ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 17, 2008

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

OR2008-09764

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# 316005.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for the winning proposal and scoring sheets for request number 000015 of RFP# 529-06-0425, Medicaid/CHIP Multiple-Consultant Services. You state the commission has released most of the submitted information to the requestor. While you raise section 552.110 of the Government Code as a possible exception to disclosure, you make no arguments and take no position regarding the applicability of this exception. Instead, you state and provide documentation showing, that you have notified MAXIMUS of the commission's receipt of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 under the Act in certain circumstances). MAXIMUS has submitted arguments against disclosure of the submitted information. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.[1]

MAXIMUS argues their information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to 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: 1) trade secrets and 2) commercial

[1]We note that the commission did not submit for our review some of the information that MAXIMUS seeks to withhold. This ruling does not address information beyond what the commission has submitted to us for review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested). Therefore, we do not address MAXIMUS' argument for this information.

or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Gov't Code § 552.110.

Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret 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.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); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.[2] RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for

---

[2]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).

exception, and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* 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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Having considered MAXIMUS' arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we find that MAXIMUS has demonstrated that some of the submitted information, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.110. As for the remaining information, we find that MAXIMUS has failed to demonstrate that its information is excepted from disclosure as either trade secret information under section 552.110(a) or commercial and financial information the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, qualifications and pricing generally not excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 184 (1978). Furthermore, we also conclude that MAXIMUS has made only conclusory allegations that release of its information would cause it substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support its allegations with regard to the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 (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). Thus, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

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,



Henisha D. Anderson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HDA/jb

Ref: ID# 316005

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steven Van Tassell
Navigant Counsuliting
1801 K Street, NorthWest, 5th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20006
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom E. McGraw
President
MAXIMUS Financial Services Division
11419 Sunset Hills Road
Reston, Virginia 20190
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Melissa Q. DeBerry
MTG Managment Consulting, L.L.C.
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 2750
Austin, Texas 78701-4030
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lisa Horning, Esq.
Healthcare- Office of General Counsel
Navigant Consulting, Inc.
30 South Wacker, Suite 3550
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(w/o enclosures)