February 17, 2015

Mr. K. Scott Oliver
Corporate Counsel
San Antonio Water System
P.O. Box 2499
San Antonio, Texas 78298-2449

OR2015-03117

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# 553752.

The San Antonio Water System (the "system") received a request for specified proposals pertaining to four specified projects.[1] Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Archer Western Construction, LLC ("Archer"), Cardinal Contractors ("Cardinal"), CYMI Industrial, Inc., Eagle Contracting ("Eagle"), Garney Companies, Inc., MCG Contractors, Inc. ("MCG"), Payton Construction ("Payton"), and Sundt. 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 companies' 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). You inform our office Cardinal, Eagle, MGC, Payton, and Sundt do not object to the release of their information, which you state

[1]We note the system received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

you have released to the requestor. We have received comments from Archer. 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 under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from Archer explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted 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 system may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Archer raises section 552.102 for some of its information. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" Gov't Code § 552.102(a). However, section 552.102 applies to information in the personnel file of a governmental employee. *See id.* None of Archer's information consists of information in the personnel file of a governmental employee. Therefore, we find section 552.102 of the Government Code is not applicable, and the system may not withhold any of Archer's information on that basis.

Archer also raises section 552.103 of the Government Code, the litigation exception, for its information. We note section 552.103 protects the interests of governmental bodies, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.--Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103), Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the system does not raise section 552.103, we will not consider Archer's argument under that exception. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 4 S.W.3d at 475-76. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of Archer's information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Archer contends portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations where the governmental body wishes to withhold information in order to obtain more favorable offers. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). As the system does not argue section 552.104 is applicable, we will not consider Archer's claims under this section. *See id.* (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the system may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Archer claims portions of its information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 (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.[2] 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

---

[2]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).

factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* 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 Record 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* Open Records Decision 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).

Upon review, we conclude Archer 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 Archer 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. Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we find Archer has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its information would cause it substantial competitive harm. *See* ORDs 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), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of Archer's information under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."[3] Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be

---

[3]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, a portion of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the system must withhold this information, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, we find the system must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the system must withhold the representative sample of information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The system must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining 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,



Ellen Webking
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EW/akg

Ref: ID# 553752

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Suzanne Dawson
Archer Western Contractors
1411 Greenway Drive
Irving, Texas 75038
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Issa Dadoush
CYMI Industrial, Inc.
815 Walker Street, Suite 453
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Gardner
Garney Companies, Inc.
1333 N.W. Vivion Road
Kansas City, Missouri 64118
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Griffith
Cardinal Contractors
1106 North Highway 360
Grand Prairie, Texas 75050
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wendell Payton
Payton Construction
P.O. Box 1734
Wimberley, Texas 78676
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Greg Ayres
Sundt
2620 South 55th Street
Tempe, Arizona 85282
(w/o enclosures)

MGC Contractors
c/o K. Scott Oliver
Corporate Counsel
San Antonio Water System
P.O. Box 2499
San Antonio, Texas 78298-2449
(w/o enclosures)

Eagle Contracting
c/o K. Scott Oliver
Corporate Counsel
San Antonio Water System
P.O. Box 2499
San Antonio, Texas 78298-2449
(w/o enclosures)