



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 12, 2007

Mr. Hyattye O. Simmons  
General Counsel  
Dallas Area Rapid Transit  
P.O. Box 660163  
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2007-08848

Dear Mr. Simmons:

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#283830.

The Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for the following: (1) a copy of all contracts between the City of Dallas, DART, contractors or general contractors in regards to a specified permit; and (2) a copy of all trench safety plans in regard to a specified permit. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.110 of the Government Code. Further, you claim that the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Archer Western Herzog JV ("AWHJV") of DART's receipt of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *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 considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the applicability of section 552.007 of the Government Code to the requested information. You inform us that Attachment C was previously released to the public. Section 552.007 provides that if a governmental body voluntarily releases

information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law. See Gov't Code 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); see also Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). As you acknowledge, section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception under the Act, and does not constitute law that makes information confidential or expressly prohibits its release for purposes of section 552.007. See *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). Accordingly, DART must release Attachment C to the requestor.

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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, AWHJV has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Therefore, AWHJV has failed to provide us with any basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information, and none of the information may be withheld on that basis. See 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 (1990).

DART informs us that AWHJV requests that the information at issue not be released as it is confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Next, we find that portions of Attachment B are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code and have marked the documents accordingly. Section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from required disclosure unless they “are expressly confidential under other law.” Gov't Code § 552.022. Under section 552.022(a)(3), information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt

or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body is public unless it is expressly confidential under other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Thus, DART may only withhold this information if it is confidential under other law. Although the city raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information at issue, we note that section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to public disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally). However, we will consider DART's arguments under section 552.110, as that exception is other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022.

Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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 (1939). This office has held that if

---

<sup>1</sup>The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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

a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[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). Section 552.110(b) requires a *specific factual or evidentiary showing*, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

After reviewing the arguments and the information at issue, we find that DART has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* ORD 552 at 5-6; *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if 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”). We also determine that DART has failed to demonstrate that the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to AWHJV for section 552.110 purposes. Further, as previously noted, AWHJV has submitted no arguments to this office explaining how release of the information at issue would affect its proprietary interests. Consequently, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code and must be released to the requestor.

We will now address the information that is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or

---

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

employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). DART has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103 exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that DART received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). DART must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor that this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances.

You state, and provide documentation showing, that you received two notice letters prior to the date you received this request for information from two law firms regarding the fatality accident. You state that the law firms represent the family members of the deceased individual. We note, however, that you have not represented that this notice of claim statement meets the requirements of the TTCA. Therefore, we will only consider the claim statement as a factor in determining whether the department reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we agree that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the request was received. Furthermore, we find that the submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a).

Accordingly, DART may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982). We therefore conclude that, other than information to which the parties to the litigation have already had access, DART may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

In summary, DART must release the information we have marked pursuant to sections 552.007 and 552.022 of the Government Code. DART may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Holly R. Davis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

HRD/eeg

Ref: ID# 283830

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Douglas O. Crewse, CFE  
Investigative Associates, Inc.  
5104 Abbey Glen Drive  
Flower Mound, Texas 75028  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenny Crabb  
Archer Western Herzgoz JV  
1401 Pacific Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(w/o enclosures)