



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 8, 2014

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

OR2014-22106

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# 546681.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information related to a specified bid. Although you take no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of some of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Covert Ford, Inc. ("Covert"); Gillie Hyde Ford Lincoln ("Gillie Hyde"); Mac Haik Ford Lincoln Mercury ("Mac Haik"); and Russell Smith Ford ("Russell Smith"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, you have notified the interested third parties of the request and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the circumstances). We have received comments from Covert and Mac Haik. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the portions of the request seeking the bid tabulation, list of bidders, and award winners. To the extent information responsive to these portions of the request existed when the department received

the request for information, we assume you have released it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

Next, 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 ruling, we have not received comments from Gillie Hyde or Russell Smith. Thus, we have no basis to conclude either Gillie Hyde or Russell Smith has a protected proprietary interest in any of the information at issue. *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 the 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 information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Gillie Hyde or Russell Smith may have in the submitted information.

Mac Haik raises section 552.104 of the Government Code. This section excepts from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). We note section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (purpose of section 552.104 is to protect governmental body's interest in competitive bidding situation). As the department does not claim section 552.104 of the Government Code is applicable, we will not consider Mac Haik's claim under this section. Therefore, no portion of the information may be withheld on this basis.

Covert and Mark Haik each assert portions of their information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code.¹ 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

¹Although Covert cites to section 552.101 of the Government Code in its brief, we understand Covert to raise section 552.110 of the Government Code based on the substance of its arguments.

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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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 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).

²The 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).

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* 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, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Covert and Mac Haik each assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Covert and Mac Haik have each failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of their information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find neither Covert nor Mac Haik has demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of Covert’s or Mac Haik’s information under section 552.110(a).

Covert and Mac Haik each 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. Upon review, we find Covert has demonstrated portions of its information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the department must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find neither Covert nor Mac Haik has demonstrated the release of any of the remaining 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 that 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). Furthermore, you inform us the contract at issue was awarded to Mac Haik. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *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 344-345 (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, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, the

department may not withhold any of Covert's or Mac Haik's remaining information under section 552.110(b).

In summary, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code and must release the remaining information.

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/eb

Ref: ID# 546681

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew H. Sharensen
Johnson DeLuca Kurisky & Gould
Counsel for Mac Haik Ford Lincoln Mercury
4 Houston Center, Suite 1000
1221 Lamar Street
Houston, Texas 77010
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenny Covert
General Manager
Covert Ford, Inc.
11514 Research Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78750
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Anthony Wheeler
Gillie Hyde Ford Lincoln, Inc.
610 Happy Valley Road
Glasgow, Kentucky 42141
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Butch Lorenz
Russell Smith Ford
2009 Beltline Road SW
Decatur, Alabama 35603
(w/o enclosures)