ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 5, 2013

Mr. Kipling D. Giles
Senior Counsel
Legal Services
CPS Energy
P.O. Box 1771
San Antonio, Texas 78296

OR2013-21139

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 507530.

The City Public Service Board of the City of San Antonio d/b/a CPS Energy ("CPS") received a request for bid information pertaining to the "CPS Energy Capitol Cement/Skyonic's Substation Sitework [c]ontract." Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you inform us release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Paloma Blanca Enterprises, Inc. ("Paloma"). Accordingly, you have notified this third party of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Paloma. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted 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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the common-law. 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. Having considered its arguments, we find Paloma has failed to demonstrate any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Paloma demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law as a trade secret.

Paloma raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure for its information. This section excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As CPS does not seek to withhold any information

---

[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).

pursuant to section 552.104, no portion of Paloma's information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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." Gov't Code § 552.110(a). As stated above, the Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110 if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude 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).

Upon review, we find Paloma failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its information at issue is a trade secret protected by section 552.110(a). *See id.* We further note 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." RESTATEMENT of Torts § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORD 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, CPS may not withhold any of Paloma's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

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 requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find Paloma has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the information Paloma seeks to withhold would cause it substantial competitive harm. Furthermore, we note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Paloma, is generally not excepted from disclosure 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* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases

applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, CPS may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b). As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information 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.

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,

Paige Lay

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/bhf

Ref: ID# 507530

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)