



January 12, 2015

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

OR2015-00500

Dear Mr. Kipling:

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# 549726.

The City Public Service Board of the City of San Antonio d/b/a CPS Energy ("CPS") received two requests from different requestors for the bid tabulation, the names of current vendors, and current bill rate for a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to the public availability of the submitted information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You state 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Apex,

---

<sup>1</sup>The third parties notified pursuant to section 552.305 are: Allied Consultants; Apex Systems, Inc. ("Apex"); Dyonyx; Experis IT Services U.S., L.L.C.; K Force; Indatatech; Modis, Inc. ("Modis"); National Human Resources Group, Inc.; Radgov; Randstad Technologies, L.P.; Structure Consulting, L.L.C.; System One Holdings, L.L.C. ("System One"); Teksystems; Triquest; and Quanta.

Modis, and System One. 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 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 only received comments from Modis and System One on why their respective company's submitted information should not be released. We note Apex states it does not object to release of its information at issue. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests in 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, CPS may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in it.

Next, we note Modis objects to disclosure of information CPS has not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by CPS and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by CPS. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Modis also contends it has a confidentiality agreement with CPS. However, information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it 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, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *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 falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Modis raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for its 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. However, Modis has not pointed to any statutory confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of its information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4

(1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, CPS may not withhold any of Modis's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Modis and System One raise section 552.104 of the Government Code. This section excepts from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). 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 did not submit arguments against disclosure of any of the submitted information under section 552.104, no portion of Modis's or System One's information may be withheld on this basis.

Modis and System One both claim their information is excepted from disclosure under 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.<sup>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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 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). We note 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; see also *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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.

Modis claims some of its information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we conclude Modis has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Modis demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its 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). As previously noted, 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; see

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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).

*Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, CPS may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Modis and System One each argue portions of their information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find neither Modis nor System One has demonstrated the release of any of the information at issue would result in substantial harm to their competitive position. *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). Furthermore, you inform us the contracts at issue were awarded to Modis and System One. 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* ORD 514 (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). 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, CPS may not withhold any of Modis's or System One's information under section 552.110(b).

Modis raises section 552.113 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.113 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure under the Act] if it is:

...

(2) geological or geophysical information or data, including maps concerning wells, except information filed in connection with an application or proceeding before an agency[.]

Gov't Code § 552.113(a)(2). In Open Records Decision No. 627 (1994), this office concluded section 552.113(a)(2) protects from public disclosure only (I) geological and geophysical information regarding the exploration or development of natural resources that is (ii) commercially valuable. ORD 627 at 3-4 (overruling rationale of Open Records Decision No. 504 (1988)). The decision explained the phrase "information regarding the exploration or development of natural resources" means "information indicating the presence

or absence of natural resources in a particular location, as well as information indicating the extent of a particular deposit or accumulation.” *Id.* at 4 n.4. However, section 552.113(a)(2) does not except general geological information about a particular location that is unrelated to the “presence or absence of natural resources.” In order to be commercially valuable for purposes of Open Records Decision No. 627 and section 552.113, information must not be publicly available. *See* Open Records Decision No. 669 (2000). Upon review, we find Modis has not demonstrated any of its information is commercially valuable geological or geophysical information regarding the exploration of or development of natural resources. Accordingly, CPS may not withhold any of Modis’s information under section 552.113 of the Government Code.

Modis raises section 552.131 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) commercial 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.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov’t Code § 552.131(a)-(b). Section 552.131(a) protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” and “commercial 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.” *Id.* § 552.131(a). This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of Modis’s claims under section 552.110, CPS may not withhold any of Modis’s information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Additionally, we note section 552.131(b) is designed to protect

the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As CPS does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude no portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, CPS must release the submitted information.

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](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,



Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 549726

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Allied Consultants  
1304 West Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Experis IT Services US  
3512 Peasanos Parkway, Suite 204  
San Antonio, Texas 78231  
(w/o enclosures)

Dyonyx  
1325 North Loop West, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77008  
(w/o enclosures)

K Force  
9601 McAllister Freeway, Suite 913  
San Antonio, Texas 78216  
(w/o enclosures)

Indatatech  
85 NE Loop 410, Suite 405  
San Antonio, Texas 78216  
(w/o enclosures)

National Human Resources Group  
P.O. Box 340940  
Austin, Texas 78734  
(w/o enclosures)

Radgov  
c/o Kipling D. Giles  
Senior Counsel  
Legal Services Division  
CPS Energy  
P. O. Box 1771  
San Antonio, Texas 78296  
(w/o enclosures)

Structure Consulting Group  
12335 Kingsride, #401  
Houston, Texas 77024  
(w/o enclosures)

Teksystems  
9601 McAllister Freeway  
Suite 200  
San Antonio, Texas 78216  
(w/o enclosures)

Triquest  
13526 George Road, #201  
San Antonio, Texas 78230  
(w/o enclosures)

Modis  
c/o Mr. Anthony Procacci  
Associate General Counsel  
Adecco Group  
Building 200, Suite 400  
10151 Deerwood Park Boulevard  
Jacksonville, Florida 32256  
(w/o enclosures)

Ranstad Technologies  
Suite 450  
911 Central Parkway North  
San Antonio, Texas 78232  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brandon Gold  
Vice President  
System One Holdings  
Suite 330  
14643 Dallas Parkway  
Dallas, Texas 75254  
(w/o enclosures)

Quanta  
c/o Kipling D. Giles  
Senior Counsel  
Legal Services Division  
CPS Energy  
P.O. Box 1771  
San Antonio, Texas 78296  
(w/o enclosures)