



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2010

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

OR2010-06295

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# 377755.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received two requests for information pertaining to the winning proposal and resulting contract for the Request for Offers for Seat Management Services (RFO # 529-09-0064). The commission takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Vintage IT Services ("Vintage"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Vintage of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its 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 Vintage. We have considered the submitted comments and reviewed the submitted information.

Vintage raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. We note, however, that section 552.104 only protects the interests of a governmental body and is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). In this instance, the commission has not argued that the release of any portion of the submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation under section 552.104. Because the commission has not submitted any arguments under section 552.104, we conclude that the commission may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Vintage also raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information. 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 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 (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 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.¹ 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

¹The 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).

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* Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999) at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

We note that some of the information that Vintage’s seeks to withhold is the company’s pricing information. Pricing information pertaining to a particular contract with a governmental body is generally not a trade secret under section 552.110(a) because 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.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Furthermore, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Vintage, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). 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* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview at 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency).

Vintage also seeks to withhold its referenced client list under section 552.110. However, Vintage’s proposal states that the clients at issue, “have generously agreed to be a reference on our behalf.” Lists of entities and individuals that have agreed to serve as references for a third party are not protected under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110).

Having considered its arguments, we find that Vintage has failed to demonstrate that any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Vintage

demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We also find that Vintage has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the information at issue would cause Vintage substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3.

Finally, we note that some the submitted information appears to be 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). As no further exceptions are raised, the submitted information must be released in accordance with 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, 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,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/jb

Ref: ID# 377755

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Hanes
Vintage IT Services
1210 West Fifth Street
Austin, Texas 78703
(w/o enclosures)