



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 1, 2014

Ms. Halfreda Anderson-Nelson
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2014-05406

Dear Ms. Anderson-Nelson:

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# 518188 (DART ORR 10461).

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for vendor proposal submissions for solicitation #P-2000101. You state, although DART takes no position with respect to the remaining requested information, its release may implicate the interests of Dilax Systems Inc. ("Dilax"); Trapeze Software Group, Inc. ("Trapeze"); and Urban Transportation Associates, Inc. ("UTA"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, DART notified the companies of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments stating why their information 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); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We received comments from Trapeze and UTA. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received any arguments from Dilax. Thus, Dilax has not

demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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, DART may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Dilax may have in the information.

Trapeze and UTA each argues some of its 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, 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 RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This

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;

office must accept a claim 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 section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular 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.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

Trapeze and UTA assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Trapeze has demonstrated the information we have marked constitutes trade secrets. Thus, DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a). Further, to the extent the client information is not publicly available on Trapeze’s website, DART must withhold the client information at issue under section 552.110(a). However, we conclude Trapeze and UTA have failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Trapeze and UTA further argue portions of their information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Trapeze and UTA have demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, DART must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Trapeze and UTA have made only conclusory

-
- (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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

allegations the release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial harm to their competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Furthermore, we note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as UTA, 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* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Finally, we note some of the remaining information appears to be subject to copyright law. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Further, to the extent the client information is not publicly available on Trapeze's website, DART must withhold the client information at issue under section 552.110(a). DART must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. DART must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 518188

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John C. Greiner
Counsel for Urban Transportation
Associates, Inc.
Graydon, Head & Ritchey, L.L.P.
1900 Fifth Third Center
511 Walnut Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dimitar Demirevski
Legal Counsel
Trapeze Software Group, Inc.
5800 Explorer Drive, 5th Floor
Mississauga, Ontario L4W 5K9
Canada
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alexander OkaPoo
President
Dilax Systems
6 Desaulniers, Suite 406
Saint-Lambert, Quebec J4P 1L3
Canada
(w/o enclosures)