



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 7, 2016

Mr. Roland Hernandez, Ph. D.
Superintendent of Schools
Office of the Superintendent
Corpus Christi Independent School District
P. O. Box 110
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403-0110

OR2016-22654

Dear Mr. Hernandez:

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# 629427.

The Corpus Christi Independent School District (the "district") received a request for (1) responses submitted for a specified request for proposals, (2) specified agreements, (3) a specified policy and its corresponding application, and (4) specified statements. The district states it released some information. Although the district takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, it states release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Aetna Life Insurance Company; Assured Benefits Administrators, Inc. ("ABA"); Blue Cross Blue Shield of Texas ("BCBS"); Healthcare Highways, Inc. ("Healthcare Highways"); United Healthcare Services, Inc. ("United"); and WebTPA. Accordingly, you state you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments on behalf of ABA, BCBS,

Healthcare Highways, and United. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which consist of representative samples.¹

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 any of the remaining third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Healthcare Highways argues its information is not responsive to the request for information. However, we note the Act requires a governmental body to make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information the governmental body holds or to which it has access. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 534 at 2-3 (1989). Because the district has submitted information for our review, we find the district has made a good-faith effort to submit information that is responsive to the request, and we will address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

ABA argues some of its information is confidential pursuant to agreements between ABA and two companies. ABA argues release of this information would violate confidentiality clauses in these agreements. We note information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 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.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

¹We assume the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at 841. BCBS and United state they have competitors. BCBS argues release of its information would provide its competitors an unfair advantage by revealing BCBS’s key details in its proposals and would allow its competitors to reverse engineer its bid. United asserts release of its information would injure the company by providing its competitors with insider knowledge of its bid information and allow its competitors to utilize United’s information to under bid United in future bids. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find BCBS and United have established the release of their information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold BCBS’s and United’s information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.²

ABA argues some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets and (2) 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. 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 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement’s definition of

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.³ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. 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. *Id.*; 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, we find ABA has failed to demonstrate the information for which it asserts section 552.110(a) meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information at issue on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

ABA also contends portions of its information are commercial or financial information, release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to ABA. Upon review of ABA’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we conclude ABA has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of ABA’s information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision No. 509 at 5 (1988) (because bid specifications and circumstances would change for future

³The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

- (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.

contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative). We therefore conclude the district may not withhold ABA's information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold BCBS's and United's information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining 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,



Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 629427

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

7 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)