



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 9, 2014

Ms. Jeanne C. Collins  
General Counsel  
El Paso Independent School District  
6531 Boeing Drive  
El Paso, Texas 79925

OR2014-07921

Dear Ms. Collins:

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# 522024 (EPISD ORR# 2014.77).

The El Paso Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a specified project. You state some of the requested information has been released to the requestor. 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 Benning Construction, Inc. ("Benning"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Benning of the request 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 representatives of Benning.<sup>1</sup> We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Benning raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, Benning makes no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume Benning to have withdrawn its claim this section applies to its information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Benning raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for its information. 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

---

<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).

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, 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 No. 661 at 5 (1999).

Benning asserts its information includes “company proprietary, financial and commercial/competitive information, pricing information, and service detail” and is subject to section 552.110 of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Benning has failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* ORD 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). Further, we find Benning has made only conclusory allegations the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* ORD 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). Furthermore, we note the contract at issue was awarded to Benning. 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* 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 district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Section 552.113 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] 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; or

(3) confidential under Subsections (c) through (f).

...

(c) In this section:

(1) "Confidential material" includes all well logs, geological, geophysical, geochemical, and other similar data, including maps and other interpretations of the material filed in the General Land Office:

(A) in connection with any administrative application or proceeding before the land commissioner, the school land board, any board for lease, or the commissioner's or board's staff; or

(B) in compliance with the requirements of any law, rule, lease, or agreement.

...

(3) "Administrative applications" and "administrative proceedings" include applications for pooling or unitization, review of shut-in royalty payments, review of leases or other agreements to determine their validity, review of any plan of operations, review of the obligation to drill offset wells, or an application to pay compensatory royalty.

Gov't Code § 552.113(a)(2)-(3), (c)(1), (c)(3). Benning generally asserts its information is subject to section 552.113 of the Government Code. 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)). Upon review, we find Benning has not demonstrated any of its information is commercially valuable geological or geophysical information regarding the exploration of or development of natural resources. Further, Benning has not demonstrated any of its information is confidential for purposes of

section 552.113(a)(3). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.113 of the Government Code.

Benning also claims its information is subject to 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). We note the scope of section 552.131(a) is co-extensive with that of section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of Benning's claims for the information at issue under section 552.110, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. We note section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the district 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.


The district states some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the district must release the submitted

information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/bhf

Ref: ID# 522024

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Henry Benning Construction  
c/o Mr. Stuart R. Schwartz  
ScottHulse PC  
P.O. Box 99123  
El Paso, Texas 79999-9123  
(w/o enclosures)