



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 21, 2006

Mr. Dan Junnell
Assistant General Counsel
Teacher Retirement System of Texas
1000 Red River Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2698

OR2006-15072

Dear Mr. Junnell:

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# 268185.

The Teacher Retirement System of Texas ("TRS") received a request for the proposals submitted in response to the RFP for Audit of the Administrators' and HMO Operations Regarding the TRS-ActiveCare program. You state that TRS will release some of the requested information. You claim that some of the responsive proposals contain insurance policy numbers that are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. You also assert that release of the proposals may implicate the proprietary interests of interested third parties. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified the interested parties, The Segal Company ("Segal"), Wolcott & Associates ("Wollcott"), Mercer Health & Benefits ("Mercer"), Sagebrush Solutions ("Sagebrush"), Claim Technologies, Inc. ("Claim"), Healthcare Data Management ("Healthcare"), and Buck Consultants ("Buck"), of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* 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 to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have considered the arguments against disclosure and have reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.305 of the Government Code allows an interested third party ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). However, as of the date of this letter, only Sagebrush has submitted arguments explaining how the release of portions of its proposal will harm its proprietary interests. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any of the remaining proposals would harm the proprietary interests of their respective companies. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under Gov't Code § 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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). Accordingly, we conclude that TRS may not withhold the proposals of Segal, Wolcott, Mercer, Claim, Healthcare, and Buck on the basis of any proprietary interest those companies may have in their information.

You assert, however, and we agree that the proposals of Mercer and Claim contain insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding 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. In accordance with section 552.136, TRS must withhold the insurance policy numbers contained in those proposals.

Sagebrush raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for certain portions of its proposal. 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.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.); 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. *Id.*

Upon review of its arguments and the information at issue, we find that Sagebrush has demonstrated that its pricing information on page 27 and its client list on pages 24 and 25 constitute commercial and financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. On the other hand, Sagebrush has failed to articulate any of the necessary factors to demonstrate that the information on pages 16 through 18 of its proposal are its trade secrets. Accordingly, we have marked the portions of Sagebrush's proposal that are confidential under section 552.110(b).

Finally, we note that portions of the submitted proposals may be 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 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, TRS must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the proposals of Mercer and Claim under section 552.136. In addition, the marked information in Sagebrush's proposal must be withheld under section 552.110(b). The remaining information must be released in accordance with federal 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, 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,



June B. Harden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JBH/sdk

Ref: ID# 268185

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Brigitte E. Schreiber
Chapman-Kelly
100 West Court Avenue, Suite 106
Jeffersonville, Indiana 47130
(w/o enclosures)

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

Claim Technologies
Attn: Russell Calkins, III
1151 North State Street #234
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(w/o enclosures)

Wolcott & Associates
Attn: Marie Pollock
12120 State Line Road #297
Leawood, Kansas 66209
(w/o enclosures)

The Segal Company
Attn: MaryAnne Watson
1230 West Washington Street, Suite 501
Tempe, Arizona 85281-1248
(w/o enclosures)

Buck Consultants
Attn: Thomas Oliver and Robyn Bayne
14911 Quorum Drive, Suite 200
Dallas, Texas 75254
(w/o enclosures)

Mercer Health & Benefits
Attn: Phillip Christie Jr.
1051 E. Cary Street, Suite 900
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(w/o enclosures)