



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 5, 2014

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

OR2014-07500

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# 521582.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "authority") received a request for the complete bid abstract and all proposals and supporting documentation received related to authority request for proposal number 8221, along with the authority's evaluation criteria of each proposal received. You state the authority will provide the requested evaluation criteria to the requestor. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you provide documentation showing you notified Doyenne Constructors, LLC ("Doyenne"), Gerace Construction Company, Inc. ("Gerace"), Restek, Inc. ("Restek"), and Structural Preservation Systems, LLC ("Structural") of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from Restek and Structural. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to

that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Doyenne or Gerace. Thus, these third parties have failed to demonstrate they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 authority may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Doyenne or Gerace may have in the information.

We note a portion of the information Restek and Structural seek to withhold was not submitted by the authority for our review. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information submitted by the governmental body requesting the ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Because this information was not submitted by the authority, this ruling does not address Restek's or Structural's arguments against its disclosure.

Next, we note Restek asserts some of its information is exempted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which exempts "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies such as the authority, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as Restek. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the authority does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Restek and Structural assert portions of the submitted information are protected by 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, which holds a trade secret to be:

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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. 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.

Upon review, we find Restek and Structural have failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Restek or Structural demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, and experience not excepted under section 552.110). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular

¹The 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; *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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 wHuffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, we find none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Restek and Structural also claim portions of the submitted information constitute commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find Structural has demonstrated its pricing information, which we have marked, would cause substantial competitive harm. Thus, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note, however, that although Restek seeks to withhold its pricing information, it was the winning bidder with respect to the contract at issue, and 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* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344–45 (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, we find Restek has failed to demonstrate that the release of any of its pricing information would cause it substantial competitive harm. Further, we find Restek and Structural have failed to demonstrate that the release of any of their remaining information would cause them substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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. Therefore, we find none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The authority must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only 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.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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 521582

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jayne Colwill
Contacts Manager
Structural Preservation Systems
925 Tollgate Road
Elgin, Illinois 60123
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Badilla
V.P. - Texas Division
Resteck
Unit J
12209 Twin Creek Road
Manchaca, Texas 78652-3784
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Amanda Little
Doyenne Constructors
P.O. Box 127
Mariah Hill, Indiana 47556
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Waskevich
Gerace Construction
4055 South Saginaw
Midland, Michigan 48640
(w/o enclosures)