ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 15, 2006

Ms. Lisa Ayers
Paralegal, Legal Affairs
Parkland Health & Hospital System
5201 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75235

OR2006-06346

Dear Ms. Ayers:

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# 251840.

The Dallas County Hospital District (the "district") received a request for the winning bids submitted in response to Request for Proposal 0342-05. Although you take no position regarding the public availability of the requested information, you state that release of the submitted information may implicate third party proprietary interests. Thus, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified the following entities of the request and each entity's right to submit arguments to this office: Cardon Healthcare Network, Inc. ("Cardon"); Chamberlin Edmonds ("CEA"); and Medical Advocacy Service for Healthcare, Inc. ("MASH") of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

We note that 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*

Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, only CEA has submitted arguments to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that the release of the submitted information pertaining to Cardon and MASH would harm their proprietary interests. *See, e.g., 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). Accordingly, we conclude that the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Cardon and MASH may have in the information.

CEA asserts that portions of its proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision," and (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." *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "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 [one] 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 a single or ephemeral event 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party's claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts

the claim as a matter of law.[1] *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). The private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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." Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Having considered CEA's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that CEA has have made a *prima facie* case that a portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut its claim with regard to this information as a matter of law. We therefore conclude that the district must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We also find that CEA has demonstrated that release of other portions of the submitted information would cause the company substantial competitive harm and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We have marked the submitted information that must be withheld under section 552.110. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the

---

[1]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).

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/sdk

Ref: ID# 251840

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert E. Hughes
2360 Campbell Creek Boulevard, Suite 500
Richardson, Texas 75082
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Molly E. Simmons
Assistant Vice President - Legal Services
Chamberlin Edmonds
14 Peidmont Center NE
3535 Piedmont Road, Suite 500
Atlanta, Georgia 30305
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Willey
Executive Vice-President
Cardon Healthcare Network, Inc.
25231 Grogan's Mill Road, Suite 100
The Woodlands, Texas 77380
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Shelton
Vice President, Operations
Medical Advocacy Services for Healthcare, Inc.
1227 West Magnolia Avenue, Suite 550
Fort Worth, Texas 76104
(w/o enclosures)