



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 25, 2014

Ms. Hadassah Schloss
Open Records Coordinator
Texas General Land Office
P.O. Box 12873
Austin, Texas 78711-2873

OR2014-17045

Dear Ms. Schloss:

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# 538254.

The Texas General Land Office (the "GLO") received a request for the current third party management contracts for Texas veterans homes. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Care Inn Management, Inc. and Touchstone Veterans GP, Inc. (collectively, "Touchstone"); and Senior Dimensions, Inc. ("Senior") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from an attorney for Touchstone. 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 under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Senior explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Senior has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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 GLO may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Senior may have in it.

Next, Touchstone claims some of its 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 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. See *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); see also ORD 552. 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. This office must accept a claim that

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; see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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. To establish the applicability of section 552.110(a), a third party must demonstrate the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. See Open Records Decision No. 402 at 2-3 (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 5-6 (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).

Touchstone argues some of its information constitutes trade secrets. 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. After consideration of the arguments submitted by Touchstone and review of the information at issue, we conclude Touchstone has failed to demonstrate the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Thus, the GLO may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Touchstone also claims release of some of its information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. However, upon review, we find Touchstone has failed to demonstrate that release of any portion of the information at issue would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. 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), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, 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 (pricing information is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Furthermore, we note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Touchstone, 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. 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). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); ORD 541 at 8 (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, the GLO may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Touchstone also raises section 552.136 of the Government Code for some of the submitted information. Section 552.136 provides, “[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.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, we find the GLO must withhold the insurance policy numbers within Touchstone's and Senior's information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the GLO must release the remaining 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, 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. Godden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLK/cbz

Ref: ID# 538254

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jennifer Windscheffel
Counsel for Care Inn Management, Inc. &
Touchstone Veterans GP, Inc.
Rosenthal Pauerstein Sandoloski Agather LLP
755 East Mulberry Suite 200
San Antonio, Texas 78212
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Susan Thomas Whittle
Interim CEO
Senior Dimensions, Inc.
1114 Lost Creek Blvd., Suite 220
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)