



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 27, 2011

Ms. Guadalupe Ruiz
Human Resources Manager
City of Corinth
3300 Corinth Parkway
Corinth, Texas 76208

OR2011-18995

Dear Ms. Ruiz:

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# 440160.

The City of Corinth (the "city") received a request for all bid proposals, excluding the requestor's company's proposal, submitted in response to Health and Welfare Employee Benefits Insurance Plan RFP# 1018. Although you indicate the city takes no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted bid proposal information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Block Vision, Inc. ("BVI"); Humana Inc. ("Humana"); MetLife; and Superior Vision Services, Inc. ("SVS"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the notified these companies of the request and of each company's 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) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from BVI and Humana. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, some of which is a representative sample.¹

¹We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and, therefore, does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 any comments from MetLife or SVS explaining why their submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude MetLife and SVS have protected proprietary interests in their 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. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of MetLife's or SVS's submitted information on the basis of proprietary interests MetLife or SVS may have in the information.

Next, Humana seeks to withhold information the city has not submitted for our review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the city. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Furthermore, Humana asserts some of the information submitted by the city is not responsive to the instant request. A governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information that is within its possession or control. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). In this instance, the city has reviewed its records and determined the documents it has submitted for Humana are responsive to the request. Thus, we find the city has made a good-faith effort to relate the request to information within its possession or control. Accordingly, we will determine whether the city must release the submitted information regarding Humana to the requestor under the Act.

BVI and Humana claim some of their submitted bid proposal information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets, and (2) certain commercial or financial information. 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 a "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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). This office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument 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.² Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects "commercial 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 section requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; ORD 661 at 5-6.

BVI and Humana claim the information they seek to withhold constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find BVI has established its customer information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets and must be withheld under section 552.110(a). We find, however, BVI has not demonstrated how the remaining information it seeks to withhold and Humana has not demonstrated how its information

²The 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 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 [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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

meets the definition of a trade secret. 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.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Consequently, the city may not withhold any of BVI’s remaining information or Humana’s information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

BVI claims its remaining information at issue and Humana claims its information at issue constitutes commercial information that, if released, would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. After reviewing the submitted arguments and the information at issue, we find BVI and Humana have established release of their pricing, rate, and performance guarantee information would cause the companies substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We find, however, BVI and Humana have not demonstrated how release of their remaining information at issue would cause them substantial competitive injury, and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such assertions. *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). Consequently, the city may not withhold any of BVI’s or Humana’s remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note 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. Thus, the remaining information must be released in accordance with copyright law.

In summary, the city must withhold BVI’s and Humana’s information we have marked under sections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, but any information protected by copyright must be released 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,



Leah B. Wingerson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LBW/dls

Ref: ID# 440160

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Audrey M. Weinstein
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Block Vision, Inc.
7700 Congress Avenue, Suite 3108
Boca Raton, Florida 33478
(w/o enclosures)

Humana Inc.
c/o Ms. Rachael Padgett
McGinnis, Lochridge & Kilgore, L.L.P.
500 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Louis Makatura
Ms. Miranda Young
Superior Vision Services, Inc.
c/o Ms. Guadalupe Ruiz
Human Resources Manager
City of Corinth
3300 Corinth Parkway
Corinth, Texas 76208
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew Clifton
MetLife
c/o Ms. Guadalupe Ruiz
Human Resources Manager
City of Corinth
3300 Corinth Parkway
Corinth, Texas 76208
(w/o enclosures)