



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 15, 2020

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

OR2020-10996

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# 822268.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for proposals submitted in response to three specified requests for proposals.¹ Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified AECOM Technical Services, Inc.; Atkins North America, Inc.; BGE, Inc. ("BGE"); Civil Systems Engineering, Inc.; Cobb, Fendley & Associates, Inc. ("Cobb"); HDR Engineering, Inc. ("HDR"); HNTB Corporation; H.W. Lochner, Inc. ("H.W. Lochner"); Idcus, Inc.; Iteris, Inc.; Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. ("Kimley-Horn"); Omega Engineers, Inc. ("Omega"); Pachego Koch Consulting Engineers, Inc; and Volkert, Inc. 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(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental

¹ The department states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

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 BGE, Cobb, HDR, Lochner, Kimley-Horn, and Omega. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note HDR argues against disclosure of information not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the department has submitted to us for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit a copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the department submitted as responsive to the request for information.

Next, 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) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the remaining third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any remaining third party 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 department may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any remaining third party may have in the information.

BGE, Cobb, Lochner, Kimley-Horn, and Omega raise section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information "if a governmental body demonstrates that release of the information would harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future." Gov't Code § 552.104(a) (emphasis added). In *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015), the Texas Supreme Court held section 552.104 does not preclude third parties from raising section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. *See Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 842. However, the Eighty-sixth Legislature has amended section 552.104 since the issuance of *Boeing*. *See* Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3. Section 552.104 now expressly limits the protections of section 552.104 to governmental bodies. Gov't Code 552.104(a). Therefore, we do not address BGE, Cobb, Lochner, Kimley-Horn, or Omega's arguments under section 552.104.

Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

(c) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, 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 is [excepted from required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). HDR and Lochner argue their information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find HDR has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, to the extent HDR's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the department must withhold HDR's customer information under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. However, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(c). Additionally, we find HDR and Lochner have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states, “[e]xcept as provided by [s]ection 552.0222, information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See id.* § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

- (1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and
- (2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). HDR and Lochner argue their information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, however, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(b). Additionally, we find HDR and Lochner have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1101 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) . . . [I]nformation submitted to a governmental body by a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor in response to a request for a bid, proposal, or qualification is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor that the information relates to demonstrates based on specific factual evidence that disclosure of the information would:

(1) reveal an individual approach to:

(A) work;

(B) organizational structure;

(C) staffing;

(D) internal operations;

(E) processes; or

(F) discounts, pricing methodology, pricing per kilowatt hour, cost data, or other pricing information that will be used in future solicitation or bid documents; and

(2) give advantage to a competitor.

Id. § 552.1101(a). HDR and Kimley-Horn assert disclosure of their information would reveal an individual approach to work, organizational structure, staffing, internal operations, processes or pricing information and give advantage to a competitor. Upon review, however, we find HDR and Kimley-Horn have failed to provide the specific factual evidence necessary to withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.1101(a), and the department may not withhold it on that basis.

In summary, to the extent HDR's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the department must withhold HDR's customer information under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. The department 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Sean McCormick
Attorney
Open Records Division

SMC/mo

Ref: ID# 822268

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

14 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)