



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

March 12, 2003

Mr. Hans P. Graff
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Independent School District
3830 Richmond Ave.
Houston, Texas 77027-5838

OR2003-1637

Dear Mr. Graff:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 177758.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for a complete copy of the top three proposals submitted to the district for Employee Assistance Services. You state that during the bid, the proposals were narrowed to the top two. Thus, you claim that there is no third document responsive to the request for information.¹ In regard to the responsive information, you claim that it may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.110, and 552.128 of the Government Code. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under any of those exceptions. You have notified CIGNA Behavioral Health, Inc. ("CIGNA"), and ValueOptions, Inc. ("ValueOptions"), the third parties whose proprietary interests may be implicated, of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.305* (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Chapter 552 of Government Code in certain circumstances). The district has submitted the information at issue to this office. We also received correspondence from CIGNA and ValueOptions. We have considered these arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the district's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this

¹We note that the Public Information Act (the "Act") does not require the district to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.--San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You state that the district received the present request for information on December 11, 2002. You also state that, due to the winter holidays and the closing of the district's offices, the 10th business day by which the district had to request a decision from this office was January 3, 2003. Therefore, the fifteenth business day after the date the district received the request was January 10, 2003. This office received copies of the requested information on January 13, 2003. Whether a submission is timely is determined by section 552.308 of the Government Code, which provides:

(a) When this subchapter requires a request, notice, or other document to be submitted or otherwise given to a person within a specified period, the requirement is met in a timely fashion if the document is sent to the person by first class *United States mail* properly addressed with postage prepaid and:

(1) it bears a post office cancellation mark indicating a time within that period; or

(2) the person required to submit or otherwise give the document furnishes satisfactory proof that it was deposited in the mail within that period.

(b) When this subchapter requires an agency of this state to submit or otherwise give to the attorney general within a specified period a request, notice, or other writing, the requirement is met in a timely fashion if:

(1) the request, notice, or other writing is sent to the attorney general by *interagency mail*; and

(2) the agency provides evidence sufficient to establish that the request, notice, or other writing was deposited in the interagency mail within that period.

Gov't Code § 552.308 (emphasis added).

The district deposited copies of the requested information with Airborne Express. Because the specific information requested was not received by this office or deposited in first class United States mail or interagency mail by its due date, January 10, 2003, the district did not meet the elements of timeliness established by section 552.308. Accordingly, the specific

information requested was not submitted within the fifteen-day deadline as required by section 552.301(e) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because sections 552.101, 552.110, and 552.128 can provide compelling reasons, we will address their applicability.

We note that portions of the submitted information have been designated as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." You have not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any of the information in question is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Therefore, none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

After reviewing the submitted arguments, we conclude that CIGNA has not demonstrated that any of its information qualifies as a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). ValueOptions does not argue section 552.110(a). Likewise, we find that CIGNA and ValueOptions have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of their information would likely result in substantial competitive harm to them. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 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 was entirely too speculative). Thus, CIGNA and ValueOptions have failed to demonstrate that any of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Further, the district does not make any argument under section 552.110.

Section 552.128 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information submitted by a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business under a local, state, or federal certification program is excepted from [required public disclosure], except as provided by this section.

(b) Notwithstanding Section 552.007 and except as provided by Subsection (c), the information may be disclosed only:

(1) to a state or local governmental entity in this state, and the state or local governmental entity may use the information only:

(A) for purposes related to verifying an applicant’s status as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business; or

(B) for the purpose of conducting a study of a public purchasing program established under state law for historically underutilized or disadvantaged businesses; or

(2) with the express written permission of the applicant or the applicant's agent.

(c) Information submitted by a vendor or contractor or a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship, a specific contract, or an application to be placed on a bidders list, including information that may also have been submitted in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business, is subject to required disclosure, excepted from required disclosure, or confidential in accordance with other law.

Gov't Code § 552.128. You do not represent, nor does it appear from reviewing the submitted information, that this information was provided to the district by potential contractors or vendors in order to become certified as historically underutilized or disadvantaged businesses under a certification program. Instead, a review of the submitted information indicates that it was supplied by a bidder seeking to supply services to the district. Under these circumstances, we do not find that section 552.128 applies to any of the requested information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

However, the submitted information relating to CIGNA and ValueOptions contains e-mail addresses of members of the public that may be excepted from disclosure. Section 552.137 of the Government Code makes certain e-mail addresses confidential and provides in relevant part:

(a) An e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Section 552.137 does not apply to a business's general e-mail address or web address. Accordingly, unless consent to release has been granted, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that portions of the proposal submitted by CIGNA are copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception

applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, we conclude that, unless consent to release has been granted, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. All remaining information must be released in compliance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 177758

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rick Dielman, CEAP
Vice President
EAP Division
WAP
2525 Wallingwood Drive, Bldg. 5
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Elizabeth M. George
Senior Counsel
CIGNA
Routing W-26
900 Cottage Grove Road
Hartford, CT 06152
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Adam R. Easterday
Associate Legal Counsel
ValueOptions, Inc.
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Falls Church, VA 22042
(w/o enclosures)