



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 15, 2012

Mr. Daniel O. Gonzalez  
General Counsel  
Wood, Boykin & Wolter  
615 North Upper Broadway, Suite 1100  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401

OR2012-12866

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

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# 462147.

The Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority (the "authority"), which you represent, received a request for information related to IFB No. 2011-FP-35 CNG Fueling Equipment. You state you have released some of the requested information. Although you take no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of ANGI Energy Systems, LLC ("ANGI"); Clean Energy Fuels Corp. ("Clean Energy"); and Mansfield Gas Equipment Systems ("Mansfield"). Accordingly, you have notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (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 certain circumstances). We have received comments from ANGI and Clean Energy. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that 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 decision, we have not received correspondence from Mansfield. Thus, Mansfield has not demonstrated that it has 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, the authority may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Mansfield may have in the information. We will, however, consider ANGI's and Clean Energy's arguments against disclosure.

ANGI and Clean Energy claim portions of their submitted proposals 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(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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 5. 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 (1939). 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. See 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 5-6.

Upon review, we find ANGI and Clean Energy have made a *prima facie* case that some of the information in their submitted proposals, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a). However, we determine ANGI and Clean Energy have both failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. 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 business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue in ANGI’s or Clean Energy’s submitted proposals on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

---

<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 (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

ANGI and Clean Energy also claim some of information in their submitted proposals, including their pricing information, constitutes commercial information that, if released, would cause these companies substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find Clean Energy has demonstrated that release of its pricing information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the authority must withhold Clean Energy's pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). However, we find Clean Energy has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information at issue in its submitted proposal would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue in Clean Energy's submitted proposal under section 552.110(b). *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), 509 at 5 (1988) (because bid specifications and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3. Additionally, ANGI seeks to withhold portions of its submitted proposal, including its pricing information, under section 552.110(b). We note ANGI was the winning bidder with respect to the contract at issue. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *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). Consequently, the authority may not withhold any of the ANGI's pricing information under section 552.110(b). We find ANGI has also failed to demonstrate how release of any of the remaining information at issue in its submitted proposal would cause ANGI substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue in ANGI's submitted proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information is 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). However, 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.

In summary, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released;

however, any information that is subject to copyright must be released in accordance with any applicable 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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](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,



Vanessa Burgess  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

VB/akg

Ref: ID# 462147

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)  
  
Ms. Sherry Gerred  
ANGI Energy Systems, LLC  
15 Plumb Street  
Milton, Wisconsin 53563  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John D. Byrd  
Mansfield Gas Equipment Systems  
1025 Airport Southwest  
Gainesville, Georgia 30501  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Katheryn Klein  
Clean Energy Fuels Corp.  
3020 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 400  
Seal Beach, California 90740  
(w/o enclosures)