



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 3, 2010

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

OR2010-11640

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# 389123.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for 1) technical and cost proposals submitted in response to Texas Prior Authorization Services RFP No. 529-10-0006, 2) a specified contract, and 3) the evaluation materials for RFP No. 529-10-0006. You state the commission is releasing some information. The commission takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Affiliated Computer Services, Inc. ("ACS") and Health Information Designs, Inc. ("HID"), (collectively the "third parties."). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 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 received comments from ACS and HID. We have considered the submitted comments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the commission's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires that a governmental body ask for a decision from this office and state which exceptions apply to the requested information by the tenth business day after receiving the request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). In addition, pursuant to section 552.301(e), within fifteen business days of receiving the request, the governmental body must submit to this office (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *Id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You inform us that the commission received the request at issue on April 23, 2010. Accordingly, the ten-business-day deadline was May 7, 2010, and the fifteen-business-day deadline was May 14, 2010. However, you did not request a ruling from this office or provide this office with the information required by section 552.301(e) until May 27, 2010. Accordingly, we find that the commission failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential by law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake, we will address whether the submitted information must be withheld to protect the interests of the third parties.

Next, we note that both ACS and HID seek to withhold certain information each company provided to the commission but that the commission has not submitted to this office for our review. The commission has informed this office that it has only submitted the information that each third party indicated in its proposal was subject to an exception under the Act. The commission further informs this office that it has already released the remaining information in the proposals. Because some of the information that ACS and HID seek to withhold was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted by the commission. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Thus, we will only address ACS's and

HID's arguments against disclosure of the information that was actually submitted to this office for our review.

ACS and HID claim some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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 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. *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 secret factors.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a

¹The 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).

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). We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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).

Having considered ACS’s and HID’s arguments, we find that ACS has established a *prima facie* case that some of its customer information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, the commission must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We note that ACS has published the identities of many of its customers on its website. Thus, ACS has failed to demonstrate that the information it has published on its website is a trade secret. Further, ACS and HID have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have ACS and HID demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of ACS’s arguments and its information at issue, we find that ACS has established that the pricing information we have marked in the submitted information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Additionally, we find that HID has established that its financial statements constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find ACS has made only conclusory allegations that the release of the remaining submitted information it seeks to withhold would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, ACS has not demonstrated that substantial competitive

injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM- 672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/jb

Ref: ID# 389123

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Tripodi
Ms. Robin Abbott
12365-A Riata Trace Parkway
Austin, Texas 78727
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark W. Hodge
Attorney for Health Information Designs, Inc.
400 West Capitol, Suite 2840
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(w/o enclosures)