



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 24, 2015

Mr. Brett Norbraten
Open Records Attorney
Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services
P.O. Box 149030
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2015-07968

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 561126 (DADS Reference No. 2015SOLEG0022).

The Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services (the "department") received a request for the winning bid proposal pertaining to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of McKesson Technologies, Inc. ("McKesson"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, you have notified McKesson of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted 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 the circumstances). We have received comments from McKesson. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

We note McKesson seeks to withhold information the department has not submitted to this office for our review. This ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted by the department. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental

body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

McKesson claims its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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 id.* § 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 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 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. 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

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).

exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of 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 at 5-6 (1999).

McKesson claims portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find McKesson has established a *prima facie* case its customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Nevertheless, to the extent McKesson has published any of the customer information at issue on its website, this information is not confidential under section 552.110. Accordingly, the department must withhold McKesson’s customer information in the submitted documents under section 552.110(a), provided McKesson has not published the information on its website.² However, upon review, we find McKesson has failed to demonstrate any of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* ORD 402, 319 at 3. We note pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, none of McKesson’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

McKesson claims portions of its remaining information constitute commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find McKesson has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its remaining information, including any customer information published on McKesson’s website, would cause it substantial competitive injury. *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

²As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as McKesson, 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; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *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 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, 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). Therefore, none of McKesson's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the customer information McKesson seeks to withhold is not publicly available on its website, the department must withhold McKesson's customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The department 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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/cbz

Ref: ID# 561126

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Emily V. Weeks
Legal Specialist
McKesson Technologies, Inc.
5995 Windward Parkway
Alpharetta, Georgia 30005
(w/o enclosures)