



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 30, 2007

Ms. Mary D. Marquez  
Legal/Records Manager  
Capital Metro Transportation Authority  
2910 East Fifth Street  
Austin, Texas 78702

OR2007-11289

Dear Ms. Marquez:

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# 288160.

The Capital Metro Transportation Authority (the "authority") received two requests for information related to RFP No. 109376 Freight and Urban Commuter Rail Operations and Maintenance. You state that some responsive information has been released. You claim that portions of the submitted proposals are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. You also indicate that release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of certain third parties. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the interested third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released.<sup>1</sup> *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (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 section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances).* We have considered the exceptions claimed and reviewed the submitted information.

Bombardier, TransitAmerica, Veolia, and WGI all claim that portions of their information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information

---

<sup>1</sup>The third parties that were notified pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: Bombardier Transportation ("Bombardier"); TransitAmerica Services, Inc. ("TransitAmerica"); Veolia Transportation Services, Inc. ("Veolia"); and Washington Group International ("WGI").

the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Gov't Code § 552.110.

Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that

---

<sup>2</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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

section 552.110(a) applies 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also* *National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Upon review, we determine that WGI has made a *prima facie* showing that some of its information constitutes a trade secret. Furthermore, we have received no arguments that rebut this company’s trade secret claims as a matter of law. Accordingly, the authority must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a). However, we determine that no part of the remaining information for which WGI asserts section 552.110(a) constitutes a trade secret, and thus may not be withheld on this basis. We also find that Bombardier, TransitAmerica, and Veolia have all failed to make a *prima facie* case that any of the submitted information belonging to these companies constitutes a trade secret. Thus, no portion of the information pertaining to these three companies may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Next, we find that Bombardier and TransitAmerica have demonstrated that release of portions of their information would cause those companies substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, we have marked the information in Bombardier’s and TransitAmerica’s proposals that must be withheld under section 552.110(b). However, we conclude that Bombardier, TransitAmerica, Veolia, and WGI have made only conclusory allegations and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support their allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause their companies substantial competitive injury. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110; *see also, e.g.*, 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), 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 is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Additionally, we note that pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Veolia in this instance, 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).

You raise section 552.136 of the Government Code, which provides as follows:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding 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.

Gov't Code § 552.136. We have marked the type of information that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that portions of the remaining information appear to 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. 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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the information we have marked must be withheld pursuant to sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the authority must comply with copyright law.

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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 288160

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Marie-Claude Galarnau  
Bombardier Transportation  
1101 Parent Street  
St-Bruno, Quebec  
Canada J3V 6E6  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Raymond V. Lanman  
TransitAmerica Services, Inc.  
600 South Riverside Road  
St. Joseph, Missouri 64507  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Doug Brigham  
Senior Vice President  
Washington Group International  
720 Park Boulevard  
Boise, Idaho 83712  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael D. Moody  
1250 Capital of Texas  
Highway South  
Building One, Suite 420  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ronald J. Hartman  
Senior Vice President  
Veolia Transportation Services, Inc.  
2015 Spring Road, Suite 750  
Oak Brook, Illinois 60523  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John T. Hoeff  
Vice President and General Counsel  
Veolia Transportation Services, Inc.  
14275 Midway Road, Suite 220  
Addison, Texas 75001  
(w/o enclosures)