresses, and personal information are ordinarily not private information subject to section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986). Therefore, the resumes of ACS personnel may not be withheld under sections 552.101 or 552.102 in conjunction with the common law right to privacy. Further, section 552.102 applies only to the personnel records of public employees, not the records of private employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The submitted resumes pertain to private employees and, as such, section 552.102 is inapplicable to that information.

Next, ACS, Washington, ETC and W.P. raise section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990).

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. 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

ACS and Washington assert that specified portions of the submitted information qualify as trade secrets under section 552.110(a). ACS, Washington, ETC, and W.P. also argue that portions of the information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). Upon review of the submitted information and arguments submitted by ACS and Washington, we find that each has presented a *prima facie* case that portions of the information that each seeks to withhold are protected as trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Moreover, we have received no arguments to rebut these claims as a matter of law. Under section 552.110(b), we find that ETC and W.P. have sufficiently shown that the release of their financial statements would be likely to cause ETC and W.P. substantial competitive harm. We have therefore marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.110. We find that ACS and Washington have failed to show that any of the remaining information that each seeks to withhold is protected as trade secret under section 552.110(a).¹ We also find that ACS and Washington have not made the showing required by section 552.110(b) that the release of any of the remaining information at issue would be likely to cause ACS or Washington any substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that none of the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 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 was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to

¹We note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision No. 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company).

organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing).

Finally, we note that portions of the information 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 protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials protected by copyright, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released in accordance with copyright law to the extent it applies.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 222302

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert Seiler
Barton Solutions
3333 West Commercial Boulevard, Suite 115
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John M. Worthington
President and Chief Executive Officer
Transcore
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael P. Huerta
Senior Vice President and Managing Director
ACS State and Local Solutions, Inc.
1200 K Street, NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20005
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Norman B. White
Director, Toll Services
Washington Group International
800 Fairway Drive, Suite 260
Deerfield Beach, Florida 33441
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Bolduc
Stumpf, Craddock, Massey & Farrimond, P.C.
1250 Capital of Texas Highway South
Building One, Suite 420
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Timothy O. Gallger
Electronic Transaction Consultants
1200 Executive Drive East, Suite 100
Richardson, Texas 75081
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. M. Scott Cooper
Senior Vice President
W.P. Engineering Consultants, Inc.
650 North Sam Houston Parkway East, Suite 220
Houston, Texas 77060
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew T. McKinney, IV
McKinney & Cooper, L.L.P.
24 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1506
Houston, Texas 77046
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Spencer Bartlett
Haynes and Boone, L.L.P.
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 1300
Austin, Texas 78701-3285
(w/o enclosures)