



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 9, 2020

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Deputy City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2020-28140

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 852656 (Ref. No. 2880).

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of AIG Retirement Services Company; Empower Retirement ("Empower"); Equitable Financial Life Insurance Company ("Equitable"); ICMA-RC; Lincoln Retirement Services Company, LLC ("LRSC"); One America Retirement Services, LLC; PlanMember Securities Corporation; Security Benefit; and Voya Financial. 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 information at issue 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 Empower, Equitable, and LRSC. 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 the submitted information should not be released. Although Empower objects to the release of its information, we note Empower has not raised any specific exceptions to disclosure or

otherwise adequately explained why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Empower or any of the remaining third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. You argue the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with section 252.049 of the Local Government Code. Section 252.049 provides:

(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(a), (b). 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 Equitable’s arguments only under section 552.110 against disclosure of the information.

Section 552.110(b) states, “[e]xcept as provided by [s]ection 552.0222, information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

(1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and

(2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

Except as provided by Section 552.0222, commercial 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 is [excepted from required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). Equitable argues some of its information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find Equitable demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, to the extent it is not publicly available on Equitable's website, the city must withhold Equitable's customer information under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. However, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(c). Additionally, we find Equitable failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Equitable argues some of its information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). However, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(b). Additionally, we find Equitable failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, city may not withhold any of the remaining at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1101 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) . . . [I]nformation submitted to a governmental body by a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor in response to a request for a bid, proposal, or qualification is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor that the information relates to demonstrates based on specific factual evidence that disclosure of the information would:

(1) reveal an individual approach to:

(A) work;

(B) organizational structure;

(C) staffing;

(D) internal operations;

(E) processes; or

(F) discounts, pricing methodology, pricing per kilowatt hour, cost data, or other pricing information that will be used in future solicitation or bid documents; and

(2) give advantage to a competitor.

Id. § 552.1101(a). LRSC asserts disclosure of some of its information would reveal an individual approach to its internal operations, processes, and staffing and give advantage to a competitor. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.1101(a). *See id.* §§ 552.0222(b). Additionally, we find LRSC failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the information at issue is subject to section 552.1101(a). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.1101(a) of the Government Code.

Equitable asserts that portions of its remaining information are protected under the common-law as trade secrets. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law. 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. 1958); *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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. Having considered its arguments,

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;

we find Equitable has failed to demonstrate any of the information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Equitable demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law as a trade secret.

We note some of the remaining information 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 city must withhold Equitable's and LRSC's websites, the city must withhold Equitable's customer information under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code to the extent it is not publicly available on Equitable's website. The city 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MT/rm

(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).

Ms. Amy L. Sims - Page 6

Ref: ID# 852656

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

9 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)