



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 4, 2007

Ms. Myrna S. Reingold  
Legal Department  
Galveston County  
722 Moody, 5th Floor  
Galveston, Texas 77550

OR2007-12969

Dear Ms. Reingold:

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# 291012.

The Galveston County Purchasing Agent's Office (the "county") received a request for the contract awarded and all proposals submitted regarding RFP number B062037 for inmate health care medical services at the county jail, as well as for the notes and score sheets of the evaluating committee. You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. Although you believe that some of the requested information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code, you take no position with respect to the applicability of those exceptions. Instead, you notified the third parties that submitted proposals of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and have reviewed the information you submitted.

---

<sup>1</sup>The third parties that received notice pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: CONMED, Inc. ("CONMED"); Correctional Healthcare Management ("CHM"); Correctional Medical Services, Inc. ("CMS"); Diamond Drugs, Inc. ("Diamond"); and Prison Health Services, Inc. ("PHS").

An interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from CONMED or PHS. Therefore, because neither of those parties has demonstrated that any of the submitted information is confidential or proprietary for the purposes of the Act, the county may not withhold any of those parties' information under section 552.101 or section 552.110. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.101, .110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999), 552 at 5 (1990).

Diamond and CMS each asserts that it submitted information as part of the RFP process with the understanding and expectation that such information would remain confidential. We note, however, that information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests confidentiality. A governmental body's promise to keep information confidential is not a basis for withholding that information from the public, unless the governmental body has specific authority to keep the information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under the [predecessor to the] Act cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988); *see also Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976) (governmental agency may not bring information within scope of predecessor to section 552.101 by promulgation of rule; to imply such authority merely from general rule-making powers would be to allow agency to circumvent very purpose of predecessor to Act). Consequently, the submitted information belonging to Diamond and CMS must fall within an exception to disclosure in order to be withheld.

CMS generally raises section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. However, CMS has not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any portion of the submitted information is considered confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information related to CMS under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Diamond objects to the release of portions of the submitted information pertaining to its employees, and claims that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information if the information (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The type of information considered intimate and

embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Upon review of the submitted information, we conclude that none of it is highly intimate or embarrassing. Accordingly, none of Diamond's submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of common law privacy.

CMS asserts that its information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the county does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, the county may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

CHM, CMS, and Diamond all raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of their bid proposals. 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). 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.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255, 232. 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. ORD 552. 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(b); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review, we determine that CMS has made a *prima facie* showing that some of its information constitutes a trade secret. Furthermore, we have received no arguments that rebut this company’s trade secret claims as a matter of law. Accordingly, the county must

withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a). However, we determine that no part of the remaining information for which CMS asserts section 552.110(a) constitutes a trade secret, and thus may not be withheld on this basis. We also find that CHM and Diamond have failed to make a *prima facie* case that any of the submitted information belonging to these companies constitutes a trade secret. Thus, no portion of the information pertaining to these companies may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Next, we find that CHM, CMS, and Diamond have demonstrated that release of portions of their information would cause those companies substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.110(b). However, we conclude that CHM, CMS, and Diamond have made only conclusory allegations and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support their allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause their companies substantial competitive injury. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; *see also, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 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 is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, no portion of the remaining information pertaining to these companies may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that section 552.136 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the information in the submitted proposals.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.136(b) states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). We have marked information that the county must withhold under section 552.136.

We also note that some of the submitted information appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted information unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information also must comply with copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* A member of the public who wishes to make copies of copyrighted information must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of

---

<sup>2</sup>This office will raise section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, as this exception is mandatory and may not be waived. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; Open Records Decision No. 674 at 3 n.4 (2001) (mandatory exceptions).

compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 at 8-9 (1990).

In summary, the county must withhold the information that we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released; however, any information that is protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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/mcf

Ref: ID# 291012

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Wendelyn R. Pekich  
Wexford Health Sources, Inc.  
Foster Plaza 2  
425 Holiday Drive  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15220  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jack Merlo  
Mr. Mark J. Zilner  
Diamond Drugs, Inc.  
Commerce Park  
645 Kolter Drive  
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15701-3570  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christina E. Capoot  
Mr. Jason A. Grant  
8484 South Valley Highway  
Suite 250  
Englewood, Colorado 80112  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd J. Aschbacher  
Mr. Frank Fletcher  
Correctional Medical Services, Inc.  
P.O. Box 419052  
St. Louis, Missouri 63141-9052  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Howard M. Haft  
Corporate Medical Director and Founder  
CONMED, Inc.  
9375 Chesapeake Street, Suite 203  
La Plata, Maryland 20646  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jon Walker  
Vice President Business Development  
Prison Health Services, Inc.  
105 Westpark Drive, Suite 200  
Brentwood, Tennessee 37027  
(w/o enclosures)