



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 25, 2011

Mr. Michael R. Salinas
Attorney at Law
302A West Third Street
Mercedes, Texas 78570

OR2011-07428

Dear Mr. Salinas:

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# 418735.

The Mercedes Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to the employee benefits program, including the winning proposals, tabulation spreadsheets, and information reviewed by the district's board members. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.¹ 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). We have received comments from BVT. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The third parties at issue are: Aetna Life Insurance Company; Allstate Workplace Division; American Fidelity Assurance Company; Ameritas Life Insurance; Bay Bridge Administrators, L.L.C.; Block Vision of Texas, Inc. ("BVT"); Colonial Life; David K. Consulting, L.L.C.; Davis Vision, Inc.; Eyetopia Vision Care; Fidelity Life Association; Financial Benefit Services, Inc.; Humana Dental Insurance Company; ING Employee Benefits; The LegalEase Group; Lincoln Financial Group; Metlife; Metlife Insurance Company; Metlife Resources; National Benefit Services, L.L.C.; Premier Pension Solutions; Provident Life; Puro Aseguro Inc.; Reliance Standard Life Insurance Company; Standard Insurance Company; Total Administration Services Corporation; Unum Life Insurance; and United Concordia Insurance Company.

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). With the exception of BVT, this office has not received comments from any of the third parties explaining why their submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of the remaining third parties.

Next, we note BVT seeks to withhold information that the district has not submitted for our review because it is not responsive to the instant request for information. This ruling does not address information beyond what the district 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). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the district submitted as responsive to the request for information. *See id.*

Next, we consider BVT's arguments against disclosure of its submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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. *Id.* § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by exempting 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 the 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. ORD 552 at 2. 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); ORD 661.

Having considered BVT's arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that BVT has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that 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 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). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of BVT's submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of BVT's arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that BVT has established that its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that BVT has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to the company's competitive position. Thus, BVT has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. See Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative). Accordingly, none of BVT's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. Accordingly, we find that the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.³

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³We note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.


Finally, we note some of the remaining information is 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(b) and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 418735

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Peter G. Trusz
Aetna Life Insurance Company
151 Farmington Road
Hartford, Connecticut 06156
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Martin E. Hall
Ameritas Life Insurance Corp.
475 Fallbrook Boulevard
Lincoln, Nebraska 68521
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Audrey M. Weinstein
Vice President
Block Vision
Suite 3108
7700 Congress Avenue
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Marianne M. Adams
Colonial Life
1200 Colonial Life Boulevard
Columbia, South Carolina 29210
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dale Paustian
Davis Vision, Inc.
159 Express Street
Plainview, New York 11803
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael A. Honeysett
Fidelity Life Association
1211 West 22nd Street, Suite 209
Oak Brook, Illinois 60523
(w/o enclosures)

Allstate Workplace Division
1776 American Heritage Life Drive
Jacksonville, Florida 32224
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Amanda Martinez
American Fidelity Assurance Company
200 Classen Boulevard
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen E. Mise
David K. Consulting, L.L.C.
Suite 300
11118 Wurzbach Road
San Antonio, Texas 78230
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ruth Roy
Bay Bridge Administrators, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 161690
Austin, Texas 78716
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Marsha Curry
Eyetopia Vision Care
28120 Highway 281 North, Suite 108
San Antonio, Texas 78260
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kyle James
Financial Benefit Services, Inc.
2121 North Glenville Drive
Richardson, Texas 75082
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Nathan Glassey
Relationship Manager
National Benefit Services, L.L.C.
8523 South Redwood Road
West Jordan, Utah 84088
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris Gilbert
ING Employee Benefits
15455 Dallas Parkway #1250
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel Jenkins
Lincoln Financial Group
1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 209
Houston, Texas 77079
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Martin Sinclair
Metlife Insurance Company
5400 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75240
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Shelly Rhynes
Premier Pension Solutions
Suite 302
801 Washington Avenue
Waco, Texas 76701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marty Klinkhammer
Standard Insurance Company
900 Southwest 6th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William J. Tait
Humana Dental Insurance Company/
CompBenefits Insurance Company
500 West Main Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tracy Lalasz
The LegalEase Group
5850 San Felipe, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77057
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jan Linklater
Metlife
800 Gessner Road, Suite 350
Houston, Texas 77024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas G. Hogan, Jr.
Metlife Resources
400 Atrium Drive
Somerset, New Jersey 08873
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom Moorman
Provident Life/Unum Life Insurance
One Fountain Square
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenneth J. Moorman
Reliance Standard Life Insurance Co.
2001 Market Street, Suite 1500
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Renee Willis
Unum Life Insurance Company
2211 Congress Street
Portland, Maine 04102
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sarah Welther
Total Administration Services Corp.
2302 International Lane
Madison, Wisconsin 53704
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig Martin
United Concordia Insurance Co.
Suite 600
8214 Westchester Drive
Dallas, Texas 75255
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Luke Frost
Unum Life Insurance Company
Suite 1400
2000 West Sam Houston Pkwy. South
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)