



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 3, 2012

Ms. Melanie J. Rodney  
Assistant County Attorney  
Harris County  
2525 Holly Hall, Suite 190  
Houston, Texas 77054

OR2012-19402

Dear Ms. Rodney:

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# 472563 (C.A. File No. 12HSP0212).

The Harris County Hospital District (the "district") received a request for proposals submitted in response to request for proposal 11/0286. Although you take no position on the public availability of the submitted information, you state some of the information at issue may implicate the interests of Accenture, LLP, Anthelio Healthcare Solutions, Inc. ("Anthelio"), Experis, Navigant Consulting ("Navigant"), No World Borders, Inc., and Pricewaterhouse Coopers ("PWC"). Accordingly, you notified these companies of the request for information and of their 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) (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 Anthelio, Navigant, and PWC. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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 decision, we have only received correspondence from Anthelio, Navigant, and PWC. Thus, we find the remaining interested third parties have not demonstrated that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of their 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 any of the remaining third parties' information on the basis of any proprietary interests these third parties may have in their information.

We understand Anthelio to assert it submitted the information at issue to the district with the expectation that it would not be publicly released. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure (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 a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. Section 757 defines 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 a single or ephemeral event 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) (citation omitted); *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.<sup>1</sup> This office will accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret under section 552.110(a) if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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 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 (citation omitted); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776.

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. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business must show by specific factual evidence that release of particular information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury).

Upon review, we find PWC has established a *prima facie* case that its customer information constitutes a trade secret. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we determine that Anthelio, Navigant, and PWC have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information at issue constitutes a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a). *See* ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information

---

<sup>1</sup>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 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information at issue may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(a).

Upon review, we find Anthelio and Navigant have demonstrated that release of their pricing information would result in substantial damage to their competitive positions. *See* ORD 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). Accordingly, the district must withhold the pricing information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that Anthelio, Navigant, and PWC have failed to demonstrate how release of their remaining information would result in substantial damage to their competitive positions. Accordingly, we determine no portion of Anthelio, Navigant, or PWC's remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b).

We note the remaining information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."<sup>2</sup> Gov't Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of section 552.136. Therefore, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note some of the information at issue may 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. *Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977)*. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975)*. 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.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.

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](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,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/tch

Ref: ID# 472563

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Theodore P. Senger  
Office of the General Counsel  
PricewaterhouseCoppers, L.L.P.  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, California 94111-4004  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Neil Hazary  
Counsel  
Navigant Consulting, Inc.  
250 East 96<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 415  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46240  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Julie Elizabeth Sherman  
Associate Counsel  
Anthelio Healthcare Solutions, Inc.  
5400 LBJ Freeway, Suite 200  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
(w/o enclosures)

No World Borders, Inc.  
Office of General Counsel  
620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1100  
Newport Beach, California 92660  
(w/o enclosures)

Experis, A Manpower Group Company  
Office of General Counsel  
1001 Fannin Avenue, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)

Accenture, L.L.P.  
Office of General Counsel  
5201 Blue Lagoon Drive, Suite 250  
Miami, Florida 33126  
(w/o enclosures)