



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 10, 2014

Ms. Sara Abbott McEown
Counsel for Fort Worth Transportation Authority
Jackson Walker, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 6000
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2014-22325

Dear Ms. McEown:

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# 546913.

The Fort Worth Transportation Authority (the “authority”), which you represent, received two requests for all proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code.¹ You also state release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, you notified Advertising Vehicles, Gateway Outdoor Advertising, Houck Transit Advertising, Mackay Advertising (“Mackay”), and Signal Outdoor of the requests and of their right to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not

¹We note, although you also raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022. Furthermore, although you also indicate some of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law as a trade secret, we understand you are relying on the third parties to make any such argument.

be released to the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *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 under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Mackay. 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 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 received comments only from Mackay explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties 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, the authority may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in it.

We understand Mackay to argue its information was supplied to the authority with the expectation that it would remain confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates that it will be kept confidential or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, the authority must release it, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an

individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You argue portions of the submitted proposals are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We note, however, section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we will not consider the authority's arguments under section 552.110. However, we will consider Mackay's arguments that some of its information is excepted 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.² 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 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 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.

Upon review, we find Mackay has established a *prima facie* case that its customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on the company’s website, the authority must withhold Mackay’s customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find Mackay failed to demonstrate how any of its remaining information constitutes a trade secret. Furthermore, Mackay has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. 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 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Mackay also asserts portions of the remaining information consist of protected commercial and financial information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review,

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 (1939); see Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

we find Mackay has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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. We therefore conclude the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, we find the authority must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on the company’s website, the authority must withhold Mackay’s customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The authority must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The authority 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,



Kristi L. Godden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLK/cz

Ref: ID# 546913

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig Heard
Gateway Outdoor Advertising
18 Pleasant Grove Road
Long Valley, New Jersey 07853
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken Black
Advertising Vehicles
10810 Kenwood Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45242
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Savey
Signal Outdoor
200 Mansell Court East, Suite 430
Roswell, Georgia 30076
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregory Pitts
Counsel for Mike Makay and Mackay Advertising
Gregory Pitts
2630 West Freeway, Suite 231
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)