



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 7, 2013

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2013-19505

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# 505014.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for the seven proposals submitted for department contract 32-3RFP0038. Although you do not take any position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Fugro Consultants, Inc. ("Fugro"); PaveTex Engineering & Testing, Inc. ("PaveTex"); Rodriguez Engineering Laboratories ("Rodriguez Engineering"); Terracon Consultants, Inc. ("Terracon"); Alliance Geotechnical Group ("Alliance"); and HVJ Associates, Inc. ("HVJ") 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 from PaveTex, Rodriguez Engineering, Terracon, and Alliance. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note 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 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, we have not received comments from Fugro or HVJ explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Fugro and HVJ have protected proprietary interests 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, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Fugro or HVJ may have in the information.

PaveTex and Rodriguez Engineering raise 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 bidding situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions generally). As the department does not argue section 552.104, we conclude none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Alliance, PaveTex, Rodriguez Engineering, and Terracon argue portions of their information are 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 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> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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). 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 of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

---

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

Alliance, PaveTex, Rodriguez Engineering, and Terracon assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Alliance has demonstrated some of its client information constitutes a trade secret. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a). We note, however, Alliance and Terracon have published the identities of some of their customers on their websites, making this information publicly available. Thus, Alliance and Terracon have failed to demonstrate that the information they have published on their websites are trade secrets. Further, we conclude Alliance, PaveTex, Rodriguez Engineering, and Terracon have failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Alliance, PaveTex, Rodriguez Engineering, and Terracon have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of Alliance's, PaveTex's, Rodriguez Engineering's, or Terracon's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Rodriguez Engineering and Terracon further argue portions of their information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, as previously noted, because Terracon published its customer information on its website, it has failed to demonstrate how release of this information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Further, we find Rodriguez Engineering and Terracon have made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of their remaining information would result in substantial harm to their competitive positions. *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 substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, none of Rodriguez Engineering's or Terracon's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

In summary, the department must withhold the client information we have marked in Alliance's information under section 552.110(a) 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Megan G. Holloway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MGH/akg

Ref: ID# 505014

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Fugro Consultants  
8613 Cross Park Drive  
Austin, Texas 78754-4565  
(w/o enclosures)

Oscar H. Rodriguez  
Rodriguez Engineering Laboratories  
13809 Turbine Drive  
Austin, Texas 78728  
(w/o enclosures)

Maghsoud Tahmoressi  
Pavetex Engineering & Testing  
3989 East Highway 290  
Dripping Springs, Texas 78620  
(w/o enclosures)

Mark J. Farrow  
Alliance Geotechnical Group  
3228 Halifax Street  
Dallas, Texas 75247  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael J. Yost  
Vice President  
Terracon Consultants, Inc.  
18001 West 106<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
Olathe, Kansas 66061  
(w/o enclosures)

HVJ Associates  
4201 Freidrich Lane  
Austin, Texas 78744-1045  
(w/o enclosures)