



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 8, 2014

Ms. Ramona Soto
Attorney
Office of Legal Services
Fort Worth Independent School District
100 North University Drive, Suite SW 172
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2014-22170

Dear Ms. Soto:

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# 545908.

The Fort Worth Independent School District (the "district") received a request for part two of the district's request for competitive sealed proposals number 15-026. Although you do not take any position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Turner Construction Company ("Turner"); Steele & Freeman, Inc. ("Steele"); Starling Richardson Construction, Inc. ("Starling"); Reeder General Contractors, Inc. ("Reeder"); Ratcliff Constructors, LP ("Ratcliff"); Pogue Construction Co., L.P. ("Pogue"); Joeris General Contractors, Ltd. ("Joeris"); Imperial Construction, Inc. ("Imperial"); CZOT-MGS, LLC ("CZOT"); Cadence McShane Construction ("Cadence"); Bartlett Cocke General Contractors, LLC ("Bartlett"); and 3i Construction, LLC ("3i") 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 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and

explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Turner, Imperial, and CZOT. We have considered the submitted comments and reviewed the submitted information.

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* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Steele, Starling, Reeder, Ratcliffe, Pogue, Joeris, Cadence, Bartlett, or 3i explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude these third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest these third parties may have in the information.

Imperial raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for its information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). However, we note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Upon review, we find none of the information at issue to be highly intimate or embarrassing information and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Imperial also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 2269.151 of the Government Code, which provides:

(a) In this chapter, "competitive sealed proposals" is a procurement method by which a governmental entity requests proposals, ranks the offerors, negotiates as prescribed, and then contracts with a general contractor for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, or repair of a facility.

(b) In selecting a contractor through competitive sealed proposals, a governmental entity shall follow the procedures provided by this subchapter.

Gov't Code § 2269.151. Section 2269.151 addresses the procedures to be used by a governmental entity utilizing the competitive sealed proposals method. Upon review, we find section 2269.151 does not make information confidential for purposes of the Act. Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (stating statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and a confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality requires express language making certain information confidential or stating information shall not be released to public). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Imperial also raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). We note section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). Accordingly, we will not consider Imperial's claim under this section. In this instance, the district does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Turner, Imperial, and CZOT state some of their information is excepted from disclosure under 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 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, which holds a trade secret to be:

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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. This office must accept a claim 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 section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (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).

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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Imperial and CZOT argue some of their information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find Imperial and CZOT have failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of their information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Turner, Imperial, and CZOT argue portions of their information consist of commercial information, the release of which would cause the companies substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find Turner, Imperial, and CZOT have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of their information would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence 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 3 (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), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). We, therefore, conclude the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[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.”² Gov’t Code § 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, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have indicated under section 552.136 of the Government Code. As no other exceptions have been raised for the remaining information, it 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.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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

Sincerely,



Megan G. Holloway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MGH/bhf

Ref: ID# 545908

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Paula Duncan
Paralegal
Turner Construction Company
Suite 100
2001 North Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Imperial Construction
c/o Mr. Toby W. Burke
Harrison Steck
1100 Sinclair Building
512 Main Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)

Steele & Freeman
1301 Lawson Road
Fort Worth, Texas 76131
(w/o enclosures)

Joeris General Contractors
15100 Trinity Boulevard, Suite 100
Fort Worth, Texas 76155
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James B. Starling
Starling Richardson Construction
1201 Kas Drive, Suite D
Richardson, Texas 75081
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt K. Young
Ratcliff Contractors
4200 Beltway Drive
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Reeder General Contractors
3005 Alta Mere Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76116
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sandra Bernard
CZOT-MGS
1420 Springhill Road
Aubrey, Texas 76227
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Geach
Cadence McShane Construction
Suite 500
5057 Keller Springs Road
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Pogue Construction
1512 Bray Central Drive, Suite 300
McKinney, Texas 75069
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Oates
Bartlett Cocke General Contractors
1750 Valley View Lane, Suite 335
Farmers Branch, Texas 75234
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Clowers
3i Construction
Suite 1050
1111 West Mockingbird Lane
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)