



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 31, 2017

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

OR2017-06761

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# 651681.

The City Public Service Board of the City of San Antonio d/b/a CPS Energy ("CPS Energy") received a request for the bid tab evaluation related to a specified request for proposals. 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 Techline, Inc. ("Techline"); Siemens Westinghouse ("Siemens"); National Switchgear Systems, Inc. ("NSS"); ABB Power TD&D Company ("ABB"); Circuit Breaker Sales & Repair, Inc. ("Circuit"); and Powell Electrical Systems, Inc. ("Powell"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Techline, Siemens, NSS, ABB, Circuit, and Powell of the request for information and of their 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 Powell. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Techline, Siemens, NSS, ABB, or Circuit explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Techline, Siemens, NSS, ABB, or Circuit has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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 Energy may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Techline, Siemens, NSS, ABB, or Circuit may have in the information.


Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. Powell states it has competitors. In addition, Powell states release of its information would cause specific harm to Powell, and would give an advantage to its competitors, allowing them to accurately estimate and undercut its future bids. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract, and especially the pricing of a winning bidder, are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company); *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). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 841. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Powell has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude CPS Energy

may withhold Powell's information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, CPS Energy must release the remaining information.

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 651681

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

6 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.