



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

August 25, 2009

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

OR2009-11957

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# 353395.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received requests from two requestors for information pertaining to a specified solicitation, including information pertaining to the contracts awarded. You state you have released some of the requested information. Although you take no position as to the disclosure of the submitted information, you state that release of the information may implicate the proprietary interests of DMJM Harris, Inc. ("DMJM") and Southwest Research Institute ("SRI"). You notified DMJM and SRI of these requests for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from both DMJM and SRI. We have considered their arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

DMJM and SRI argue that their information is excepted from disclosure under 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 trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *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>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of

---

<sup>1</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 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 [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).

law. See ORD 552 at 5. 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. *Id.*; see also Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

We understand DMJM to claim portions and SRI to claim all of their information are trade secrets excepted under section 552.110(a). Having considered DMJM’s and SRI’s arguments, we conclude that they have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information in their respective proposals falls within the definition of a trade secret. DMJM and SRI have also not established any of the trade secret factors with respect to any of their information. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Thus, none of DMJM’s and SRI’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Both DMJM and SRI claim that release of their information would cause their respective companies substantial competitive harm. Thus, we understand them to contend their information is excepted under section 552.110(b). Among other things, SRI argues the release of its information could deter vendors such as SRI from competing for government contracts, so as to lessen competition for such contracts and deprive governmental entities in future procurements. In advancing this argument, SRI appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). See also *Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm’n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. See *Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration the release of the information in question would cause the

business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only SRI's and DMJM's interests in their information.

Upon review, we find DMJM and SRI have made only conclusory allegations that release of their information would cause them substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; ORD 661 at 5-6 (business entity must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, experience, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We further note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as DMJM and SRI, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *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 reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, we conclude that none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the submitted information must be released.

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 [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Greg Henderson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

GH/rl

Ref: ID#353395

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: R.B. Kalmbach  
Southwest Research Institute  
PO Box 28510  
San Antonio, Texas 78728  
(w/o enclosures)

Christopher J. Karpathy  
Southwest Regional Legal Counsel  
AECOM  
5757 Woodway Drive, Suite 101 West  
Houston, Texas 77057-1599  
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. Robert Edelstein  
Vice President, National ITS Practice Leader  
DMJM Harris, Inc.  
400 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 500  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)