



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 8, 2009

Ms. Nicole B. Webster
Assistant City Attorney
City of Waco - Legal Services
P.O. Box 2570
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2009-17334

Dear Ms. Webster:

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# 363527 (Waco reference # LGL-09-1011).

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for the bid responses for Request for Proposal for Electronic Demand Response Services, Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT) Emergency Interruptible Load Services (EILS) No. 2009-040.¹ The city takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of CPower Inc. ("CPower"), EnerNOC Inc, and MPower² LLC ("MPower"), (collectively, the "third parties"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from representatives for CPower and MPower. We have considered the submitted arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be

¹The city sought and received a clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed).

withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received any arguments from EnerNOC, Inc. We, thus, have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes EnerNOC, Inc.'s proprietary 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 city may not withhold any of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of EnerNOC, Inc.

Next, CPower asserts that its information may not be disclosed because it was provided to the city with the understanding that it was sealed and would not be revealed to other bidders. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

CPower and MPower 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 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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.² 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 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) 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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Having considered CPower’s and MPower’s arguments, we find that CPower and MPower have established a *prima facie* case that some of the customer information each company seeks to withhold, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We note that CPower has published the identities of some of its customers on its website. Thus, CPower has failed to demonstrate that the information it has published on its website is a trade secret. Further, CPower and MPower have failed to demonstrate that any

²The 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).

of the remaining information each company seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has either company demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that information, including pricing information, pertaining to a particular proposal or 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." See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3, 306 at 3 (1982). Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

CPower also contends that a portion of its information is excepted under section 552.110(b). Among other things, CPower argues the release of its information at issue would harm the city's and other Texas municipalities' ability to obtain detailed pricing and personnel information with regard to future bids. In advancing its argument, CPower appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body's ability to obtain necessary information in future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. However, section 552.110(b) has been amended since the issuance of *National Parks*. Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard for excepting from disclosure confidential information. The current statute does not incorporate this aspect of the *National Parks* test; it now requires only a specific factual demonstration that release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). Thus, the ability of a governmental body to obtain information from private parties is no longer a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only CPower's interests in its information.

Upon review of CPower's arguments and its remaining information at issue, we find that CPower has established that its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the city must withhold the pricing information we have marked in sections 7.4 and 7.5 of CPower's information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As we noted above, CPower has published the identities of some of its customers on its website. Thus, CPower has failed to demonstrate that release of these customers' information would cause it substantial competitive injury. Additionally, CPower has made only conclusory allegations that the release of the remaining information it seeks to withhold would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, CPower has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. 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 (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). Accordingly, none of CPower's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Finally, the city informs us and we agree that some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/jb

Ref: ID# 363527

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Brewster
President
EnerNOC, Inc.
101 Federal Street, Suite 1100
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeff Jumonville
Business Development Manager
EnerNOC, Inc.
1900 Georgia Landing Cove
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Roy Trey Price III
MPower², LLC
24 Waterway Avenue, Suite 625
The Woodlands, Texas 77380
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Patricia A. Leotta
General Counsel
CPower, Inc.
3570 Hamilton Boulevard, Suite 102
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18103
(w/o enclosures)