



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 6, 2006

Mr. Carey E. Smith
General Counsel
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.o. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2006-01874A

Dear Mr. Smith:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2006-01874 (2006) on February 27, 2006. We have examined this ruling and determined that we made an error. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on February 27, 2006. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act")).

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 243165.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received one request for the evaluations, proposals, and awarded contract pertaining to a request for proposals for the "CHIP Dental Contract" and two other requests for the awarded contract and evaluation information. You state that some of the requested information has been released. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the following third parties of the commission's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor: Delta Dental; CompBenefits; Dental Benefit Providers; Doral Dental ("Doral"); United Concordia; and First Continental Life. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). You indicate that the submitted information may be excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, but take no position as to whether this information is excepted under that section. We have reviewed the submitted information and arguments submitted by Doral and United Concordia.

Initially, 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 it should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter neither Delta Dental, CompBenefits, Dental Benefit Providers, nor First Continental Life has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of any of these companies, and the commission may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. See Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, 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), 542 at 3 (1990).

United Concordia argues that some of its information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. We note that section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. See Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the commission does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, we find this section does not apply to the submitted information. See Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104). Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.104.

Doral and United Concordia assert that some of the information at issue is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." 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. 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); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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 RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). 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).

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).

Having considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that Doral and United Concordia have established that the release of some of the submitted information would cause these companies substantial competitive injury; therefore, the commission must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). However, we find Doral and United Concordia have made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause either

¹The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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).

company substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. We also find Doral and United Concordia have not shown that any of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Thus, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110.²

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue 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).

To conclude, the commission must withhold the information marked under section 552.110. The commission must release the remaining documents to the respective requestors, but any copyrighted information may only 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, 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

²We note that some of the information at issue is publicly available on the websites of some of the third parties.


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. 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/er

Ref: ID# 243165

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Cheryl Rawlinson
Delta Dental
1115 International Drive
Rancho Cordova, California 95670
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken MacDougall
CompBenefits
100 Mansell Court East, Suite 400
Roswell, Georgia 30076
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Judy Blalock
Dental Benefit Providers
48 Broad Street, Suite 114
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bryan J. Roberts
Doral Dental
12121 North Corporate Parkway
Mequon, Wisconsin 53092
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. Gary Delz
United Concordia
4401 Deer Path Road
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Anthony J. Mungin
First Continental Life
12946 Dairy Ashford, Ste. 350
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(w/o enclosures)

FOIA Request Coordinator
Onvia
1260 Mercer Street
Seattle, Washington 89109
(w/o enclosures)