



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 2, 2006

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

OR2006-04463

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# 248136.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for the winning proposal and subsequent contract related to the Medicaid/CHIP Financial Audit Request for Proposals, project number 529-04-243. You state that "most" of the responsive information is being released to the requestor. Although you make no arguments as to whether the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure, you believe that this information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the commission notified Clifton Gunderson, L.L.P. ("Clifton"), the interested third party, of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); 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 to disclosure in certain circumstances).* We have considered the arguments that have been submitted to this office by the third party and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that Clifton seeks to withhold certain information that the commission has not submitted for our review.<sup>1</sup> We do not reach Clifton's arguments with regard to information that has not been submitted for our review by the commission. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting a decision from Attorney General must submit a copy of the specific information requested, or representative sample if voluminous amount of information was requested). Further, as the commission states that "most" of the responsive information is being released to the requestor, we assume that, to the extent it existed on the date the commission received the instant request for information, the information that Clifton seeks to withhold that the commission has not submitted for our review is being or has already been released to the requestor.

Clifton contends that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

---

<sup>1</sup>Specifically, the commission has not submitted pp. 3-4, 27-53, and 101-122 of Clifton's proposal.

- (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. *Id.*; *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

After reviewing the submitted information and the arguments of Clifton, we find that Clifton has made a *prima facie* case that some of the information it seeks to withhold is protected as trade secret information. We have marked the customer list and financial information in the submitted documents that the commission must withhold pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we determine that Clifton has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has this company demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We therefore determine that no portion of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

We further find that Clifton has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of the remaining information would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. Accordingly, we determine that none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 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).

In summary, we have marked the information that the commission must withhold under section 552.110(a). The remaining information must be released.

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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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/eb

Ref: ID# 248136

Enc. Submitted documents

c: FOIA Request Coordinator  
Onvia  
1260 Mercer Street  
Seattle, Washington 98109  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Carl J. Varley  
Clifton Gunderson, L.L.P.  
301 SW Adams Street, Suite 600  
Peoria, Illinois 61602  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Frank N. Vito  
Clifton Gunderson, L.L.P.  
9600 North Mopac Expressway, Suite 325  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(w/o enclosures)