



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 30, 2010

Mr. John B. Dahill
General Counsel
North Texas Tollway Authority
5900 West Plano Parkway, Suite 100
Plano, Texas 75093

OR2010-19540

Dear Mr. Dahill:

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# 404595.

The North Texas Tollway Authority (the "authority") received a request for the proposals, scores, and rankings for a specified request for qualifications. You claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. In addition, you state some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you have notified Jacobs Engineering, Inc. ("Jacobs") and HNTB Corporation ("HNTB") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (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 HNTB. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we understand HNTB argues that none of the submitted information is responsive since the requestor has specifically excluded from her request references to "insurance, financial, or similar sensitive information." We note a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information that it holds. *See* Open Records Decision

No. 561 at (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). The submitted information consists of the requested proposals and evaluation information. Accordingly, we conclude the authority has made a good-faith effort to relate this request to responsive information. Therefore, we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Next, 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, we have not received any arguments from Jacobs. Thus, we have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information pertaining to Jacobs constitutes proprietary information, and the authority may not withhold any portion of their information on that basis. *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, 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.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an 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. This exception 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, no writ); 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 that 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. *See* ORD 615 at 5. 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. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). 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). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* 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 that Exhibit B consists of evaluation sheets relating to the authority's possible selection of a program management consultant ("PMC"). You contend that this information is subject to section 552.111 because it is intertwined with "the related policy questions of (1) the fundamental business model of the [authority] regarding in-house and outsourced engineering resources; (2) the scope of work of the PMC relative to the scope of the [authority's] general engineering consultant . . .; and (3) the transition of projects currently in progress." Upon review, we agree the information at issue represents the advice, opinion, and recommendations of the authority concerning matters of policy. Accordingly, the authority may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.111 of the Government Code.¹

HNTB asserts all of its submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of governmental body in competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the authority does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find section 552.104 is not applicable to HNTB's information. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

HNTB further argues its submitted 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

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we do not consider HNTB's arguments for this information.

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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that 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 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* ORD 661 at 5 (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).

²The 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

HNTB asserts its information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude HNTB has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find HNTB has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of HNTB's information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

HNTB further argues its submitted information contains commercial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find HNTB has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its 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 that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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, none of HNTB's information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

In summary, the authority may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/eeg

Ref: ID# 404595

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David C, Kent
Sedwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold LLP
1717 Main Street, Suite 5400
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Darrell Thompson
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
7950 Elmbrook Drive
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)