



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 12, 2012

Ms. Sara Hoglund
Office of the Purchasing Agent
Collin County
2300 Bloomdale Road, Suite 3160
McKinney, Texas 75071

OR2012-03701

Dear Ms. Hoglund:

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# 447493.

Collin County (the "county") received a request for information submitted by UnitedHealthcare ("United") related to request for proposals numbers 09308-11 and 09326-11. Although you take no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of United. Accordingly, you notified United of the request and of its 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 circumstances). We have received comments from United. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

United claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts “information which, if released, would give advantage to competitors or bidders.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). However, this section only protects the interests of a governmental body and not those of private parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (purpose of section 552.104 is to protect governmental body’s interest in competitive bidding situation). Because section 552.104 does not protect the interests of private parties, and the county does not claim this section applies to the submitted information, the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to two types of information: “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and “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(a)-(b).

The Supreme Court of Texas 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, 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. . . . [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) (emphasis added); *see 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 the person establishes a *prima facie* case

for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). We cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable, however, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[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). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Having considered United’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that United has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that 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 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, 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of United’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we note United was the winner of the bidding processes to which the submitted information pertains. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under

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

section 552.110(b). *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). Further, 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); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of United's pricing information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Further, we find United has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial damage to the company's competitive position. Thus, United has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the submitted information. *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 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, and qualifications and experience). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that "[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."² Gov't Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Therefore, the county must withhold the group insurance policy numbers we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note that portions 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

²The 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).

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 county must withhold the group insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information subject to copyright may only 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,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 447493

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cara M. Hawkinson
Assistant Associate General Counsel
Legal Services
MN012-S205
5901 Lincoln Drive
Edina, Minnesota 55436
(w/o enclosures)