



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 2, 2016

Ms. Jacqueline E. Hojem  
Public Information Coordinator  
Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County  
P.O. Box 61429  
Houston, Texas 77208-1429

OR2016-09807

Dear Ms. Hojem:

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# 608100 (MTA No. 2016-0192).

The Metropolitan Transit Authority (the "authority") received a request for information pertaining to a specified audit performed by MuniServices, LLC ("Muni"). The authority informs us it has released some information. Although the authority takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the authority informs us release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Muni; Kasner & Associates ("K&A"); and Goldsmith Consultants ("Goldsmith"). Accordingly, the authority states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 have received comments from a representative of Muni. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note Muni seeks to withhold information not submitted to this office by the authority. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information submitted by the governmental body requesting the ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Because this information was not submitted

by the authority, this ruling does not address this information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the authority.

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from K&A and Goldsmith explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude either third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest K&A or Goldsmith may have in the information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not exempted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The authority must release the information at issue, which we have marked, pursuant to subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless it is exempted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Muni seeks to withhold the information at issue under section 552.116 of the Government Code. However, section 552.116 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.116 of the Government Code. However, Muni also raises section 552.110 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential under the Act. Accordingly, we will consider the applicability of section 552.110 to the information subject to section 552.022. We will also address the applicability of this section to the remaining information.

Muni asserts its information is exempted 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.<sup>1</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 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).

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,

---

<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 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).

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 (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).

Muni argues its information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find Muni has established a *prima facie* case the information we have marked constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find Muni has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORDs 402, 319 at 3. 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, none of Muni’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Muni claims its remaining information constitutes commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find Muni has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its remaining information would cause it substantial competitive injury. *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), 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). We note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Muni, 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; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted from disclosure 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 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Therefore, none of Muni’s 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 under 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](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,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/bhf

Ref: ID# 608100

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)