



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 14, 2014

Ms. Maureen Franz
Deputy Chief Counsel
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2014-18399

Dear Ms. Franz:

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# 539469.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received three requests from different requestors for information related to RFP #529-15-0002. You state the commission is releasing some of the requested information to the requestors. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of American Medical Response, Inc. ("AMR"), LeFleur Transportation of Texas, Inc. ("LeFleur"), Medical Transportation Management, Inc. ("MTM"), Project Amistad ("PA"), and Texoma Area Paratransit System, Inc. ("TAPS"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request 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) (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

We have received comments from LeFleur, MTM, and PA. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requests received from the second and third requestors are narrower than the request received from the first requestor. Thus, the commission need not release information to these requestors that is not responsive to their requests for information.

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 AMR or TAPS explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude these third parties have 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 commission may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest AMR or TAPS may have in it.

PA claims portions of its information should be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). However, PA has failed to direct our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any of the submitted information is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, the commission may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

LeFleur, MTM, and PA all claim some of the information at issue is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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.¹ 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).

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

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).

result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5 (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).

LeFleur, MTM, and PA all argue portions of their information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find LeFleur and MTM's financial statements, as well as LeFleur's training manuals, which we have marked, consist of commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.² However, we find PA has failed to demonstrate release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *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 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 (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). Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

PA also asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude PA has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find PA has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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."³ 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.

²As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the remaining argument against its disclosure.

³The 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).

See Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Upon review, the commission must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


We note some of the materials 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 commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code and the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The commission must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law, and the commission need not release information to the second and third requestors that is not responsive to their requests for 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Neal', written in a cursive style.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 539469

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

LeFleur Transportation of Texas
c/o Mr. Gregory S. Saikin
Baker & Hostetler
811 Main Street, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77002-6111
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Etta J. Jackson
Associate General Counsel
Medical Transportation Management, Inc.
16 Hawk Ridge Drive
Lake Saint Louis, Missouri 63367
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Cyr
Director
American Medical Response, Inc.
7509 South Freeway
Houston, Texas 77021
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brad Underwood
Chief Executive Officer
Texoma Area Paratransit System, Inc.
3400 Texoma Parkway
Sherman, Texas 75090
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Xavier Bañales
Chief Executive Officer
Project Amistad
P.O. Box 26807
El Paso, Texas 79926-6807
(w/o enclosures)