



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 13, 2003

Ms. Diane J. Cordova
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Independent School District
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77027-5838

OR2003-8160

Dear Ms. Cordova:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191006.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for certain proposals submitted to the district. The district takes no position with regard to the release of the requested information. However, you have notified the seven interested third parties of the requests 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 section 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). The district has submitted the documents at issue to this office. We also received correspondence from CIGNA Healthcare ("CIGNA"), Kelsey-Seybold Clinic ("Kelsey"), and United Healthcare of Texas, Inc. ("United"). We have considered their arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that several of the submitted proposals have been designated as confidential or proprietary. However, information is not confidential under the Public Information Act (the "Act") simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 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."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

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, Insurance One Management, Inc., aka Blue Cross Blue Shield ("Insurance One"), Humana, Inc. ("Humana"), Harrington Benefit Services ("Harrington"), and Aetna have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, these parties have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *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 submitted information relating to Insurance One, Humana, Harrington, and Aetna is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Kelsey claims as an exception to disclosure section 552.305 of the Government Code. However, this section is not an exception to public disclosure. Rather, it prescribes procedures under which a governmental body may decline to release requested information for the purpose of requesting an attorney general decision under section 552.301. *See* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (addressing statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305).

Next, Kelsey and United assert section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This exception encompasses information that is deemed to be confidential under other law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (information made confidential by statute), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Kelsey and United have cited no law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any of the submitted information relating to Kelsey and United is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, none of the information relating to Kelsey and United is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Kelsey and United also assert that their proposals are excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). Section 552.104 excepts information from

disclosure if a governmental body demonstrates that the release of the information would cause potential specific harm to the governmental body's interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). The district has not argued that the release of submitted information would harm the district's interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, the proposals submitted by Kelsey and United may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

CIGNA, Kelsey, and United claim section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section 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.

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).

Having reviewed the submitted briefs, we conclude that Kelsey and United have established that portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110. We have marked the information that the district must withhold. However, we conclude that CIGNA has failed to make a *prima facie* case that any of its information constitutes trade secrets, nor has Kelsey and United made such a representation in regard to the remainder of their information. Further, we find that CIGNA, Kelsey, and United have made only conclusory allegations and have made no specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of any of their information would likely cause them substantial commercial harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative); 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor); *see generally* Open Records Decision

Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 184 (1978). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, the district must withhold only the information we have marked.

Additionally, Kelsey claims that its proposal is excepted from disclosure under section 552.128 of the Government Code. This section provides as follows:

(a) Information submitted by a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business under a local, state, or federal certification program is excepted from [required public disclosure], except as provided by this section.

(b) Notwithstanding Section 552.007 and except as provided by Subsection (c), the information may be disclosed only:

(1) to a state or local governmental entity in this state, and the state or local governmental entity may use the information only:

(A) for purposes related to verifying an applicant's status as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business; or

(B) for the purpose of conducting a study of a public purchasing program established under state law for historically underutilized or disadvantaged businesses; or

(2) with the express written permission of the applicant or the applicant's agent.

(c) Information submitted by a vendor or contractor or a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship, a specific contract, or an application to be placed on a bidders list, including information that may also have been submitted in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business, is subject to required disclosure, excepted from required disclosure, or confidential in accordance with other law.

We note that the information at issue was not provided to the district in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business under a certification program. Rather, the information Kelsey seeks to withhold was submitted by Kelsey to the district in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship. Therefore, we conclude that Kelsey's information is not excepted from disclosure pursuant

to section 552.128 of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any portion of this proposal on that basis.

Finally, we note that several of the submitted proposals contain information that is copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, we conclude that the district must withhold the information we have marked in the proposals submitted by Kelsey and United under section 552.110 of the Government Code. All remaining information must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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/lmt

Ref: ID# 191006

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Brian Kagel
10125 Lanshire Dr.
Dallas, Texas 75238
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Gisele M. Malloy
Senior Counsel
CIGNA Healthcare
Routing W-26A
900 Cottage Grove Road
Hartford, Connecticut 06152
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James C. Hoyle, Jr.
Medical Director for Operations
Kelsey-Seybold Clinic
2727 W. Holcombe Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77025
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Paula Denney
Strasburger & Price, LLP
1401 McKinney Street, Suite 2200
Houston, Texas 77010-4035
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig Dawson
Insurance One Management, Inc.
1309 West Wall
Midland, Texas 79701-6684
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick Bryan
Humana, Inc.
500 West Main Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40201-1438
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Paul Kaiser
Sr. VP Marketing
Harrington Benefit Services
675 Brooksedge Blvd.
Westerville, Ohio 43081
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William A. Leighton, IV, CEBS
Sales Vice President
Aetna
3800 Buffalo Speedway, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77098
(w/o enclosures)