



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 27, 2012

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2012-20760

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 474812.

The Texas Department of Transportation ("TxDOT") received a request for the current Environmental Services Contract Request for Proposal ("RFP") and the winning proposals. You state you have released the RFP to the requestor. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the remaining requested information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Arcadis US Inc. ("Arcadis"), Corrigan Consulting ("Corrigan"), Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. ("Shaw"), TRC Environmental Corporation ("TRC"), and Tetra Tech Nus, Inc. ("Tetra") of the request and 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 parties to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining 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 have

received comments submitted by Shaw and Tetra. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Arcadis, Corrigan, or TRC. Thus, these companies have not demonstrated they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *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. Accordingly, TxDOT may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests these companies may have in the 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, 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 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

Shaw claims its entire proposal, including its customer and pricing information constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We conclude Shaw has established a *prima facie* claim for its customer information. Accordingly, TxDOT must withhold the customer information we have marked in Shaw’s proposal under section 552.110(a). Upon review of the remaining information, we conclude Shaw has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Shaw demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because 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

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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; see Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

of the business.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Shaw and Tetra each claim portions of their information constitute commercial and financial information, that if released, would cause each company substantial competitive harm. In advancing its arguments, Tetra relies, in part, on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d at 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Tetra’s interest in the submitted information.

After reviewing the submitted arguments and the information at issue, we find Tetra has established that release of its customer information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, we find TxDOT must withhold the information we have marked in Tetra’s proposal under section 552.110(b). We note that although Shaw and Tetra seek to withhold their pricing information, both were winning proposals with respect to the contract at issue, and the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344–45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, we find that Shaw and Tetra have made only conclusory allegations that the release of their remaining information would result in substantial damage to their competitive position. Thus, we find Shaw and Tetra have failed to demonstrate that the release of any of their remaining information would cause them substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5. Accordingly, TxDOT may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, TxDOT must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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](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,



Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 474812

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Arcadis US Inc.  
711 North Carancahua, Suite 1700  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401  
(w/o enclosures)

Corrigan Consulting  
12000 Aerospace Avenue, Suite 450  
Houston, Texas 77034  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Edward J. Everitt  
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.  
4171 Essen Lane  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809  
(w/o enclosures)

TRC Environmental Corporation  
505 East Huntland Drive Suite 250  
Austin, Texas 78752  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark A. Matranga  
Houston Operations Manager  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
2901 Wilcrest Drive, Suite 405  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(w/o enclosures)