



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 13, 2007

Ms. Sylvia N. Salazar
Assistant General Counsel
Employees Retirement System of Texas
P.O. Box 13207
Austin, Texas 78711-3207

OR2007-04148

Dear Ms. Salazar:

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# 275688.

The Employees Retirement System of Texas (the "system") received a request for the complete bid tabulation and pricing which led to a named company being selected as the system's audit vendor for 2006-2008. You state that you have released a portion of the requested information. You claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code.¹ In addition, you state that the remaining information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the system notified Sagebrush Solutions, L.L.P. ("Sagebrush") and HealthLinX, L.L.C. ("HealthLinX") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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). Both Sagebrush and HealthLinX have

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you have provided no argument explaining how this exception is applicable to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume you no longer assert this exception to disclosure. Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

submitted arguments.² We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

HealthLinX raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. Section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the system did not submit any arguments in support of withholding any information pursuant to section 552.104, the system may not withhold any of HealthLinX’s information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

The system, Sagebrush, and HealthLinX each claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) 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. 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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

²Sagebrush and HealthLinX have both submitted arguments for information which the system has not submitted for our review. Accordingly, this ruling does not address information related to these companies beyond what the system submitted for our review, and is limited to the information the system submitted as responsive to the present request. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

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). There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

After reviewing the information at issue, we find that the system, Sagebrush, and HealthLinX have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information at issue meets the definition

of a trade secret, and have failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 552 at 5-6; *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if 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”). We therefore determine that no portion of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

We find, however, that HealthLinX has made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that the release of a portion of the information at issue, which we have marked, would cause its company substantial competitive harm. Thus, this marked information must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b). We conclude, however, that the system, Sagebrush, and HealthLinX have failed to demonstrate that any other portion of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause either company or the system substantial competitive harm. *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 costs, 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 (information relating to organization, personnel, professional references, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Additionally, we note that 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 also 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). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110(b), the system must withhold only those portions of the information at issue that we have marked.

In summary, the system must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining 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

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,



Jordan Johnson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 275688

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Russell W. Calkins, III
Executive Vice President
Claim Technologies Incorporated
1151 North State Street, #234
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sally Reaves
Sagebrush Solutions, L.L.C.
15820 Addison Road, Suite 100
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alan Kellogg, R.Ph
Health LinX, L.L.C.
1192 East Draper Parkway, #303
Draper, Utah 84020
(w/o enclosures)