



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 2, 2004

Ms. Sara Shiplet Waitt
Legal and Compliance Division
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR2004-7486

Dear Ms. Waitt:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 208629.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for current rates, rules, forms, underwriting guidelines and actuarial information pertaining to specified program offerings of five insurance companies. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. You also assert that the release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified the following interested third parties of the department's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor: Texas Farm Bureau ("Texas Farm"), Progressive County Mutual ("Progressive"), Dairyland County Mutual ("Dairyland") and State Farm County Mutual ("State Farm"). See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

Initially, we address your assertion that the responsive information for Allstate was the subject of a previous ruling issued by this office as Open Records Letter No. 2004-3497

(2004). In that ruling, this office concluded that the underwriting guidelines constituted a trade secret under section 552.110(a). The department does not inform this office of any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling is based. Accordingly, the department may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2004-3497 with respect to the information pertaining to Allstate. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Public Information Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling).

We note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Progressive, Dairyland and State Farm have not submitted comments to this office in response to the section 552.305 notice; therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these companies have a proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See* 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. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that Progressive, Dairyland or State Farm may have in the information.

In response to your section 552.305 notice, Texas Farm argues that its information is excepted under sections 552.101, 552.104 and 552.110. Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision 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.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

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). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.¹ *Id.* 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 private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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).

Having reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments, we find that Texas Farm has established a *prima facie* case that its underwriting guidelines are protected as trade secret information. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut these claims as a matter of law. Thus, the department must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.110(a). Because our conclusion under section 552.110(a) is dispositive, we do not address Texas Farm's remaining assertions.

¹ The 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.

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).

Lastly, we address your claim under section 552.137. As amended by the 78th Legislature, this section provides as follows:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, 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.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Section 552.137(a) is applicable to certain e-mail addresses of members of the public that are provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. Section 552.137(a) is not applicable to the types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) or to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. Therefore, the department must withhold as confidential under section 552.137 the marked e-mail addresses found in the submitted documentation, unless the owner of a particular e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure.

In summary, the department must withhold the information pertaining to Texas Farm as confidential pursuant to section 552.110(a); the department must withhold under section 552.137 the marked e-mail addresses, unless the owner of a particular e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure; the department may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2004-3497 with respect to the information pertaining to Allstate; and the department must release all remaining information.

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,


Marc A. Barenblat
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAB/jh

Ref: ID# 208629
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kim Thatcher, CPCU
American Modern Insurance Group
700 Midland Boulevard
Amelia, Ohio 45102
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Hall
Progressive County Mutual
625 Alpha Drive
Highland Heights, Ohio 44143
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregg R. Mecherle, CPCU, CLU
State Farm Insurance Companies
One State Farm Plaza, B-3
Bloomington, Illinois 61710-0001
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lori Daul
Dairyland County Mutual Insurance
P.O. Box 8034
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481-8034
(w/o enclosures)

c: Mr. James Langford, CPCU
Texas Farm Bureau Insurance
P.O. Box 2689
Waco, Texas 76702-2689
(w/o enclosures)