ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 10, 2014

Mr. Mark A. Booker
Director of Purchasing
Garland Independent School District
P.O. Box 469026
Garland, Texas 75046-4923

OR2014-11935

Dear Mr. Booker:

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# 528548.

The Garland Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to RFP 357-01-14 for Voluntary Benefits and Third Party Administration Services. You state the district will release some of the requested information. 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 ADP, Inc.; Aetna Life Insurance Company; Block Vision of Texas, Inc. ("BVT"); Cigna Health and Life Insurance; Cigna Dental Health of Texas, Inc.; Davis Vision, Inc.; EyeMed Vision Care, LLC; First Financial Administrators, Inc.; First Financial Capital Corporation; Humana; and TCG Consulting, LP and Jem Resource Partners (collectively, "Jem") 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. *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 and Jem. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note 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). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the remaining third parties explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of 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 of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in it.

Next, BVT and Jem claim their information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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.[1] 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. *See* 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (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).

Upon review, we find BVT has established its customer information constitutes a trade secret. Therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the customer information we have marked is publicly available on BVT's website, it may not be withheld under section 552.110(a). However, we find BVT and Jem have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information each company seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have BVT or Jem demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, none of BVT's remaining information or Jem's submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

---

[1]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).

Upon review of BVT's and Jem's arguments and the information at issue, we find BVT has established release of its pricing information would result in substantial damage to BVT's competitive position. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, we find BVT and Jem have not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of their remaining information. We note Jem was the winning bidder of the RFP at issue. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *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 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, 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). Accordingly, none of BVT's remaining information or Jem's submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is 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. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the district must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may be 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 BVT's customer information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the customer information we have marked is publicly available on BVT's website, it may not be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the

[2]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 528548

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. J. Matt Absher
Practice Leader
Benefits Administration
ADP, Inc.
5800 Windward Parkway
Alpharetta, Georgia 30005
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tami Polsonetti
Sales Director for Public and Labor Sector
151 Farmington Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06156
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Audrey M. Weinstein
Senior Vice President
Block Vision of Texas, Inc.
939 Elkridge Landing Road, Suite 200
Linthicum, Maryland 21090
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. C. Scott Hamey
Chief Financial Officer
Davis Vision, Inc.
175 East Houston Street
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sherri Pruitt
President
First Financial Administrators, Inc.
11811 North Freeway, Suite 900
Houston, Texas 77060
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rich Tisch
Sales Executive
Humana
8111 LBJ Freeway, Suite 200
Dallas, Texas 75221
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David E. Friedman
General Counsel
Jem Resource Partners
900 S Capital of Texas Hwy Suite 350
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. H. LaMonte Thomas
Vice President
Cigna Health
1640 Dallas Parkway
Plano, Texas 75093
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Hiagis
Vice President of Finance
EyeMed Vision Care, LLC
4000 Luxottica Place
Mason, Ohio 45040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin McCarthy
First Financial Capital Corporation
11811 North Freeway, Suite 850
Houston, Texas 77060
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Cochran
Partner
TCG Consulting, LP
900 S Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 350
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)