



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 31, 2009

Mr. Vic Ramirez  
Associate General Counsel  
Lower Colorado River Authority  
P.O. Box 220  
Austin, Texas 78767-0220

OR2009-12286

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# 354048.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "LCRA") received a request for pricing information from a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to the disclosure of the requested information, you state the information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You also state, and provide documentation showing, you have notified the following third parties: Cleveland Price Inc.; KBS Electrical Dist. Inc.; Mopac Ind. Inc.; Pascor Atlantic; Royal Switchgear ("Royal"); Stuart Sindy Co.; Turner; and USCO Power Equipment Corp. ("USCO") of the request and of their opportunity 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 the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances).* Royal and USCO have submitted comments to our office. 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 only received

arguments from Royal and USCO. None of the remaining third parties have submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information pertaining to the remaining third parties constitutes proprietary information, and the LCRA may not withhold any portion of their 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.

We now address Royal's and USCO's arguments for their submitted information. USCO argues that the submitted information is confidential because it submitted the documents at issue to the LCRA with the understanding that the information would remain confidential. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Next, Royal and USCO both raise 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it

relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552. 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). We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because 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." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Having considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that Royal and USCO have not shown that any of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Thus, LCRA may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.


However, we find that USCO has established that the release of some of its information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the LCRA must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We find, however, that Royal and USCO have made only conclusory allegations that release of their remaining information would cause substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110; *see also, e.g.*, ORD 661 at 5-6, 509 at 5 (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). Furthermore, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Royal in this instance, 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 reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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](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,



Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 354048

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Mr. Matthew Morgan  
Royal Switchgear  
3995 Pine Lane Southeast  
Bessemer, Alabama 35022  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Thames  
Mopac Ind. Inc.  
2725 C Ginter  
Tucson, Arizona 85706  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Roy Onofrey  
Cleveland Price Inc.  
14000 RT 993  
Trafford, Pennsylvania 15085  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Abel  
Stuart Sindy Co.  
9705 Deck CN  
Austin, Texas 78758  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt McGuire  
KBS Electric Dist. Inc.  
504 East Saint Elmo Road  
Austin, Texas 78745  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Allen Combs  
Pascor Atlantic  
254 Industry Drive  
Bland, Virginia 24315  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. W. Scott McLellan  
Brooks & Smith LLP  
98 San Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 720  
Austin, Texas 78701-4039  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeremy Hoagland  
USCO Power Equipment Corporation  
8100 Churchill Avenue  
Leeds, Alabama 35094  
(w/o enclosures)