



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 9, 2014

Ms. Leah A. Curtis
Counsel for the Hunt Memorial Hospital District
Curtis, Alexander, McCampbell & Morris, P.C.
P.O. Box 1256
Greenville, Texas 75403-1256

OR2014-11836

Dear Ms. Curtis:

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# 528387.

The Hunt Memorial Hospital District (the "district") received a request for specified contracts and proposals from the winning bidders and any non-winning bidders for those contracts. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Automatic Data Processing, Inc. ("ADP") and Kronos, Inc. ("Kronos"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the district notified ADP and Kronos of the request for information and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted 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 Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from ADP and Kronos. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2014-02865 (2014). In that ruling, we concluded the district must release the information at issue. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which Open Records Letter No. 2014-02865 was based have changed. Accordingly, with regard to the

requested information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office in the prior ruling, we conclude the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2014-02865 as a previous determination and release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We now address your arguments for the submitted information that is not encompassed by the previous ruling.

Next, we note Kronos objects to disclosure of information the district has not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the district and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the district. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

We note ADP contends some of its information is defined as “confidential” under the agreements at issue. However, information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [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). ADP has not identified any law that authorizes the district to enter into an agreement to keep any of the submitted information confidential. Therefore, the district may not withhold ADP’s information unless it falls within the scope of an exception to disclosure, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

ADP raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. However, ADP has not pointed to any statutory confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of its information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of ADP’s information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

ADP and Kronos claim some of their 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 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, 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 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. 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 law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is

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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

“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; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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 at 5 (1999).

ADP claims some of its information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we conclude ADP has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has ADP demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, and experience not excepted under section 552.110). As previously noted, pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret 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; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

ADP and Kronos also claim portions of the submitted information constitute commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find ADP and Kronos have demonstrated some of their information, which we have marked, would cause substantial competitive harm. Thus, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note, however, that although ADP seeks to withhold its pricing information, it was the winning bidder with respect to the contract at issue, and the pricing information of a winning bidder 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* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, we find ADP has failed to demonstrate that the release of any of its pricing information would cause it substantial competitive harm. Further, we find ADP and Kronos have failed to demonstrate that the release of any of their remaining information

would cause them substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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 is too speculative), 319 at 3. Therefore, we find none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2014-02865 as a previous determination and release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with that ruling. 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; however, any information protected by copyright may only 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.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,



Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/tch

Ref: ID# 528387

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Alicia A. Amil
Vice President and Assistant General Counsel
Automatic Data Processing, Inc.
One ADP Boulevard
Roseland, New Jersey 07068-1728
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Giuseppe E. Bellavita
Senior Corporate Counsel
Kronos Incorporated
297 Billerica Road
Chelmsford, Massachusetts 01824
(w/o enclosures)