ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 2, 2007

Ms. Sylvia N. Salazar
Assistant General Counsel
Employees Retirement System of Texas
P.O. Box 13207
Austin, Texas 78711-3207

OR2007-04122

Dear Ms. Salazar:

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# 276356.

The Employees Retirement System of Texas (the "system") received a request for (1) records relating to the last request for proposals or bids for group term life insurance, accidental death and dismemberment coverage, and disability income benefits; (2) the bid review analysis, decision matrix, and other information regarding the selection of the current carrier; and (3) the proposal from Fort Dearborn. You state that the system will release some of the requested information. You have submitted information that the system seeks to withhold under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also believe that the submitted information implicates the interests of Fort Dearborn Life Insurance Company ("Fort Dearborn"). You notified Fort Dearborn of this request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.[1] We received arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.110 from Fort Dearborn. We have considered all of the submitted arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

Both the system and Fort Dearborn point out that the submitted information was specifically identified as being confidential when it was provided to the system. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body

[1] *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Neither the system nor Fort Dearborn has directed our attention to any law under which any of the submitted information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101 of the Government Code. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101.

Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to 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." 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); *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" aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.[2] *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (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).

Among other things, both the system and Fort Dearborn argue that release of the submitted information could discourage private parties from bidding on contracts with governmental entities in the state of Texas. The system contends that "[t]his would limit [its] ability to attract qualified bidders who prefer to keep their trade secrets and other commercial or financial information confidential, thus adversely impacting [the system's] ability to provide [its] members with the best value of services available on the market." In invoking the system's interests in the submitted information, the parties appear to rely on the test announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton,* 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974), pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency. *See Nat'l Parks*, 498 F.2d 765; *see also Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* standard under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held that *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am.*

---

[2]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).

Insurers, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App. – Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only the interests of Fort Dearborn in the submitted information under section 552.110.

Having considered the system's arguments and those that we received from Fort Dearborn, we conclude that the system must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.110(b). We find that neither the system nor Fort Dearborn has demonstrated that any of the remaining information qualifies as a trade secret of Fort Dearborn under section 552.110(a). We also conclude that neither the system nor Fort Dearborn has made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of the remaining information would cause Fort Dearborn substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. In reaching this conclusion, we note that the submitted information relates to pricing aspects of a contract that the system awarded to Fort Dearborn. Pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Likewise, the pricing information of a winning bidder such as Fort Dearborn is generally not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview at 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency).

In summary, the system must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released.

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 W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/jb

Ref: ID# 276356

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ben Anderson
The Standard
14100 San Pedro, Suite 102
San Antonio, Texas 78232
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark A. Mosby
Fort Dearborn Life Insurance Company
1020 31st Street
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515-5591
(w/o enclosures)