



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 27, 2017

Ms. Halfreda Anderson-Nelson
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2017-22194

Dear Ms. Anderson-Nelson:

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#677472 (DART ORR W00001809-071117).

The Dallas Rapid Area Transit ("DART") received a request for the names and cities of firms that were awarded four specified contracts. You state DART does not have some of the requested information.¹ Although you take no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of five third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request and their rights to submit arguments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* 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).

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

We received comments from one of the third parties.² We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks only the names and cities of firms that were awarded specific contracts. Thus, the portions of the submitted documents that do not consist of the names and cities of the firms requested are not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and DART is not required to release that information in response to the request.

The third party asserts section 552.101 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). However, the third party has failed to direct our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any of the submitted information is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, we address the third party’s argument under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial 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. 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

²We also received comments from a second third party, which states it does not object to release of the responsive information.

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 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (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.³ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (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 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.*; Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

The third party argues portions of the submitted responsive information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find the third party has failed to demonstrate the information for which it asserts section 552.110(a) meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, DART may not withhold the information at issue on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

³The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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).

The third party also contends portions of the submitted responsive information are commercial or financial information, release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the third party. However, we find the third party has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the third party's remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We therefore conclude DART may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no other arguments against disclosure of the information have been made, the submitted responsive 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,



Patrick P. Mehaffy
Attorney
Open Records Division

PPM/eb

Ref: ID#677472

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

5 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)