



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 9, 2005

Ms. Amy L. Sims  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Lubbock  
P.O. Box 2000  
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2005-10149

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 236033.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received two requests for information submitted in response to the city's request for proposals, RFQ 05-041-VK, and all the evaluation criteria documentation for this bid. Although the city takes no position with respect to the requested information, you state that the documents at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of Benefit Partners, Inc. ("Benefit"); Benefit Plan Audit Services, LLC; Claim Technologies Incorporated ("Claim"); Claims Management, Inc.; Sagebrush Solutions; Wiener Strickler LLP; Buck Consultants, LLP; and PPC Partner-Plus Consulting, Inc. Accordingly, the city has notified these entities of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* 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 to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Benefit and Claim and have reviewed their arguments and the submitted information.

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, Benefit Plan Audit Services, LLC, Claims Management, Inc., Sagebrush Solutions, Wiener Strickler LLP, Buck Consultants, LLP, and PPC Partner-Plus Consulting, Inc. have not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect their

proprietary interests. Therefore, Benefit Plan Audit Services, LLC, Claims Management, Inc., Sagebrush Solutions, Wiener Strickler LLP, Buck Consultants, LLP, and PPC Partner-Plus Consulting, Inc. have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of 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 city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of these companies.

Both Benefit and Claim raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of their information.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret 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.” *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court 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 a single or ephemeral event 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, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party's claim for exception as valid

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Claim also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for their proprietary information, section 552.110 of the Government Code is the proper exception to claim for this type of information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

under that component if that party establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). The private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983). 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 information at issue. *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).

Although both Benefit and Claim argue that section 552.110 applies to portions of their information, after review of their arguments and the submitted proposals, we find that neither company has established by specific factual evidence that the information it seeks to withhold in its respective proposal qualifies as trade secret information under section 552.110(a). *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business”). We note that the information Benefit and Claim seek to withhold under section 552.110 includes customer information. We find that release of the customer information would cause substantial competitive harm and have marked the information that the city must withhold under section 552.110(b). We find, however, that Benefit and Claim have not made the showing required by section 552.110(b) that the release of any of their remaining information would be likely to cause their companies any substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (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), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We therefore conclude that none of the remaining information Benefit and Claim seeks to withhold is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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 also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

We note that the remaining submitted documents also contain information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 provides in relevant part:

(a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or

(2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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.

Gov’t Code § 552.136. The city must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that the proposals at issue contain information 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 protected by copyright. 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 materials protected by copyright, 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, the city must withhold the information we have marked in the submitted proposals pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



James Forrest  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JF/jpa

Ref: ID# 236033

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Joseph A. Franchetti  
JAF Consulting, Inc.  
P.O. Box 925  
Mullica Hill, New Jersey 08062  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Russell W. Calkins, III  
Claim Technologies, Inc.  
1151 North State Street #234  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Raquel Tamez  
Benefit Partners, Inc.  
9400 North Central Expressway, Suite 1400  
Dallas, Texas 75231  
(w/o enclosures)

Benefit Plan Audit Services, LLC  
Attn: Robert J. Freck  
961 Amherst Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90049-5801  
(w/o enclosures)

Sagebrush Solutions  
Attn: Faith Glover  
15820 Addison Road, Suite 100  
Addison, Texas 75001  
(w/o enclosures)

Wiener Strickler L.L.P.  
Attn: Gary Gomer  
201 East Main, Suite 500  
El Paso, Texas 79901  
(w/o enclosures)

Buck Consultants, LLC  
Attn: Tamara Shelton  
14911 Quorum Drive, Suite 200  
Dallas, Texas 75254  
(w/o enclosures)

PPC Partner-Plus Consulting, Inc.  
Attn: Nan L. Coleman  
100 West Southlake Boulevard, Suite 142 #450  
Southlake, Texas 76092  
(w/o enclosures)