



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 2, 2009

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

OR2009-04363

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# 338791.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for two specified proposals. You state you have released some of the requested information. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. In addition, you state the remaining information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, you have notified America's Skilled Personnel ("America") and L.K. Jordan and Associates ("Jordan") of the request and of their rights to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Jordan. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments

from America. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of America's information constitutes proprietary information, and the department may not withhold any of America's information on that basis. See 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 (1990).

Jordan claims a portion of its proposal is subject to section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom it was obtained. Gov't Code § 552.110. 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. 1957); 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.¹ 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

¹The 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).

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. 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.* § 552.110(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Jordan seeks to withhold its audited financial statement under section 552.110. Jordan, however, has not provided any arguments to establish a *prima facie* case that this information meets the definition of a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110(a).


Jordan also raises section 552.110(b). However, beyond a general assertion that release of this information would divulge private financial information and create a hardship and unfair competition, Jordan has submitted no specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of these portions of its proposal. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (section 552.110(b) requires specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of information). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of Jordan’s information under section 552.110(b).

You claim portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136(b) states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, we agree the insurance policy numbers you have marked are access device numbers for the purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the department must withhold these numbers under section 552.136. As you have raised no further exceptions to disclosure, the remaining submitted information must be released.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php; or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Olivia A. Maceo
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

OM/eeg

Ref: ID# 338791

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William R. Hibbs II
Vice President of Human Resources/General Counsel
L. K. Jordan & Associates
8140 North Mopac Expressway, Building One, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Birenbaum
Vice President Sales
America's Skilled Personnel
2800 I-35 South #111
Austin, Texas 78704
(w/o enclosures)