



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 20, 2008

Ms. Janis Kennedy Hampton
Assistant City Attorney
City of Bryan
P.O. Box 1000
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2008-03705

Dear Ms. Hampton:

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# 305252.

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for the "Proposed Rates Submission Form[s]" submitted to the city in response to request for proposals number 07-110. You state that you have released a portion of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. You also state that the submitted information may contain proprietary information, and thus, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified eleven interested third parties of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from BlueCross BlueShield of Texas ("BlueCross") and JI Companies ("JI"), two of the interested third parties. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (providing that any person may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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 Id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Aetna, Humana, Inc., Fiserv Health, TML Intergovernmental Employee Benefits Pool, Alliance Health Providers of Brazos Valley, Inc., Ameritas Group, Delta Dental, HealthFirst TPA, and Mutual Assurance

Administrators, Inc. have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their requested information should not be released. Therefore, these companies have not provided us with any basis to conclude that they have protected proprietary interests in any of the requested information. *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. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the requested information on the basis of any proprietary interest that these companies may have in the information.

Next, JI asserts that its financial statements and audit report are excepted from public disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. We note, however, that the city did not submit this information for our review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the city has submitted to us for review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested). Therefore, we do not address JI's arguments for this information.

BlueCross raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 552.104. Section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which 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 city did not submit any arguments in support of withholding any information pursuant to section 552.104, the city may not withhold any of BlueCross's information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

The city asserts that the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The section encompasses information protected by other statutes. The city raises section 552.101 in conjunction with section 252.049 of the Local Government Code, which provides as follows:

(a) Trade secrets and confidential information in competitive sealed bids are not open for public inspection.

(b) If provided in a request for proposals, proposals shall be opened in a manner that avoids disclosure of the contents to competing offerors and keeps

the proposals secret during negotiations. All proposals are open for public inspection after the contract is awarded, but trade secrets and confidential information in the proposals are not open for public inspection.

Local Gov't Code § 252.049. This provision merely duplicates the protection section 552.110 of the Government Code provides to trade secret and commercial or financial information. Therefore, we will address BlueCross's and JI's arguments regarding section 552.110.

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. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 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. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 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* ORD 232. 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.* § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

BlueCross and JI object to the release of their submitted information under section 552.110. Upon review of the submitted information and arguments, however, we find that BlueCross and JI have made only generalized allegations and have failed to demonstrate that any portion of their information meets the definition of a trade secret. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.110(a).

JI has demonstrated, however, that release of some of its requested information would cause it substantial competitive injury; therefore, the city must withhold the pricing information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review of BlueCross’s submitted arguments, we find that it has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of its information would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. *See* ORD 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue). Specifically, the information BlueCross seeks to withhold is pricing information. We note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *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, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Melanie J. Villars
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/jh

Ref: ID# 305252

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Patrick Baker
4606 Winchester
Bryan, Texas 77802
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Evens, Account Executive
Aetna
2777 North Stemmons Freeway, 3rd Floor
Dallas, Texas 75207
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lana Grimes, Account Executive
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Texas
P.O. Box 655730
Dallas, Texas 75265-5730
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steven Jones, Sales Executive
Humana, Inc.
8111 LBJ Freeway, Suite 200
Dallas, Texas 75251
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Susan Smith, Executive Director
TML Intergovernmental Employee Benefits Pool
1821 Rutherford Lane, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78745-5151
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen McBride, Vice President, Sales
Fiserv Health
12750 Merit Drive, Suite 500
Lock Box 80
Dallas, Texas 75251
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Vogel, Executive Director
Alliance Health Providers of Brazos Valley, Inc.
3131 East 29th Street, Building C
Bryan, Texas 77802
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig Miller, State Manager-Group Sales
Ameritas Group
7000 North Mo-Pac Expressway, 2nd Floor
Austin, Texas 78731
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kirk Lavalley, Account Executive
Delta Dental
317 RR 620 South, Suite 301
Austin, Texas 78734
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom Slack, CEO
HealthFirst TPA
821 E.S.E. Loop 323, Suite 200
Tyler, Texas 75701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jason Hopkins, Sales Manager
Mutual Assurance Administrators, Inc.
4004 Belt Line Road
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph W. Hrbek, Chief Operating Officer
JI Companies
10535 Boyer Boulevard, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78758
(w/o enclosures)