



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 30, 2005

Mr. Jeffrey S. Young  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Tech University System  
3601 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 2B141, STOP 6246  
Lubbock, Texas 79430-6246

OR2005-07897

Dear Mr. Young:

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# 231292.

The Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center ("TTUHSC") received a request for "the recently signed letter of intent" related to a merger of TTUHSC, Harrington Cancer Center ("Harrington"), and Baptist St. Anthony's Health System ("BSA"). You raise no exceptions on behalf of TTUHSC, but state that the request may involve third party proprietary interests. Accordingly, you indicate and provide documentation showing that, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Harrington and BSA of the request for information and of each entity's right to submit arguments explaining why the information concerning it should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Harrington has not submitted to this office reasons explaining why TTUHSC should not release the requested information. Therefore, Harrington has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information, and none of the information may be withheld

on that basis. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

BSA contends that the letter is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) commercial 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(a), (b).

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.); *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). 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 232 (1979). 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. Gov’t Code § 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).

BSA claims that the requested information is confidential under section 552.110 as a trade secret. However, BSA has not demonstrated that the requested information meets the definition of a trade secret. We therefore determine that none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. BSA also states that release of the requested information would cause substantial competitive harm to BSA. However, we find that BSA has not provided any specific factual evidence substantiating the claims that the release of any the submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to BSA. Accordingly, we determine that none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (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).

BSA also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) commercial 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.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” and “commercial 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.” *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Because BSA has not demonstrated that the requested information qualifies as a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, nor made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of the information would result in substantial competitive harm, we also conclude that TTUHSC may not withhold any of the requested information pursuant to section 552.131(a). Furthermore, we note that section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. Accordingly, none of the requested information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

Finally, BSA asserts that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.1235 of the Government Code, which excepts “the name or other information that would tend to disclose the identity of a person, other than a governmental body, who makes a gift, grant, or donation of money or property to an institution of higher education[.]” Gov't Code § 552.1235(a). However, this section does not except from disclosure the amount or value of an individual gift, grant, or donation. *See id.* § 552.1235(b). “Institution of higher education” is defined by section 61.003 of the Education Code. *Id.* § 552.1235(c). Section 61.003 of the Education Code defines an “institution of higher education” as any public technical institute, public junior college, public senior college or university, medical or dental unit, public state college, or other agency of higher education as defined in this section. TTUHSC indicates it is a component of the Texas Tech University System. Thus, we agree that TTUHSC qualifies as an “institution of higher education” under section 61.003 of the Education Code. Further, because section 552.1235 of the Government Code does not provide a definition of “person,” we look to the definition provided in the Code Construction Act. *See id.* § 311.005. “Person” includes corporation, organization, government or governmental subdivision or agency, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, association, and any other legal entity. *Id.* § 311.005(2).

BSA asserts that “[t]he discussions contemplated by the [requested information] could result in TTUHSC receiving a gift, grant, or donation[,]” and therefore BSA seeks to withhold “any information tending to reveal potential donations.” Upon review of BSA’s arguments and the submitted information, we find that BSA has failed to show that the information at issue identifies a donor who made a gift, grant, or donation of money or property to TTUHSC pursuant to section 552.1235 of the Government Code. Therefore, section 552.1235 is inapplicable, and none of the submitted information may be withheld on this basis. As neither BSA nor TTUHSC raises any other exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, 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 appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/jpa

Ref: ID# 231292

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. George Schwarz  
Health/Medicine/Business Writer  
Amarillo Globe-News  
P.O. Box 2091  
Amarillo, Texas 79166  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Hicks  
Ms. Elizabeth Pulliam  
Baptist St. Anthony's Health System  
1600 Wallace Boulevard  
Amarillo, Texas 79106  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Taylor  
Interim CEO and CFO  
Harrington Cancer Center  
1500 Wallace Boulevard  
Amarillo, Texas 79106  
(w/o enclosures)