



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 1, 2010

Ms. Katharine Marvin
Senior Attorney, Contracts and Personnel
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2010-07866

Dear Ms. Marvin:

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# 381077 (PIR Nos. 10.03.12.06, 10.03.12.07, 10.03.16.01).

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received three requests from two requestors for information relating to two specified contracts and a bid proposal, including a copy of the commission's current contract with PacoTech Inc. ("PacoTech"). You state the commission will release some of the responsive information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state that release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of PacoTech. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified PacoTech of the requests 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from PacoTech. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The commission raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the federal Freedom of Information

Act ("FOIA"). *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552. We note, however, that FOIA is applicable to information held by an agency of the federal government. In this instance, the information at issue was created for and is maintained by the commission, which is subject to the state laws of Texas. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979) (FOIA exceptions apply to federal agencies, not to state agencies); Open Records Decision Nos. 496 (1988), 124 (1976); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 7 n 3 (1990) (noting that federal authorities may apply confidentiality principles found in FOIA differently from way in which such principles are applied under Texas open records law); *Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F.2d 895, 897 (5th Cir. 1980) (state governments are not subject to FOIA). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with FOIA.

PacoTech contends portions of its information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that 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 governmental body in competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the commission does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find section 552.104 is not applicable to PacoTech's information. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, we turn to the submitted arguments under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as, for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it

relates to the production of goods, as, for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).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 exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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.* § 552.110(b); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

¹There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company’s] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
and
- (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 No. 232 (1979).

The commission and PacoTech both raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for the information at issue. The commission claims release of the information may cause harm to PacoTech's competitive position, as well as impair the commission's ability to obtain similar information in the future.² We note that section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties such as PacoTech, not the interests of a governmental body. Therefore, we will consider only PacoTech's interests in its information under this exception.

After reviewing the submitted information and PacoTech's arguments, we find that PacoTech has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. We note that 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 business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Thus, the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We also find that PacoTech has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its information would result in substantial harm to the company's 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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We note PacoTech was the winning bidder on the contract at issue. 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 generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, 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, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the

²We note the ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied); ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) of the Government Code by Seventy-sixth Legislature).

Government Code. As no other exceptions to disclosure are 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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Pamela Wissemann
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PFW/em

Ref: ID# 381077

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Gayle Page
President
PacoTech
1739 Nina Lee
Houston, Texas 77018
(w/o enclosures)