



January 29, 2015

Ms. Elizabeth Hanshaw Winn  
Assistant County Attorney  
Transactions Division  
Travis County  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767-1748

OR2015-01816

Dear Ms. Winn:

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# 551889.

The Travis County Purchasing Office (the "county") received a request for the proposals, excluding the requestor's company's proposal, submitted in response to a specified request for proposals, the evaluation of all bidders for the specified request for proposals, and the final contract issued pursuant to the request for proposals. You state the county has released some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state the release the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Aetna Life Insurance Company, Catamaran LLC ("Catamaran"), Cigna, Envision Pharmaceutical Services, LLC ("Envision"), H-E-B Rxtra Advantage, ProAct, Inc., and United Healthcare Services, Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why

requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exceptions to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Catamaran and Envision. 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 only received comments from Catamaran and Envision. 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 county may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Next, we note both Catamaran and Envision argue against the disclosure of information not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the county has submitted to us for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit a copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the county submitted as responsive to the request for information.

Catamaran and Envision argue some of their information is excepted 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. 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, 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 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.<sup>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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 section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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). We note 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." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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,

---

<sup>1</sup>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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

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.

Upon review, we find Catamaran has established that its customer information constitutes a trade secret. Therefore, to the extent Catamaran's customer information is not publicly available on its website, the county must withhold Catamaran's customer information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a). We further find Catamaran has established some of its remaining information constitutes trade secret information. Accordingly, the county must withhold the additional information we have marked under section 552.110(a).<sup>2</sup> However, we find Catamaran and Envision have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information they seek to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the 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 Catamaran's or Envision's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Catamaran and Envision each further argue portions of their information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Catamaran has demonstrated portions of its remaining information constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the county must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find neither Catamaran nor Envision has demonstrated the release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial harm to their competitive position. *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). Furthermore, you inform us the contract at issue was awarded to Envision. 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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address Catamaran's remaining argument against its disclosure.

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, the county may not withhold any of Catamaran's or Envision's remaining information under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n 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, writ ref'd n.r.e.); 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 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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *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).

You state the information you have marked consists of notes and evaluation materials for the specified request for proposals. You claim these materials reflect the county's internal policymaking processes. Based on your representations and our review, we find the

information at issue consists of advice, opinion and evaluations for regarding each bidder. Therefore, the county may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.111.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[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.”<sup>3</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the county must withhold the information we have marked 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 county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code; however, the county may only withhold Catamaran’s customer information to the extent this information is not publicly available on Catamaran’s website. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The county may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.111. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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/>

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

[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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 551889

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig Grossardt  
Senior Counsel  
Catamaran LLC  
1600 McConnor Parkway  
Schaumburg, Illinois 60173-6801  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Louis Heerwagen  
Aetna Life Insurance Company  
151 Farmington Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut 06156  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Manuel Perez  
Account Manager  
H-E-B Rxtra Advantage  
646 South Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78204  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Nolte  
United Healthcare Services, Inc.  
Building 1, Suite 250/360  
1250 Capital of Texas Highway South  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jennilyn Thiboult, Esq., CHC  
Associate Legal Counsel  
Envision Pharmaceutical Services, LLC  
1301 East Broward Boulevard, Suite 300  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Liz Austin  
National Sales Director  
ProAct, Inc.  
125 Feritti Drive  
Lakeway, Texas 78734  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tobin Hawkins  
Cigna  
2700 Post Oak Boulevard  
Houston, Texas 77056  
(w/o enclosures)