ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

December 13, 2011

Mr. Matthew C. G. Boyle
Boyle & Lowry, L.L.P.
4201 Wingren, Suite 108
Irving, Texas 75062-2763

OR2011-18285

Dear Mr. Boyle:

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# 439048.

The City of Hurst (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for proposals submitted regarding vision care coverage. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.110 and 552.137 of the Government Code.[1] You also state the release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of interested third parties. Accordingly, you provided notice of the request to the third parties, notifying them of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why the information should not be released.[2] *See* Gov't Code §552.305 (permitting interested third parties to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments from BVT. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have marked portions of the submitted information as non-responsive. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

---

[1]Although the city also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, it makes no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the city has withdrawn its claim that this exception applies to the submitted information.

[2]The city notified the following third parties pursuant to section 552.305: Ameritas Group; Avesis; Block Vision of Texas, Inc. ("BVT"); Cigna; Davis Vision; Humana; and Superior Vision Services.

Next, 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 received correspondence only from BVT. Thus, the remaining third parties have not demonstrated that they have protected proprietary interests 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 city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in their information.

Although the city argues the requested information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the city's arguments under section 552.110. We will, however, address BVT's arguments under this exception. 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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.[3] 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. *See* 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. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of the submitted arguments, we find BVT has made a *prima facie* case that portions of its submitted information constitute trade secrets. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We find BVT has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We note 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 business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of BVT's arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that BVT has established some of its information, including its pricing information, constitutes commercial

---

[3]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).

or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find BVT has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its remaining information would result in substantial damage 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 that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

The city also seeks to withhold e-mail addresses in the remaining information. Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137(c)(3) states an e-mail address "contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals [or] similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract" is not excepted from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(c)(3). The e-mail addresses in the submitted information are all subject to section 552.137(c)(3) of the Government Code. Consequently, these e-mail addresses may not be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information 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 city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, but any information protected by copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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, 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,

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 439048

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Audrey M. Weinstein
Senior Vice President & General Counsel
Block Vision
7700 Congress Avenue, Suite 3108
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rhonda Whitworth
Senior Client Manager
Cigna
1640 Dallas Parkway
Plano, Texas 75093
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jacqueline St. Hilaire
Senior Group Sales Representative
Ameritas Group
12655 North Central Expressway, Suite 910
Dallas, Texas 75243
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Denise Schulze
Account Executive
Humana
8111 LBJ Freeway, Suite 200
Dallas, Texas 75251
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary W. Hinkle
Director of Group Market Sales
Davis Vision
159 Express Street
Plainview, New York 11803
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Louis Makatura
Regional Sales Manager
Superior Vision Services
11101 White Rock Road, Suite 150
Rancho Cordova, California 95670
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Russell Rice
Regional Vice President
Avesis
8000 IH 10 West, Suite 715
San Antonio, Texas 78230
(w/o enclosures)