



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 31, 2013

Ms. Connie Crawford  
Assistant County Attorney  
Legal Department  
University Medical Center of El Paso  
4815 Alameda Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite B  
El Paso, Texas 79905

OR2013-13207

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# 494783.

The El Paso County Hospital District d/b/a/ University Medical Center El Paso (the "district") received a request for contracts for the winning bidders for the most recent request for proposals for temporary staffing for nursing and clerical services, including pricing information and any other agreements within the contracts.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state release of the this information may implicate the proprietary interests of AMN Healthcare Inc. ("AMN"), Advance'd Temporaries, Inc. ("Advance'd"), Allegiance Staffing ("Allegiance"), Integrated Human Capital ("Integrated"), and Nightingale Nurses, LLC ("Nightingale"). Accordingly, you state and provide documentation showing, you have notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

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 the circumstances). We have received comments from AMN. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note 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 Advance'd, Allegiance, Integrated, or Nightingale. Thus, these parties have not demonstrated 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 these third parties may have in the information.

Next, we note AMN seeks to withhold information that the district has not submitted for our review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the district has submitted to us for review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the district submitted as responsive to the request for information. *See id.*

AMN raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure for its information. This section excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” *Id.* § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the district does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, no portion of AMN's information may be withheld on this basis.

AMN also raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for a portion of its information. 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 Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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 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 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; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

---

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

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.

AMN asserts a portion of the submitted information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude AMN has failed to demonstrate any portion of information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* 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). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

AMN further argues a portion of the submitted information consists of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note although AMN seeks to withhold its pricing information, it was the winning bidder with respect to the contracts at issue, and the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder 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* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, we find AMN has failed to demonstrate the release of any of the submitted information would cause it substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision 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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b). As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the district must release the submitted information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kristi L. Wilkins  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 494783

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rosa Santana  
CEO  
Suite 103  
7300 Viscount  
El Paso, Texas 79925  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Hammon Scott Gibson  
President/Owner  
Advance'd Temporaries  
1221 WSW Loop 323  
Tyler, Texas 75701  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cathryn Baker  
President/Owner  
Allegiance Staffing  
6065 Montana, Suite B-10  
El Paso, Texas 79925  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Barakat Alao  
Associate General Counsel  
AMN Healthcare  
12400 High Bluff Drive  
San Diego, California 92130  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Yocum  
Branch Manager  
Advance'd Temporaries  
9530 Viscount, Suite 11  
El Paso, Texas 79924  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Marello  
Nightingale Nurses  
Suite 250  
6401 South Congress Avenue  
Boca Raton, Florida 33487  
(w/o enclosures)