ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 20, 2006

Mr. Vic Ramirez
Associate General Counsel
LCRA
P. O. Box 220
Austin, Texas 78767-0220

OR2006-06451

Dear Mr. Ramirez:

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# 252015.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "LCRA") received a request for the proposals and "scoring card/matrix" related to LCRA's RFP # 6082 Consultant Review Services. Although you take no position as to whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you indicate that the submitted information may be subject to the third-party proprietary interests of Barrington-Wellesley Group, Inc. ("BWG"), The Liberty Consulting Group ("Liberty"), Northstar Consulting Group ("Northstar"), and Schumaker & Company, Inc. ("Schumaker"). Thus, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you inform us you have notified BWG, Liberty, Northstar, and Schumaker of the request and each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *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 considered the submitted comments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that BWG has informed this office that it does not object to the release of its proposal. Next, we note that 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 that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from Schumaker explaining how the release of the submitted information will affect its proprietary interests. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of Schumaker. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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).

Both Liberty and Northstar argue that their information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm.

Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." 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. 1958); *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 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. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). 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) 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Having considered Liberty's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that Liberty has demonstrated that release of certain portions of its proposal would cause the company substantial competitive harm and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We have marked the submitted information that must be withheld under section 552.110(b).

However, we conclude that Liberty and Northstar have failed to make a *prima facie* case that the remaining information at issue constitutes trade secrets. Furthermore, we also conclude that Liberty and Northstar have made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause those companies substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support their allegations with regard to the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial

---

[1]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).

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), 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 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110).

With regard to the public availability of pricing information, we are informed that Northstar was the winning bidder. Federal cases applying the analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption to prices in awarded government contracts have denied protection for cost and pricing information, reasoning that disclosure of prices charged the government is a cost of doing business with the government. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000). Moreover, we believe that the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988). Furthermore, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Govt. 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).

Finally, we note that BWG's proposal includes a W-9 form with a social security number. Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides that "[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from" required public disclosure under the Act.[2] LCRA must withhold the social security number under section 552.147.

In summary, LCRA must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. The social security number in the submitted information must be withheld under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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

---

[2]We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal 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 appeal 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/eb

Ref: ID# 252015

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sue Hong
Virchow Krause & Company, L.L.P.
P. O. Box 7398
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7398
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. F. Wayne Lafferty
Barrington-Wellesley Group, Inc.
2940 Cedar Ridge Drive
McKinney, Texas 75070
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Perry L. Wheaton
Barrington-Wellesley Group, Inc.
P. O. Box 2390
New London, New Hampshire 03257
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Stright
The Liberty Consulting Group
P. O. Box 1237
Quentin, PA 17083
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Doug Bennett
Northstar Consulting Group, Inc.
900 East Main Street, Suite 104
Santa Maria, California 93454
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dennis J. Schumaker
Schumaker & Company, Inc.
3101 Walnut Ridge Drive
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103
(w/o enclosures)