



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 26, 2011

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

OR2011-10763

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# 424904 (MTA No. 2011-0231).

The Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County ("METRO") received a request for the following four categories of information pertaining to RFP0700007 for high occupancy vehicle lanes to high occupancy toll lanes/managed lanes modification project: (1) original request for proposal and all amendments; (2) all technical and price proposals submitted in response to this RFP; (3) all METRO evaluation team scoring documents and evaluation notes; and (4) awarded contracts and amendments. You state METRO has released the information responsive to categories (1), (3), and (4). Although you state METRO takes no position with respect to the public availability of the remaining requested information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Electronic Transaction Consultants Corporation ("ETC"), TransCore, and Raytheon Company ("Raytheon"). Accordingly, you notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)* (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 to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from ETC and TransCore. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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 letter, this office has not received

comments from Raytheon explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that Raytheon 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, 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. Accordingly, METRO may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of Raytheon.

Next, we address ETC's argument the present request for information is unreasonably vague, broad, and burdensome. The request is not unreasonably vague or broad because it asks for specific items. A governmental body may not decline to comply with the requirements of the Act on the ground of administrative inconvenience. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 687 (Tex. 1976) (cost or difficulty in complying with Act does not determine availability of information). The fact that it may be burdensome to provide the information at issue does not relieve a governmental body of its responsibility to comply with the Act. *Id.*; Open Records Decision No. 497 (1988). In this instance, METRO submitted information that it has deemed to be responsive to the request. Accordingly, we will determine whether the exceptions claimed by ETC are applicable to the submitted information.

We note that ETC argues to withhold from public disclosure information METRO did not submit, including ETC's pricing proposal. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by METRO and is limited to the information submitted by METRO. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

TransCore and ETC raise section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 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 METRO does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find section 552.104 is not applicable to any of the information at issue. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.104.

ETC and TransCore raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted 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. 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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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 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).

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 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of ETC’s and TransCore’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we find ETC and TransCore have failed to demonstrate that any portion of their submitted information constitutes a trade secret. Accordingly, METRO may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of ETC’s and TransCore’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that ETC and TransCore have made only conclusory allegations that the release of their submitted information would result in substantial damage to either company’s 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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, METRO may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the materials at issue may be 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. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released; however, any information protected by copyright may be released only 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 424904

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Whitt Hall, P.E.
Associate Vice President
TransCore
4903 West Sam Houston Parkway North
Houston, Texas 77041
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Donald W. McFarland
Manager
Raytheon Company
P.O. Box 3310
Fullerton, California 92834
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ted Hull-Ryde
Director of Special Projects
Electronic Transaction Consultants
1705 North Plano Road
Richardson, Texas 75081
(w/o enclosures)