



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 12, 2014

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

OR2014-08001

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# 522291.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for the submissions of four named companies related to two specified requests for qualifications.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified AGL Constructors ("AGL"); Northern Link Constructors ("Northern Link"); NorthGate Horseshoe Constructors JV/Kiewit Infrastructure Group ("NorthGate"); and Pegasus Link Constructors/Fluor Enterprises, Inc. ("Pegasus") 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).

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us, and provide documentation showing, the requestor modified his request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing 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 over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

We have received comments submitted on behalf of all notified third parties. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that in a letter dated March 10, 2014, you inform us the requestor withdrew a portion of his request. Consequently, you state the department no longer seeks an opinion concerning the submitted Forms C because this information is not responsive to the narrowed request. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, nor is the department required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Next, we note the notified third parties consist of joint ventures made up of subsidiary individual entities. We have received comments from some of these individual entities, both arguing on behalf of the joint venture as a whole and on behalf of the individual entity itself. However, as of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the remaining individual entities explaining why the submitted information should not be released. 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 Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). Therefore, we have no basis to conclude these remaining entities have 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest these individual entities may have in the information. However, we will consider the arguments submitted on behalf of the joint ventures as a whole.

AGL, Northern Link, NorthGate, Pegasus, and one of the individual entities each claim portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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 must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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. *See* 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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Upon review of the submitted arguments under section 552.110(b), we find AGL, NorthGate, and the individual entity have established portions of their financial information, which we have marked, constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause these companies substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find no third party has demonstrated the release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, these third

---

<sup>2</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors 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 other 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).

parties have not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of their remaining information at issue. *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). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b). Furthermore, we find no third party has demonstrated that any of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has any third party demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 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 [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 522291

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Stoppenhagen  
Executive Director, Transportation  
Pegasus Link / Flour Enterprises  
2400 Cliffs Edge Drive  
Austin, Texas 78733  
(w/o enclosures)

Northgate Horseshoe Constructors  
c/o Mr. Joseph P. Dirik  
Norton Rose Fulbright  
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard A. Fence  
Northern Link Constructors  
2400 Cliffs Edge Drive  
Austin, Texas 78733  
(w/o enclosures)

AGL Constructors  
c/o Mr. Eric Klupp  
Corporate Counsel  
Walsh Group  
929 West Avenue Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60607  
(w/o enclosures)