ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 6, 2014

Ms. Kristi Ward
Public Information Officer
UMC Health System
602 Indiana Avenue
Lubbock, Texas 79415

OR2014-03845

Dear Ms. Ward:

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# 516011.

The Lubbock County Hospital District d/b/a University Medical Center (the "district") received a request for proposals submitted for RFP UMC ITB 2013-21 Large Display for Cardiac Cath Lab.[1] The district does not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act. However, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified HatchMed Interventional Lab Retrofitting ("Hatch"), Perkins Healthcare Technologies ("Perkins"), St. Jude Medical ("St. Jude"), and Stryker Communications, Inc. ("Stryker") of the district's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each 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 at 3 (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 correspondence from Perkins and Stryker objecting to the release of some of the information at issue. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and information.

Initially, we note Perkins asserts its information is not responsive to the request for information. A governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information that is within its possession or control. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). The district has reviewed its records and determined the documents it has

[1]The district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

submitted are responsive to the request. Thus, we find the district has made a good-faith effort to relate the request to information within its possession or control. Accordingly, we will determine whether the district must release the submitted information under the Act.

We also note Stryker has submitted information to this office it asserts is excepted from release. However, the district did not submit this information for our review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the district has submitted to us for review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the district submitted as responsive to the request for information. *See id.*

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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, neither Hatch nor St. Jude has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these third parties, and the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* 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, 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.

We next note information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information to a governmental body anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). Thus, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 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."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the requested information falls within an exception to disclosure, the district must release it, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Perkins argues some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information that, if released, would give an advantage to a competitor or bidder. Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that 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). The district did not assert section 552.104. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to that section. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret 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. 1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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.[2] RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown 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).

---

[2]The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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." Gov't Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

We find Perkins and Stryker have established the release of some of the information at issue would cause each third party substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). But Perkins and Stryker have made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b). In addition, we conclude Stryker failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the remaining information is a trade secret. *See id.* § 552.110(a); ORD 402. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110.

To conclude, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district 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, 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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tch

Ref: ID# 516011

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken C. Stone
Counsel for Perkins Healthcare Technologies
Looper Reed & McGraw, P.C.
1601 Elm Street, Suite 4600
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael G. Cartier
Deputy General Counsel
Stryker Communications, Inc.
2825 Airview Boulevard
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Hatch
HatchMed Interventional
Lab Retrofitting
c/o Ms. Kristi Ward
Public Information Officer
UMC Health System
602 Indiana Avenue
Lubbock, Texas 79415
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Wright
St. Jude Medical
6500 Red Rock Road
Amarillo, Texas 79118
(w/o enclosures)