



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 5, 2010

Mr. Brooks Landgraf
Shafer, Davis, O'Leary & Stoker
P. O. Drawer 1552
Odessa, Texas 79760-1552

OR2010-06466

Dear Mr. Landgraf:

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# 379013.

The Ector County Hospital District d/b/a Medical Center Hospital (the "hospital"), which you represent, received a request for (1) the signed contract and awarded vendors proposal for the RFP for Primary Collection Services, (2) any documents showing how vendors were scored or ranked during evaluations including prices offered by each vendor, (3) a list of companies that requested the RFP and submitted a proposal, and (4) any reports over any time period related to contract performance, preferably from the most recent month, quarter, or year. You state you will release the list of companies to the requestor. It is our understanding that the hospital does not have some of the requested information.¹ Although you raise no exceptions to disclosure of the requested information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the hospital has notified Nationwide Recovery Systems, Ltd. ("NRS") and CreditWatch Services Ltd. of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist at the time the request for information was received or create new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments from NRS. We have reviewed the submitted information.

Next, we note 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 the third 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 CreditWatch Services Ltd. Thus, because this third party has not demonstrated that any of the requested information is proprietary for the purposes of the Act, the hospital may not withhold any of the information on that basis. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999).

NRS raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for the submitted information.² 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).

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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 (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

²We note that NRS argues against release of additional information, including all Exhibits attached to their winning proposal. However, this information has not been submitted by the hospital for our review. This decision addresses only the information submitted by the hospital as responsive to the instant request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D).

secret factors.³ Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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. *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. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 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).

Upon review, we find that NRS has failed to demonstrate that any of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has NRS demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that 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.” Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Further, we find that NRS has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its information at issue would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus,

³The 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 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 [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).

NRS has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the submitted information. *See* Open Records Nos. 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), 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). We note the submitted contract was awarded to NRS by the hospital. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a company contracting with a governmental body is generally not excepted 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, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a 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); ORD 541 at 8 (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b). As no further exceptions are raised, the submitted information must be released in its entirety.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Andrea L. Caldwell
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALC/eeg

Ref: ID# 379013

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris Mathews
Nationwide Recovery Systems, Ltd
2304 Tarpley Road, Suite 134
Carrollton, Texas 75006
(w/o enclosures)