



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 12, 2006

Ms. Stacy E. Wilson  
Assistant County Attorney  
County of Travis  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2006-04960

Dear Ms. Wilson:

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# 253345.

The Travis County Purchasing Office (the "office") received a request for all proposals submitted in response to RFS# SO600-82-ML concerning Professional Mental Health Consulting Services and a request for all information regarding the ranking of the proposals. You state that the requestor has been provided with a copy of its scoring sheets. You further state that release of some of the information may implicate the proprietary interests of 2Thrive4 L.L.C. ("2Thrive4"); Gilbert, McClure, & Boldin ("Gilbert"); Health Management Associates ("HMA"); Inspiring Transformations, Inc. ("ITI"); and Psychiatric Emergency Services, Inc. ("PES"). You inform us that you have notified these interested third parties of the office's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released.<sup>1</sup> 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). HMA and ITI have responded to the notice and argue that some of the requested information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. ITI also argues that some of its information is excepted under section 552.102 of the Government

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that you state that you have been unable to reach PES.

Code. You explain 2Thrive4 and Gilbert do not object to the release of their proposals. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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, PES has not submitted to this office reasons explaining why the office should not release its information. Therefore, PES has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the information at issue, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. See *id.* § 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).

ITI asserts that the resume in its proposal is protected under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). This office has found that section 552.102 only applies to information in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. Since the information ITI seeks to withhold is not in the personnel file of any employee of a governmental body, we determine that section 552.102 is inapplicable to this information, and it may not be withheld on this basis.

Next, we consider HMA and ITI's arguments 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. *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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); 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. *Id.* § 552.110(c); *see also National*

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

In this instance, we find that neither HMA nor ITI has demonstrated how any of their information meets the definition of a trade secret. See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). Accordingly, this information may not be withheld under section 552.110(a). However, we conclude that ITI has demonstrated that release of certain information would result in substantial competitive harm to this company for purposes of section 552.110(b). We have marked the information that must be withheld on this basis. Furthermore, we find that HMA and ITI have not made the showing required by section 552.110(b) that the release of any of the remaining information would be likely to cause these companies substantial competitive harm. See Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). In conclusion, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining 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); *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,



Tamara L. Harswick  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TLH/eb

Ref: ID# 253345

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Angela Luck  
Copia Consulting, Inc.  
2730 Kinney Oaks Court  
Austin, Texas 78704  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karen Hale, M.S.  
Health Management Associates  
515 Congress Avenue, Suite 1760  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Ref: ID# 253345

c: Ms. Suzanne Clifford, M.B.A.  
Inspiring Transformations, Inc.  
108 East 43<sup>rd</sup>  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46205  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Avrim Fishkind, M.D.  
Psychiatric Emergency Solutions  
1611 Missouri Street  
Houston, Texas 77006  
(w/o enclosures)