



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 17, 2022

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

OR2022-31846

Dear Ms. Barner:

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# 975415 (ORR# R016123-071922).

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for all proposals related to a specified contract. 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 CDM Smith Inc. ("CDM"); Dannenbaum Engineering Corporation; Garver, LLC ("Garver"); Huitt-Zollars, Inc.; LJA Engineering, Inc. ("LJA"); Othon, Inc.; Parkhill, Smith & Cooper, Inc.; Rodriguez Transportation Group, Inc. ("RTG"); Stantec Consulting Services Inc. ("Stantec"); and Volkert, Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties 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 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 CDM, Garver, LJA, RTG, and Stantec. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note RTG argues against disclosure of information not submitted to this office for our 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) of the Government Code 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 the remaining third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Garver and LJA raise section 552.104 of the Government Code for their 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.” *Id.* § 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 Garver's and LJA's arguments under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

CDM, Garver, LJA, RTG, and Stantec raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Section 552.110(b) states, “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). Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

[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 is excepted from [required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Upon review, we find CDM, Garver, LJA, RTG, and Stantec have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Further, we find CDM, Garver, LJA, and RTG have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

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

(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, 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). CDM, Garver, LJA, RTG, and Stantec assert disclosure of their information would reveal an individual approach to work, organizational structure, staffing, internal operations, processes, or pricing methodology and give advantage to a competitor. Upon review, we find CDM, Garver, LJA, RTG, and Stantec have failed to provide specific

factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the information at issue is subject to section 552.1101(a). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.1101(a) of the Government Code.

Garver claims its information fits the definition of a trade secret found in section 134A.002(6) of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code of the Texas Uniform Trade Secrets Act (the "TUTSA"). Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 134A.002(6) provides:

(6) "Trade secret" means all forms and types of information, including business, scientific, technical, economic, or engineering information, and any formula, design, prototype, pattern, plan, compilation, program device, program, code, device, method, technique, process, procedure, financial data, or list of actual or potential customers or suppliers, whether tangible or intangible and whether or how stored, compiled, or memorialized physically, electronically, graphically, photographically, or in writing if:

(A) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and

(B) 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.

Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 134A.002(6). We note the legislative history of TUTSA indicates it was enacted to provide a framework for litigating trade secret issues and provide injunctive relief or damages in uniformity with other states. Senate Research Center, Bill Analysis, S.B. 953, 83rd Leg., R.S. (2013) (enrolled version). Section 134A.002(6)'s definition of trade secret expressly applies to chapter 134A only, not the Act, and does not expressly make any information confidential. *See* Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 134A.002(6); *see also id.* § 134A.007(d) (TUTSA does not affect disclosure of public information by governmental body under the Act). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998), 478 at 2, 465 at 4-5 (1987). Confidentiality cannot be implied from the structure of a statute or rule. *See* ORD 465 at 4-5. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of Garver's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 134A.002(6) of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code.

CDM argues its information is 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

copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the department must release the submitted information; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/jxd

Ref: ID# 975415

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

10 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)