



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

May 13, 2011

Mr. Lee F. Christie
Pope, Hardwicke, Christie, Schell, Kelly & Ray, L.L.P.
901 Fort Worth Club Building
306 West 7th Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-4995

OR2011-06706

Dear Mr. Christie:

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# 417457.

The Tarrant Regional Water District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the four construction manager at risk proposals submitted for the Richland-Chambers Phase II Wetlands Expansion Project. Although you raise no exceptions to disclosure of the submitted information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Allco; CH2M Hill; McCarthy Building Companies, Inc. ("McCarthy"); and S.J. Louis Construction of Texas Ltd. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the district notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* 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 certain circumstances). We received arguments from McCarthy. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted proposals.

We first note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to the third party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from Allco, CH2M Hill, and S.J. Louis Construction of Texas Ltd. Thus, because these third parties have not demonstrated that any of the requested

information is proprietary for the purposes of the Act, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of the proprietary interests of these companies. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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.

McCarthy raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of its information. 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 (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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a

¹The 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 others involved in [the company's] business;

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 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. *See* 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 5-6 (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).

Upon review, we find some of McCarthy’s customer information constitutes trade secrets. Thus, the district must withhold the information we have marked in McCarthy’s proposal under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we note McCarthy has made the identities of most of the customers it seeks to withhold publicly available on its website. Thus, McCarthy has failed to demonstrate the information published on its website is a trade secret. Further, we conclude McCarthy has failed to demonstrate that any of its remaining submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has McCarthy demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of McCarthy’s arguments under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, we find McCarthy has established that the release of some of its information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Thus, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, in McCarthy’s proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government

-
- (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).

Code. However, we find McCarthy has made only conclusory allegations that release of its remaining information would result in substantial competitive injury. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of McCarthy's submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.


McCarthy also argues its submitted information is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Bob Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSD/eeg

Ref: ID# 417457

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terry L. Salazar
Attorney for McCarthy Building Companies, Inc.
2001 Bryan Street, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Donald L. Klose
CH2M Hill
9191 South Jamaica Street
Englewood, Colorado 80112
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Osmus, P.E.
S.J. Louis Construction of Texas
P.O. Box 834
Mansfield, Texas 76063
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. T. W. Harrison
Allco
P.O. Box 3684
Beaumont, Texas 77704
(w/o enclosures)