



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 7, 2004

Ms. Carol Longoria
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2004-0109

Dear Ms. Longoria:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 193809.

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for "copies of all proposals that won for RFP 92502, 'Collection Agency Services for Student Loans.'" Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you claim that the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of General Revenue Corporation ("General"), National Credit Management ("National"), and Williams & Fudge, Inc. ("Williams"). You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why information pertaining to each third party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act ("Act") in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from National and Williams. We have reviewed their arguments and the submitted information.

As you acknowledge, the university did not comply with the procedural requirements of the Act in requesting this decision. Section 552.301(b) of the Government Code provides that a governmental body that wishes to withhold requested information must "ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the 10th business day after the date of receiving the written request." Pursuant to section 552.301(e), the governmental body must, within fifteen business days of receiving the request, submit to this office (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which

parts of the documents. Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You state that the university received the present request on October 14, 2003. However, you did not submit the specific information requested for our review until November 5, 2003. Thus, you did not comply with section 552.301(e).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally speaking, a compelling reason exists when third party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake in this instance, we will address the third parties' arguments. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977).

We next 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, General has not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect its proprietary interests. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that General has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 551.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Thus, the submitted information related to General must be released.

National argues that its client lists and reference information are excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). This exception is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *Id.* Because section 552.104 is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies and not third parties, and the university does not raise section 552.104, the submitted information is not excepted under section 552.104.

Williams asserts that financial information contained within its proposal is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the doctrine of

common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Upon review of Williams' proposal, we find that any financial information concerns a company rather than an individual and is therefore not protected by common-law privacy. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (corporation has no right to privacy). Therefore, none of Williams' financial information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Both National and Williams argue that portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision," and (2) "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." *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "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 a single or ephemeral event 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party's claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a prima facie case for the exception, and no

one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). The private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) 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. *See* 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).

National asserts that its financial records can be considered proprietary under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We conclude, however, that National has not provided the specific factual evidence required by section 552.110(b) that the release of its information would cause National substantial competitive harm. Thus, National has not demonstrated that any of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code, and therefore all of the submitted information related to National must be released, except as specified below.

Williams asserts that its client lists are excepted under section 552.110(a) and that its financial information is excepted under section 552.110(b). After reviewing Williams' arguments and the information at issue, we conclude that Williams has established the applicability of section 552.110 to most of the information it seeks to withhold. Thus, the university must withhold the information related to Williams that we have marked. The remaining information related to Williams must be released, except as specified below.

We note that the information related to both Williams and National contains social security numbers that may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law. The 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). The university has cited no law, nor are we are

¹The 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).

aware of any law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990, that authorizes it to obtain or maintain social security numbers. Therefore, we have no basis for concluding that the social security numbers contained within the submitted information are confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) of title 42 of the United States Code. We caution the university, however, that section 552.352 of the Government Code imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing these social security numbers, the university should ensure that they were not obtained and are not maintained by the university pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Finally, we note that the information related to Williams appears to contain account numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value;
or

(2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding 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. We have marked account number information that the university must withhold under section 552.136 of the Government Code, provided that the account numbers are real. Fictitious account numbers may not be withheld under section 552.136.

In summary, the university must withhold the submitted information we have marked related to Williams. The university must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 if they are actual account numbers. Social security numbers may be confidential under federal law. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 193809

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jonathan S. Myerov
Collection Company of America
700 Longwater Drive, 2nd Floor
Norwell, MA 02061
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. W. Robert Lawhorn
Executive Vice President
General Revenue Corporation
11501 Northlake Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45249-1643
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Connie Robinson
Account Executive
National Credit Management
1177 North Warson Road
St. Louis, MO 63132
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary L. Williams
President and CEO
Williams & Fudge, Inc.
P. O. Box 11590
Rock Hill, SC 29731-1590
(w/ enclosures)