



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 24, 2008

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

OR2008-10059

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 316805.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for the construction contract for segments five and six of SH 130, including all amendments and attachments. You state that the requestor subsequently clarified that the request included Exhibits E-K of the contract. We understand that some of the responsive information has been released to the requestor. Although the department takes no position as to the disclosure of the submitted information, you state that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the department notified SH 130 Concession Company, L.L.C. ("Concession") and Central Texas Highway Constructors, L.L.C. ("CTHC"), the interested third parties, of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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 considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that some of the information that CTHC seeks to withhold, specifically, the contract and Exhibits A-E, was not submitted by the department for our review.<sup>1</sup> This ruling does not address information beyond what the department has submitted to us for review.

---

<sup>1</sup>The department has submitted Exhibits F-K, amendments to section 8 of the contract, and letter of credit documents to this office for review.

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

Next, you acknowledge, and we agree, that the department failed to request a ruling or submit the responsive information within the statutory time periods prescribed by sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *Open Records Decision No. 319* (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. *Open Records Decision No. 150* (1977). Because the proprietary interests of a third party can provide a compelling reason against the presumption of openness, we will consider whether any of the submitted information can be withheld on that basis.

Concession raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for the letter of credit documents and Exhibits F, H, and K. CTHC seeks to withhold Exhibits F and H, a letter of credit, and the amendments to section 8 of the contract pursuant to section 552.110. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) 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(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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.); *see also* *Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2* (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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.<sup>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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 private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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 National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review of the submitted information and arguments, we find that Concession and CTHC have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have these companies demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Accordingly, we determine that no portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We also find that Concession and CTHC have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of the information at issue would result in substantial competitive harm to these companies. We therefore conclude that none of the submitted

---

<sup>2</sup>The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, 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 2 (1982) (finding information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). The submitted information must, therefore, be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can challenge that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 316805

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Matthew J. Timbario  
Alliance Consulting Group  
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW,  
Suite 650  
Washington D.C. 20006  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lisa A. Smith  
Mr. Jeffrey J. Horner  
Bracewell & Giuliani, L.L.P.  
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300  
Houston, Texas 77002-2770  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jose A. Labarra  
SH 130 Concession Company, L.L.C.  
7700 Chevy Chase Drive  
Chase Park One, Suite 500-B  
Austin, Texas 78752-1562  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Blakely L. Fernandez  
Tuggey Rosenthal Pauerstein  
Sandoloski Agather, L.L.P.  
755 East Mulberry Avenue  
Suite 200  
San Antonio, Texas 78212  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jose Penalver Lamarca  
Central Texas Highway  
Constructors, L.L.C.  
1524 South IH 35, Suite 207  
Austin, Texas 78704  
(w/o enclosures)