



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 17, 2008

Mr. Carey E. Smith
General Counsel
Health and Human Services
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2008-05128

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 307572.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for the non-winning bids from RFP 529-07-0087. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure. Instead, you state that the request may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties, namely, EDS and Bearing Pointe. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified these companies of the request and of their 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). You state that Bearing Pointe does not object to release of its information and that you have released this information to the requestor. We have received comments from EDS. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

Initially, EDS seeks to withhold the submitted information under its Statement of Confidentiality. We note, however, that information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests confidentiality. A governmental body's promise to keep information confidential is not a basis for withholding that information from the public, unless the governmental body has specific authority to keep the information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under the [predecessor to the] Act

cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988); *see also Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976) (governmental agency may not bring information within scope of predecessor to section 552.101 by promulgation of rule; to imply such authority merely from general rule-making powers would be to allow agency to circumvent very purpose of predecessor to Act). Therefore, this information may not be withheld on the basis of confidentiality.

Next, EDS claims that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 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 the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of 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 single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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; *see also* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted 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) 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.* § 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 arguments and the submitted information, we find that EDS has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret. *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 submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

EDS has established, however, that release of some of the submitted information would cause it substantial competitive injury; therefore, the commission must withhold the pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note, however, that EDS has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its

remaining information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, EDS has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of the remaining information. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b). As no other arguments against disclosure have been raised, the remaining information must be released.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Loan Hong-Turney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LH/eeg

Ref: ID# 307572

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Davis Horton
Strategic Partnership, Inc.
6034 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78730
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris Keel
Bearing Pointe
301 Congress Avenue, Suite 1500
Austin, Texas 787801
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Reitz
EDS- S&L HHS
5400 Legacy Drive, H1-2C-34
Plano, Texas 75024
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karan Nimocks
EDS- S&L HHS
5400 Legacy Drive, H1-2C-34
Plano, Texas 75024
(w/o enclosures)