



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 8, 2014

Mr. Les Trobman  
General Counsel  
Texas Water Development Board  
P.O. Box 13231  
Austin, Texas 78711-3231

OR2014-15770

Dear Mr. Trobman:

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# 535405.

The Texas Water Development Board (the "board") received a request for the bid tabulations, proposal, and pricing for the vendor awarded a specified solicitation. You state you have released some information 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 RFD & Associates, Inc. ("RFD") and Sistema Technologies ("Sistema"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified RFD and Sistema of the request for information and of their rights 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 RFD. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 ruling, we have not received comments from Sistema. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Sistema has a protected proprietary interest 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, the board may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Sistema may have in the information.

RFD asserts its information should be withheld because the company expected confidentiality when the information was submitted to the board. Information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information 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 overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. 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 at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

RFD 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 ORD 552. 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.<sup>1</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. 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 ORD 661 at 5-6 (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).

RFD asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude RFD has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find RFD has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. See ORDs 402, 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, none of RFD’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

---

<sup>1</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).

RFD argues some of its information consists of commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find RFD has demonstrated some of its information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the board must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, RFD has not established any of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Furthermore, we note RFD was a winning bidder in this instance. 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 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). In addition, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990). Accordingly, none of RFD's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the board must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) 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](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,



Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 535405

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

RFD & Associates, Inc.  
c/o Ms. M'Lou Patton Bell  
Munsch, Hardt, Kopf & Harr, P.C.  
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 3050  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joe Vallejo  
President  
Sistema Technologies  
512 Congress Avenue, Suite 2415  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)