



August 27, 2002

Ms. Paula A. Jones
General Counsel
Employees Retirement System of Texas
P.O. Box 13207
Austin, Texas 78711-3207

OR2002-4780

Dear Ms. Jones:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 167713.

The Employees Retirement System of Texas ("ERS") received a request for copies of three specified responses to a Request For Information issued by ERS. ERS takes no position with regard to release of the requested information. You assert, however, that the request for information may implicate the proprietary interests of FlexBen Corporation ("FlexBen"), PayFlex Systems USA, Inc. ("PayFlex"), and Medical Group Insurance Services, Inc. ("MGIS"). You state that you have notified these parties 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 Public Information Act in certain circumstances). ERS submitted the information at issue to this office. We also received correspondence from MGIS. We have considered these arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the requestor specifically excluded information marked as "proprietary and confidential" by the third parties from his request for information. Of the interested third parties in question, only PayFlex submitted a portion of its response to ERS marked as "proprietary and confidential." Thus, this portion of PayFlex's information is not responsive to the request for information and we will not address the applicability of the Act in regard to it. However, we will address the applicability of the Act regarding the remainder of PayFlex's information.

In regard to the responsive information concerning FlexBen and PayFlex, 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 decision, FlexBen and PayFlex have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that any of the submitted information relating to FlexBen and PayFlex is proprietary. *See, e.g.*, Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Therefore, the responsive information relating to FlexBen and PayFlex is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

In regard to the submitted information concerning MGIS, MGIS claims section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of its information.¹ 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 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.

¹MGIS submitted a copy of the information it believed to be responsive to the request for information, which differs in some respects from the information of MGIS that ERS submitted to this office. This decision addresses the information that ERS submitted.

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 correspondence submitted by MGIS, we agree that most of the information MGIS has identified consists of trade secret information and commercial or

financial information. MGIS has established a *prima facie* case for the exemption of trade secret information, and this office received no arguments that rebut the claims of MGIS as a matter of law. Furthermore, MGIS has demonstrated by assertion of specific factual evidence that the release of most of the identified commercial or financial information would cause substantial competitive harm. Thus, ERS must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code.²

In regard to its list of references, MGIS additionally claims section 552.101 of the Government Code for information concerning the listed individuals. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information deemed confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law right to privacy. Information is protected under the common-law right to privacy when (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. The list of references does not contain information considered highly intimate or embarrassing. In addition, we note that telephone numbers, addresses, and personal information are ordinarily not private information subject to section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986). Therefore, the list of references may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and must be released.

MGIS also asserts section 552.102 of the Government Code in regard to its organization chart. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” This exception is applicable only to information contained in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.--Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision Nos. 473 at 3 (1987), 444 at 3-4 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984). As the organization chart does not relate to governmental employees, we need not address section 552.102.

Finally, we note that the submitted information relating to FlexBen, PayFlex, and MGIS 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:

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the argument of MGIS under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

(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.

Accordingly, unless consent to release has been granted, ERS must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude that: 1) ERS must withhold the MGIS information we have marked under section 552.110; and 2) unless consent to release has been granted, ERS must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in the FlexBen, PayFlex, and MGIS information under section 552.137. All remaining responsive information must be released.

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 Department of Public 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/sdk

Ref: ID# 167713

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rayford Walker
Walker Consulting
8601 Altus Cove
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David L. Lowe
Four Main Street, Suite 150
Los Altos, CA 94022
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael C. Creal
Vice President of Administrative Services
FlexBen Corporation
2250 Butterfield Drive
Troy, MI 48084
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin J. Hitzemann
Vice President of National Sales
PayFlex Systems USA, Inc.
P.O. Box 3039
Omaha, NE 68103-0039
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ron Weltman
Medical Group Insurance Services, Inc.
1849 West North Maple
Salt Lake City, UT 84116
(w/o enclosures)