



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 28, 2020

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

OR2020-11948

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# 821592.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for certain information pertaining to a specified solicitation. You state you have released some information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Apex Systems, LLC ("Apex"); Infojini, Inc. ("Infojini"); and KPMG, LLP ("KPMG"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the department notified these third parties of the request for information and of the 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 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 Apex and KPMG. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and the submitted information.

Initially, we note Apex and KPMG argue against the release of information that was not submitted by the department. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the department and is limited to the information the department has submitted

for our review.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested).

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 Infojini explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Infojini 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 Infojini may have in the information.

Apex raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for a portion of its information. 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 Apex's arguments under section 552.104.

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.

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the submitted arguments against disclosure for this 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). Apex and KPMG argue some of their information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find Apex has demonstrated its client information constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, to the extent the client information is not publicly available on Apex's website, the department must withhold the client information, which we marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.² 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 Apex and KPMG 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 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

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].

See 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). Apex and KPMG argue some of their information at issue consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find Apex and KPMG have demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.³ 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 Apex has 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 552.1101 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, information 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,

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Apex's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address KPMG's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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.

(b) The exception to disclosure provided by Subsection (a) does not apply to:

(1) information in a voucher or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public funds by a governmental body; or

(2) communications and other information sent between a governmental body and a vendor or contractor related to the performance of a final contract with the governmental body or work performed on behalf of the governmental body.

See id. § 552.1101(a), (b). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.1101(a) does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). KPMG asserts disclosure of some of its remaining information would reveal an individual approach to pricing methodology and processes and give advantage to a competitor. Upon review, we find the information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.1101(a). *See id.* § 552.0222(b) (listing certain types of information not excepted under section 552.1101). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.1101(a) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception

applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, to the extent the client information we marked is not publicly available on Apex's website, the department must withhold it under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/mo

Ref: ID# 821592

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

3 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)