



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

May 24, 2011

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

OR2011-07344

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# 418911.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received two requests for the bid tabulation for RFO BID #B442011006946000. The department takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of 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 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 arguments from M&A Technology, Inc. ("M&A"). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge the department failed to meet the deadlines prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting an open records decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government

Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential by law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake, we will address whether the submitted information must be withheld to protect the interests of the third parties.

We 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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received arguments from M&A.¹ We, thus, have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes the other companies' proprietary information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of the non-briefing third parties.

M&A argues some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code.² Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). The department did not assert section 552.104. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.104. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

M&A also claims section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, which protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't

¹The remaining third parties you have notified are as follows: Checkpoint Services, Inc.; Dell Marketing LP; Prime Systems, Inc; Texas Electronic Information Computer Corporation; and Xnet Systems, Inc.

²Although M&A also raises section 552.021 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, we note this provision is not an exception to disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.021 (providing public information is available during normal business hours).

Code § 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* ORD 552. 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.³ 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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). Upon review of its arguments, we find M&A has failed to demonstrate that its information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has M&A demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Thus, none of M&A's information may be withheld under section 552.110(a)

³The 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).

of the Government Code. 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). As no further exceptions to its 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, 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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/em

Ref: ID# 418911

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher Kalis
Attorney for M&A Technology, Inc.
5160 Village Creek Drive, Suite 100
Plano, Texas 75093
(w/o enclosures)

Texas Electronic Information Computer Corporation
1315 Price Plaza Drive
Katy, Texas 77449
(w/o enclosures)

Dell Marketing LP
One Dell Way - Building 8
Round Rock, Texas 78682
(w/o enclosures)

Xnet Systems, Inc.
14503 Bammel North Houston Road, Suite 220
Houston, Texas 77014
(w/o enclosures)