ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 26, 2009

Ms. Camila W. Kunau
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P. O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2009-03962

Dear Ms. Kunau:

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# 338081 (COSA File No. 09-0036).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for a specified company's bid proposal submitted for a specified project. Although you take no position as to the disclosure of the submitted proposal, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of ThyssenKrupp Airport Systems ("TKAS"). You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified TKAS of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why its 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 the applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have considered comments received from TKAS, and we have reviewed the submitted information.

TKAS raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Gov't Code. § 552.110(a)-(b). 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." *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. 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 a single or ephemeral event 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] 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) excepts from disclosure "[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). Section 552.110(b) 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999)

---

[1]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).

(business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

TKAS claims section 552.110(a) for portions of its submitted information. After reviewing TKAS's information and arguments, we find that most of TKAS's information is specific to a single transaction, and TKAS has failed to demonstrate how any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business" rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business"). Thus, we find TKAS has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the submitted information it seeks to withhold constitutes a trade secret. Therefore, we determine that no portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

TKAS also argues section 552.110(b) for portions of its submitted information. Upon review, we find TKAS has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of the information at issue would result in 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 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 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). Further, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *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) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b). As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released in its entirety.

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,

Greg Henderson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GH/jb

Ref: ID#338081

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen K. Yungblut
Brookhollow Two
2221 East Lamar Boulevard, Suite 150
Arlington, Texas 76006
(w/o enclosures)