



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 22, 2007

Ms. Cynthia Villarreal-Reyna
Section Chief
Texas Department of Insurance
MC 110-1A
P. O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR2007-03118

Dear Ms. Villarreal-Reyna:

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# 273029.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for the "access plan and provider list" for ten counties from the following healthcare networks: Aetna AWCA ("Aetna"), First Health Texas HCN ("First Health"), National Choice Care ("National"), and Zurich ("Zurich"). You state that the department does not have information responsive to a part of the request.¹ We understand you to assert that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining requested information, you indicate that release of this information at issue may implicate the

¹We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

proprietary interests of Aetna, First Health, National, and Zurich. Accordingly, you state and provide documentation showing that you notified these companies 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 under Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted arguments and the submitted representative sample of information.²

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, this office has not received comments from Aetna, National, or Zurich explaining how the release of the submitted information will affect their proprietary interests. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of these companies. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 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, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests that Aetna, National, or Zurich may have in it.

Although First Health does not object to the release of its requested provider list, it claims that its access plans are trade secrets. 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." *See id.* § 552.110(a). 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

²We assume that the sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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.³ 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).

After reviewing First Health's arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that First Health has failed to make a *prima facie* case that its access plans constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

The e-mail addresses contained in the submitted information are subject to 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

³The 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).

§ 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). In addition, you have not informed us that the department has received consent for the release of these e-mail addresses. Therefore, the department must withhold these e-mail addresses under section 552.137.

In summary, the department must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under 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 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/eb

Ref: ID# 273029

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Joyce Jones
1905 Donnybrook
Tyler, Texas 75701
(w/o enclosures)

Aetna Workers' Compensation Access
151 Farmington Avenue, RC61
Hartford, Connecticut 06156
(w/o enclosures)

Donna Lucas
Aetna Workers' Compensation Access
980 Jolly Road, UIIN
Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19422
(w/o enclosures)

Kelly Weigand
First Health Texas HCN
4141 North Scottsdale Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
(w/o enclosures)

Karen Weitendorf
First Health
3200 Highland Avenue
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515
(w/o enclosures)

Melissa West
National Choice Care
P. O. Box 691205
San Antonio, Texas 78269
(w/o enclosures)

Kathleen Gallagher
Zurich Service Corporation HCN
1400 American Lane
Tower 2-6th Floor
Schaumburg, Illinois 60196
(w/o enclosures)

David Bowers
Zurich Service Corporation HCN
1400 American Lane
Tower 2-6th Floor
Schaumburg, Illinois 60196
(w/o enclosures)