



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 23, 2014

Mr. K. Scott Oliver
Corporate Counsel
San Antonio Water System
P.O. Box 2449
San Antonio, Texas 78298-2449

OR2014-10704

Dear Mr. Oliver:

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# 526801.

The San Antonio Water System (the "system") received a request for information pertaining to a specified solicitation, including scoring sheets. You state you have released some information to the requestor.¹ Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Arredondo, Zepeda & Brunz, LLC ("AZ&B") and LNV, Inc. ("LNV"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from AZ&B and LNV. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note AZ&B seeks to withhold information not submitted to this office by the system. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information

¹You state you have released information submitted by Bain Medina Bain, Inc. ("Bain"); K Friese & Associates, Inc. ("K Friese"); and Lockwood, Andrews & Newman, Inc. ("Lockwood"). You state, and provide documentation showing, Bain, K Friese, and Lockwood do not object to release of any of their information. You further state you have released the scoring sheets.

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 system, this ruling does not address this information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the system.

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 id.* § 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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This

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

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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (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).

AZ&B and LNV assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find AZ&B and LNV have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of their information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find AZ&B and LNV have failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* 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, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). 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.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Consequently, the system may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

AZ&B and LNV claim portions of their information are protected under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find AZ&B and LNV have failed to demonstrate release of any of their information would result in substantial harm to their competitive positions. *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, 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Although LNV

seeks to withhold its pricing information, the system informs our office LNV was one of the winning bidders with respect to the solicitation at issue. We note 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; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *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). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of AZ&B's or LNV's information under section 552.110(b). As no further 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 Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 526801

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Derek E. Naiser
Principal
LNV, Inc.
8918 Tesoro Drive, Suite 401
San Antonio, Texas 78217
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alfonso P. Garza
President
Arredondo, Zepeda & Brunz, LLC
11355 McCree Road
Dallas, Texas 75238
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Pamela Bain
President
Bain Medina Bain, Inc.
7073 San Pedro Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dale Murphy
Vice President
K Friese & Associates, Inc.
CityView 2, Suite 100
1120 South Capital of Texas Highway
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph A. Boyd
Senior Vice President
Lockwood, Andrews & Newnam, Inc.
1320 South University Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(w/o enclosures)