



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 17, 2004

Ms. Mary D. Marquez
Legal/Records Manager
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2910 East Fifth Street
Austin, Texas 78702

OR2004-7977

Dear Ms. Marquez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 209557.

The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Capital Metro") received six requests for certain information related to a specified request for proposals. You state that Capital Metro has released a portion of the requested information to the requestors.¹ Capital Metro takes no position with regard to the release of the remaining requested information. However, you have notified seven interested third parties of the requests for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code.² 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 that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act ("Act") in certain circumstances). Capital Metro has submitted the information at issue to this office. We also received correspondence from Connex, First Transit, McDonald, and New Century. We have considered their arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also

¹You note that the Greater Austin Transportation Co. ("Greater Austin") has notified Capital Metro that it does not object to the release of its information.

²The interested third parties you notified are: Connex South LLC ("Connex"); First Transit Inc. ("First Transit"); Greater Austin; Laidlaw Transit Services, Inc. ("Laidlaw"); MV Transportation, Inc. ("MV"); McDonald Transit Associates, Inc. ("McDonald"); and New Century Transportation ("New Century").

considered comments submitted by one of the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that person may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

In regard to the request for information dated June 30, 2004, we note that Capital Metro has not sought an open records decision from this office within ten business days of its receipt of this request as prescribed by section 552.301. *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 procedural 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* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Thus, we will address the arguments submitted by the interested third parties in regard to the information responsive to all six requests.

Connex and First Transit assert that portions of their information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). Section 552.104 excepts information from disclosure if a governmental body demonstrates that the release of the information would cause potential specific harm to the governmental body's interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). Capital Metro has not argued that the release of the submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, the submitted information related to Connex and First Transit may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, we understand that Connex, First Transit, McDonald, and New Century assert section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (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).

Having reviewed the submitted briefs, we conclude that First Transit and New Century have established that a portion of their information is excepted under section 552.110. We have marked the information that Capital Metro must withhold. However, we conclude that New Century has not demonstrated that the remainder its information qualifies as trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, nor have Connex and McDonald made such a demonstration in regard to their information.³ *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We also find that First Transit and New Century have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of the remainder of their information would likely result in substantial competitive harm to them, nor have Connex and McDonald made such a showing in regard to their information. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that 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 was entirely too speculative). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, Capital Metro must withhold only the information we have marked.

Additionally, we note that a portion of New Century’s information is confidential under section 552.136 of the Government Code, which states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. Thus, pursuant to this section, Capital Metro must withhold the account number we have marked.

Finally, 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) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision Laidlaw and MV have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be

³First Transit does not assert section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

released. Therefore, these parties have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See, e.g.*, Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Therefore, the remaining submitted information must be released.

In summary, we conclude that Capital Metro must withhold the information we have marked in the proposals of First Transit and New Century under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. All remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WMM/krl

Ref: ID# 209557

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Keith Whalen
Executive Vice President
MV Transportation, Inc.
360 Campus Lane, Suite 201
Fairfield, California 94534
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Melissa Winkler
New Century Transportation
645 Horning Street
San Jose, California 95112
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Rude
Manager of Business Development
Laidlaw Transit Services, Inc.
5360 College Blvd., Suite 200
Overland Park, Kansas 66211
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Connolly
Greater Austin Transportation Co.
10315 McKalla Pl.
Austin, Texas 78758
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael L. Petrucci
Associate General Counsel
FirstGroup America, Inc.
705 Central Avenue, Suite 300
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin J. Adams
President
Connex South LLC
10511-B Hardin Valley Road
Knoxville, Tennessee 37932
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert T. Babbitt
President
McDonald Transit Associates, Inc.
4500 Mercantile Plaza, Suite 307
Fort Worth, Texas 76137
(w/o enclosures)