



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 7, 2014

Ms. Kerri L. Butcher
Chief Counsel
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2910 East Fifth Street
Austin, Texas 78702

OR2014-03939

Dear Ms. Butcher:

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# 516415.

Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority (the "authority") received a request for information related to "Executive Recruiting Services, RFP 127706[.]" including the winning proposal, the resulting contract, and evaluator's notes or rating sheets on all submitted proposals. You state the authority will release some responsive information. Although the authority takes no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state the proprietary interests of Krauthamer & Associates, Inc. ("Krauthamer"), might be implicated. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, you notified this third party of the request and of its right to submit comments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *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 under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Krauthamer. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Krauthamer asserts its information should be withheld because the company expected confidentiality when the information was submitted to the authority. Information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a

governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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, which holds a trade secret to be:

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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.¹ This office must accept a claim that

¹The 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 Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).*

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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (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. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 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).

Upon review, we find Krauthamer has established a *prima facie* case that some of its information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Krauthamer has also established a *prima facie* case that some of its customer information constitutes trade secret information. Therefore, the authority must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The authority must also generally withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, Krauthamer has failed to demonstrate any customer identities that have been published on its website constitute trade secret information. Accordingly, to the extent any of the customer information Krauthamer seeks to withhold has been published on the company’s website, such information is not confidential under section 552.110(a). Further, we find Krauthamer has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Krauthamer demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information. *See* ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We note 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; *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of Krauthamer’s remaining information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Krauthamer argues the remaining information consists of commercial or financial information the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm

under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note Krauthamer was the winning bidder in this instance. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, 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* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). In addition, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990). Further, to the extent any of the customer identities Krauthamer seeks to withhold have been published on its website, we find Krauthamer has failed to establish release of such information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find Krauthamer has not established any of the remaining information constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the authority must withhold the information we have marked and any customer information not published on Krauthamer's website pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The authority 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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 516415

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregg Moser
Krauthamer & Associates, Inc.
5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1202
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815
(w/o enclosures)