



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 2, 2014

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

OR2014-17551

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# 538119 (DART ORR# 10935).

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for "the evaluation sheets and a copy of the winning proposal" relating to a specified request for proposals. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining submitted information, you state release of the information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, you notified LTK Engineering Services ("LTK") of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We received comments from an attorney on behalf of LTK. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]" Gov't Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. ORD 615 at 5; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). However, a governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; ORD 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state some of the submitted information consists of evaluation criteria and evaluation results from DART's procurement officers for solicitation P-2009844. You explain the evaluations are an internal function of DART's procurement department and contain evaluators' advice and opinions. Thus, you indicate these documents pertain to DART's policymaking functions. You state release of the information at issue would prevent open discussion of these types of matters by DART evaluators. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the submitted evaluation materials constitute advice, opinion, and recommendation on policymaking matters. Thus, DART may withhold the submitted evaluation materials under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

LTK raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. However, LTK has not pointed to any statutory confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make this information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, DART may not withhold any of LTK's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions to disclosure under the Act.

LTK asserts some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This 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

---

<sup>2</sup>LTK does not object to release of the submitted resumes.

<sup>3</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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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).

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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find LTK has established a *prima facie* case some of its information, including customer information, constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a).<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, to the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on the company’s website, DART must withhold LTK’s customer information and the information we have marked under section 552.110(a). However, LTK failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has LTK demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 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). Consequently, none of LTK’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

LTK further argues the remaining information at issue consists of commercial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find LTK has failed to demonstrate substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information. *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 that 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). Accordingly, DART may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

---

<sup>4</sup>In this case, customer information consists of customer name, location, and contact information.

In summary, DART may withhold the submitted evaluation materials under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on the company's website, DART must withhold LTK's customer information and the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. DART must release the remaining information, including any customer information publicly available on LTK's website.

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](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# 538119

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas J. Williams  
Haynes and Boone, L.L.P.  
201 Main Street, Suite 2200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(w/o enclosures)