



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 15, 2014

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

OR2014-00914

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 511072.

The City Public Service Board of the City of San Antonio d/b/a CPS Energy ("CPS") received five requests from different requestors for the bid tabulation for the Construction of Underground Staff Office Building, RFP No. 10408230. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Franchise Maintenance Organization ("FMO"), Pugh Constructors ("PUGH"), and F.A. Nunelly Company ("F.A.").¹ Accordingly, you state and provide documentation showing, you have notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the circumstances). We

¹You inform us Buildem Construction, Inc., Keller-Martin Constuction, Inc., Con-Cor, Inc., and Capital Construction Division do not object to the release of their information.

have received comments from FMO. We have considered its arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 not received arguments from Pugh or F.A. Thus, these parties have not demonstrated 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, CPS may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Pugh and F.A. may have in the information.

FMO argues against release of information that was not submitted by CPS. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by CPS and is limited to the information CPS has submitted as responsive for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information other statutes make confidential. FMO asserts its information is protected by the Privacy Act of 1974, section 552a of title 5 of the United States Code ("Federal Privacy Act"). However, the Federal Privacy Act applies only to a federal agency. *See* 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(f), 552a(a). State and local government agencies are not covered by the Federal Privacy Act. *See Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F. 2d 895, 896 (5th Cir. 1980); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979). Because CPS is not a federal agency, it is not bound by the Federal Privacy Act's confidentiality provisions as would be a federal agency. *See* 5 U.S.C. §§ 552a(a)(1), 552(f) (defining "agency" for purposes of Federal Privacy Act). Therefore, none of the information at issue can be considered confidential by law pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Federal Privacy Act.

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. *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.² 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.

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

In advancing its arguments, we understand FMO to rely, in part, on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body's ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d at 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. See *Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only FMO's interest in its submitted information.

Upon review, we determine FMO has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, CPS may not withhold any of FMO's information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we find FMO has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, FMO has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the information at issue. See ORD 661 at 5. Accordingly, none of FMO's information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

FMO also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. 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) 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.* 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 FMO's claims under section 552.110, CPS may not withhold any of FMO's information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, 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 other exceptions against 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,



Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 511072

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 5 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Micha Pugh
Pugh Constructors
4843 Whirlwind Drive
San Antonio, Texas 78217
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. W. Wayne Pape
President
Franchise Maintenance Organization, Inc.
5221 Port Entry
San Antonio, Texas 78222
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Regina Guerrero
F.A. Nunelly Company
c/o Kipling D. Giles
Senior Counsel
Legal Services Division
CPS Energy
P.O. Box 1771
San Antonio, Texas 78296
(w/o enclosures)