



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2012

Ms. Leena Chaphekar
Assistant General Counsel
Employee Retirement System
P.O. Box 13207
Austin, Texas 78711-3207

OR2012-01782

Dear Ms. Chaphekar:

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# 444374.

The Employee Retirement System of Texas (the "system") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to the successful bidder for a specified request for proposals. You state the system will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.139 of the Government Code. You also inform us release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Humana Insurance Company ("Humana"). Accordingly, you notified Humana of the request for information and of its 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) (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 an attorney for Humana. We have considered the

submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which consist of representative samples.¹

Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect the interests of a governmental body in competitive bidding situations where the governmental body wishes to withhold information in order to obtain more favorable offers. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Section 552.104 protects information from disclosure if the governmental body demonstrates potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision No. 463 (1987). Generally, section 552.104 does not except bids from disclosure after bidding is completed and the contract has been executed. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 (1990). However, in some situations, section 552.104 will operate to protect from disclosure bid information that is submitted by successful bidders. *See id.* at 5 (recognizing limited situation in which statutory predecessor to section 552.104 continued to protect information submitted by successful bidder when disclosure would allow competitors to accurately estimate and undercut future bids).

You state the information in Exhibits 4, 5, and 8 relates to a request for proposals to provide a Medicare Advantage Plan to members of the system eligible for Medicare. You inform us the contract was awarded to Humana and that a majority of the contract has been executed. However, you also inform us the submitted information in Exhibits 4, 5, and 8 pertains to the “Clarifications and Performance Assessment” portions of the contract that have not been executed. You state the system and Humana are still in negotiations regarding these portions of the contract. You explain that release of the information in Exhibits 4, 5, and 8 would interfere with the system’s ability to negotiate terms with Humana in a manner consistent with its fiduciary duties to the beneficiaries of the system’s trust fund. You further contend the release of this information would place the system at a competitive disadvantage in future negotiations for these services. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the system may withhold the information in Exhibits 4, 5, and 8 under section 552.104 of the Government Code, until such time as the contract has been executed.²

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege

¹We assume the “representative sample” of information 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than those submitted to this office.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You claim the hand-written notes in Exhibit 2 are protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state these notes consist of communications between an assistant general counsel for the system and the system’s Benefit Contracts Division. You state these communications were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal services to the system. You state these communications were intended to be and remain confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the hand-written notes, which we have marked, in Exhibit 2. Accordingly, the system may withhold this information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of

section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* ORD 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

We note section 552.111 can encompass a governmental body's communications with a third-party, including a consultant or other party with which the governmental body shares a common deliberative process or privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). In order for section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9. We note that a governmental body does not have a privity of interest or common deliberative process with a private party with which the governmental body is engaged in contract negotiations. *See id.* (section 552.111 not applicable to communication with entity with which governmental body has no privity of interest or common deliberative process).

You state Appendices A, B, and C of Exhibit 3 are protected by the deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state this information reflects the opinions, advice, and recommendations of members of the system's review and selection

committee, as well as other system employees, regarding policy issues stemming from the selection of a provider of a Medicare Advantage Plan. Based upon your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the evaluation score sheets in Appendix A are excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code and the system may withhold this information from disclosure on that basis. However, we find the information in Appendix B consists of the opinions of references of the bidders for the request for proposals at issue. Furthermore, we note the submitted information in Appendix C consists of communications between system representatives and representatives of Humana. We note the communications with Humana relate to contract negotiations between the system and Humana. Because the system and Humana were negotiating a contract, their interests were adverse. Thus, the system and Humana did not share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to this information. Consequently, the submitted information in Appendices B and C of Exhibit 3 is not excepted under the deliberative process privilege and may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Humana asserts some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure 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. *See Gov't Code* § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *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. 1957); *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.³ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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.*; *see also* 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).

Upon review, we find that Humana has established a *prima facie* case that the customer information we have marked constitutes a trade secret. Therefore, the system must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We note, however, that Humana has made the remaining customer information it seeks to withhold publicly available on its website. Because Humana has published this information, it has failed to demonstrate this information is a trade secret. We also find Humana has failed to demonstrate how any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We further note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is

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).

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.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of Humana’s remaining information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Humana claims that some of its remaining information, if released, would cause the company substantial competitive harm. However, as previously noted, because the system published its remaining customer information on its website, it has failed to demonstrate how release of this information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Furthermore, we find Humana has not made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of its remaining information would cause it substantial competitive injury. *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 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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Additionally, we note 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* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Consequently, the system may not withhold any of Humana’s remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that 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 system may withhold Exhibits 4, 5, and 8 under section 552.104 of the Government Code. The system may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 2 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The system may withhold the evaluation score sheets in Appendix A of Exhibit 3 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The system must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the

Government Code. The system must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to 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,



Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/agn

Ref: ID# 444374

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Snyder
Humana, Inc.
Humana Group Medicare
485 Metro Place South, Suite 410
Dublin, Ohio 43017
(w/o enclosures)