

The ruling you have requested has been modified pursuant to a court order. The court judgment has been attached to this document.



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 9, 2008

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

OR2008-09313

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# 315203.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for information relating to the Superior HealthPlan Network ("Superior"), including Superior's response to a request for proposals and its related contract with the commission.<sup>1</sup> You state that the commission takes no position on the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the information implicates Superior's proprietary interests. You notified Superior of this request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.<sup>2</sup> We received correspondence from an attorney for Superior. We have considered Superior's arguments and have reviewed the information you submitted.

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us that the commission has confirmed that this request for Superior's "basic awarded contract" also encompasses its response to the request for proposals. You also inform us that the commission no longer requires a decision by this office regarding a previous request for Superior's proposal because the previous requestor is satisfied with the responsive information that the commission has released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

<sup>2</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).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and (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.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be

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 a single or ephemeral event 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.<sup>3</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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) 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Superior contends that portions of its proposal and contract with the commission constitute trade secrets that are protected by section 552.110(a). Superior also asserts that the information in question falls within the scope of section 552.110(b). Having considered all of Superior's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we have marked information that the commission must withhold under section 552.110(b).<sup>4</sup> We conclude that Superior has not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue qualifies as a trade secret of the company for the purposes of section 552.110(a). We also conclude that Superior has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would be likely to cause Superior substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110. *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).

With specific regard to Superior's pricing information, we note that the information in question is related to a contract that the commission awarded to Superior. Pricing information pertaining to a particular 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 (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Likewise, the pricing aspects of a contract with a governmental entity are 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* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview at 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a

---

<sup>4</sup>The marked information is found in Binder 3 of 6 at pages 610 through 1250; in Binder 5 of 6 at pages 2448-49 and 2451-52; and in the binder titled Items for Clarification, Book 2 of 2, at Managed Care Accessibility Analysis.

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).

In summary, the commission must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 315203

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lynne Skelley  
FedSources  
8400 Westpark Drive, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tony Hernandez  
P.O. Box 685087  
Austin, Texas 78768-5087  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stacey M. Hull  
Superior HealthPlan, Inc.  
2100 South IH-35 Suite 202  
Austin, Texas 78704  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Janet Farrer  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP  
300 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street Suite 2100  
Austin, Texas 78701-2916  
(w/o enclosures)



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 9, 2008

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

OR2008-09313

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# 315203.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for information relating to the Superior HealthPlan Network ("Superior"), including Superior's response to a request for proposals and its related contract with the commission.<sup>1</sup> You state that the commission takes no position on the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the information implicates Superior's proprietary interests. You notified Superior of this request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.<sup>2</sup> We received correspondence from an attorney for Superior. We have considered Superior's arguments and have reviewed the information you submitted.

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us that the commission has confirmed that this request for Superior's "basic awarded contract" also encompasses its response to the request for proposals. You also inform us that the commission no longer requires a decision by this office regarding a previous request for Superior's proposal because the previous requestor is satisfied with the responsive information that the commission has released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

<sup>2</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).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and (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.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be

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 a single or ephemeral event 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.<sup>3</sup> *See Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990)*. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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 (1939); *see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980)*.

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) 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Superior contends that portions of its proposal and contract with the commission constitute trade secrets that are protected by section 552.110(a). Superior also asserts that the information in question falls within the scope of section 552.110(b). Having considered all of Superior's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we have marked information that the commission must withhold under section 552.110(b).<sup>4</sup> We conclude that Superior has not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue qualifies as a trade secret of the company for the purposes of section 552.110(a). We also conclude that Superior has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would be likely to cause Superior substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110. *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).

With specific regard to Superior's pricing information, we note that the information in question is related to a contract that the commission awarded to Superior. Pricing information pertaining to a particular 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 (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Likewise, the pricing aspects of a contract with a governmental entity are 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* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview at 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a

---

<sup>4</sup>The marked information is found in Binder 3 of 6 at pages 610 through 1250; in Binder 5 of 6 at pages 2448-49 and 2451-52; and in the binder titled Items for Clarification, Book 2 of 2, at Managed Care Accessibility Analysis.

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).

In summary, the commission must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 315203

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lynne Skelley  
FedSources  
8400 Westpark Drive, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tony Hernandez  
P.O. Box 685087  
Austin, Texas 78768-5087  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stacey M. Hull  
Superior HealthPlan, Inc.  
2100 South IH-35 Suite 202  
Austin, Texas 78704  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Janet Farrer  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP  
300 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street Suite 2100  
Austin, Texas 78701-2916  
(w/o enclosures)