



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 17, 2006

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

OR2006-00506

Dear Ms. Waitt:

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# 240309.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for "a copy of a typical Group Self Insurance Program's initial submission for a certificate to self-insure as a group." You claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The department takes no position on whether the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure, but you believe the third-party proprietary interests of the Texas Automobile Dealers Self Insurance Group ("TADSIG") may be implicated. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the department notified TADSIG of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments explaining why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (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 section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). TADSIG, in response to the department's notice, has submitted arguments to this office asserting that its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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 id.* § 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). 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 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.¹ *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)*.

¹The 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)*.

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[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.” 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 requested information. *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).

Upon review of TADSIG’s arguments and the submitted information, we determine that TADSIG has made a specific factual showing that release of some of the submitted information would cause substantial competitive harm to TADSIG and that such information is therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). The department must withhold this information, which we have marked. However, we find that TADSIG has not established by specific factual evidence that any of the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure as either trade secret information under section 552.110(a) or commercial or financial information the release of which would cause TADSIG substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *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”); Open Records Decision No. 661. Accordingly, none of the remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

The department asserts that some of the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses you have marked do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). In addition, you inform us that the department has not received any consents for the release of the e-mail addresses at issue. Therefore, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137.

In summary, the department must withhold (1) the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code and (2) the e-mail addresses you have marked pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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 ten 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 ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Robert B. Rapfogel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RBR/er

Ref: ID# 240309

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert Maucher
R & D Program Coordinator
Compensation Risk Managers, L.L.C.
112 Delafield Street
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert F. Boggus
Boggus Motor Sales, L.P.
Chairman of the Board of Trustees for TADSIG
c/o Ms. Sara Shiplet Waitt
Senior Associate Commissioner
Legal and Compliance Division
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Barry Layton, ARM, CSP
Assistant Vice President
Brentwood Services Administrators Inc.
P. O. Box 1125
Brentwood, Tennessee 37024-1125
(w/o enclosures)