



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 2, 2014

Ms. Sarah Parker  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11th Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2014-17550

Dear Ms. Parker:

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# 538178.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for the Statement of Qualifications for four consultants that obtained contracts under RFP 36-4RFP5034. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interest of Surveying and Mapping-Construction Services, Inc. ("SAM"), Lamb-Star Engineering, LP ("Lamb-Star"), Don Durden, Inc. ("Durden"), and Jacobs Engineering Group ("Jacobs"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties 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; Open Records Decision No. 542 (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 SAM and Lamb-Star. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 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, Durden and Jacobs have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these third parties, and the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (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 (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Lamb-star argues some its information is protected as a trade secret under section 552.101 of the Government Code pursuant to judicial decision and cites to *In re Lee M. Bass*, 113 S.W.3d 735 (Tex. 2003). However, upon our review, we find this case does not determine the confidentiality of any information for purposes of the Act. Therefore, we find that none of Lamb-Star’s information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with this judicial decision.

Lamb-Star also raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies such as the department, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as Lamb-Star. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the department does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

SAM and Lamb-Star claim section 552.110 of the Government Code excepts their information, which 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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. 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 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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999) (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).

SAM and Lamb-Star argue the submitted information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find SAM and Lamb-Star have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that their information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they

---

<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).

demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* ORD 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). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

SAM and Lamb-Star further argue the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find SAM and Lamb-Star have failed to provide specific factual evidence the release of any of their information would result in substantial harm to their 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 substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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 SAM's or Lamb-Star's information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Lastly, we address Lamb-Star's argument under section 552.128(c) of the Government Code. Section 552.128(c) provides:

[i]nformation submitted by a vendor or contractor or a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship, a specific contract, or an application to be placed on a bidders list, including information that may also have been submitted in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business, is subject to required disclosure, excepted from required disclosure, or confidential in accordance with other law.


Gov't Code § 552.128(c). In this instance, Lamb-Star submitted its proposal to the department in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship with the department. We therefore conclude the department may not withhold any portion of Lamb-Star's information under section 552.128 of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted 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](#), 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,



Rustam Abedinzadeh  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RA/dls

Ref: ID# 538178

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cookie F. Munson  
General Counsel & Secretary  
Surveying And Mapping, LLC  
Building Two, Suite 100  
4801 Southwest Parkway  
Austin, Texas 78735  
(w/o enclosures)

Lamb-Star Engineering, LP  
c/o Mr. Kevin J. Allen  
Jones, Allen & Fuquay, LLP  
8828 Greenville Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75243  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Frank Jaste  
Don Durden, Inc.  
11550 IH-10 West, Suite 395  
San Antonio, Texas 78230  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Duane A. Schwarz  
Jacob Engineering Group, Inc.  
911 Central Parkway North, Suite 425  
San Antonio, Texas 78232  
(w/o enclosures)