



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 22, 2011

Ms. Lisa Ott Laky
General Counsel
Austin Travis County Integral Care
P.O. Box 3548
Austin, Texas 78764

OR2011-17302

Dear Ms. Laky:

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# 436994.

The Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center d/b/a Austin Travis County Integral Care (the "center") received a request for the contracts related to Gerloff Company, Inc. ("Gerloff") during a specified period.¹ You state the center has released most of the information. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state Gerloff's proprietary interests might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Gerloff of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office explaining why its 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 statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances).

¹We note the center sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

We have received arguments submitted by an attorney for Gerloff. We have considered its arguments and reviewed the submitted information.²

Gerloff raises section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from required public disclosure “information which, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect the purchasing interests of a governmental body in competitive bidding situations where the governmental body wishes to withhold information in order to obtain more favorable offers. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of governmental body in competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to government). As the center does not seek to withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104, we find this exception is not applicable to Gerloff’s information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

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, 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 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement’s definition of trade secret as well as the

²Although Gerloff raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1–2 (2002). Accordingly, we do not consider Gerloff’s assertion of section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.³ 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* 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 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). We note 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." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3, 306 at 3.

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 (1999).

Upon review, we find Gerloff has not demonstrated how any of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Gerloff demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b, ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim). Accordingly, the center may not withhold any of Gerloff's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon further review, we find Gerloff has not demonstrated how any of the submitted information constitutes commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause it substantial competitive harm. We note Gerloff was awarded the contract at issue. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to

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 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Accordingly, the center may not withhold any of Gerloff's information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As Gerloff raises no other exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released.

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,



Neal Falgoust
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NF/agn

Ref: ID# 436994

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rick Espy
For Gerloff Company, Inc.
Espy & Associates, P.C.
13750 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 730
San Antonio, Texas 78232
(w/o enclosures)