



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 9, 2012

Ms. Connie Crawford
Assistant County Attorney
El Paso County Hospital District
4815 Alameda Avenue, 8th Floor, Suite B
El Paso, Texas 79905

OR2012-16073

Dear Ms. Crawford:

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# 467347 (File No. HO-12-224).

The El Paso County Hospital District d/b/a University of Medical Center of El Paso (the "district") received a request for five categories of information pertaining to request for proposal number 935-01/12-001: (1) the signed contract; (2) documents showing rates submitted by vendors; (3) the list of vendors that submitted a response; (4) a list of vendors that requested procurement documents; and (5) performance reports. You inform us the district does not have any information responsive to items four and five of the request.¹ You state you have released information responsive to item three of the request. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Alegis Revenue Group, L.L.C. ("Alegis"), Cardon Outreach ("Cardon"), and Resource Corporation of America ("RCA") 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 statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

circumstances). We have received arguments from Alegis. Thus, we have considered its arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Cardon and RCA. Thus, Cardon and RCA have failed to demonstrate they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)–(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Cardon and RCA may have in the information.

Next, we note some of the information Alegis seeks to withhold was not submitted by the district for our review. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information submitted by the governmental body requesting the ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Because this information was not submitted by the district, this ruling does not address Alegis's argument against its disclosure.

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 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, 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 Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.² 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. 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 ORD 661 at 5.

Alegis claims some of its information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find Alegis has established a *prima facie* case that its customer information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, the district must withhold this information under section 552.110(a). However, we find Alegis has failed to demonstrate any of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. 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). We note 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." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; see also *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a).

²The 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.

Alegis also contends some of its remaining information is commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company competitive harm. Upon review of Alegis's arguments under section 552.110(b), we conclude Alegis has established the release of its pricing information, which we have marked, would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, we find Alegis has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showings required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *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). We therefore conclude the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining 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,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 467347

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Douglas Turek
Chief Operating Officer
Alegis Revenue Group
1201 Lake Woodlands Drive, Suite 4024
The Woodlands, Texas 77380
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dana Darragh
Resource Corporation of America
1120 Marina Bay Drive
Clear Lake Shores, Texas 77565
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Emily Fisher
Cardon Outreach
4185 Technology Forest Boulevard, Suite 200
The Woodlands, Texas 77381
(w/o enclosures)