



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 9, 2005

Ms. Ruth H. Soucy
Manger and Legal Counsel
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts
Open Records Division
P.O. Box 13528
Austin, Texas 78711-3528

OR2005-08235

Dear Ms. Soucy:

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# 231034.

The Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (the "comptroller") received a request for "(i) an executed copy of the contract(s) . . . entered into by the Texas Prepaid Higher Education Tuition Board and the current recordkeeper(s)/plan administrator(s) for Tomorrow's College Investment Plan . . . and the Texas Guaranteed Tuition Plan[;] (ii) copies of all amendments to date, if any, to such contracts; and (iii) a copy of the proposal(s) submitted by [the comptroller's] current recordkeeper(s)/plan administrator(s) . . . to provide administrative and recordkeeping services for [these plans]." You state that you will provide some of the requested information to the requestor. Although you make no arguments as to whether the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure, you believe it may involve third party proprietary interests. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified Enterprise Capital Management, Inc. ("Enterprise") and State Street Corporation ("State Street") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments explaining why the information concerning each company should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (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 that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely

on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from State Street. We have considered State Street's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we 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, this office has not received comments from Enterprise explaining how the release of the submitted information will affect its proprietary interests. Thus, Enterprise has not demonstrated that any of its information is proprietary for purposes of the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; *see also, e.g.*, 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 (1990). Accordingly, the comptroller may not withhold any of Enterprise's information on the basis of any proprietary interest that it may have in the information.

We now address the arguments submitted by State Street. State Street claims its Global Controls Examination Report is protected by 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). 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) 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).

After reviewing the arguments and the information at issue, we conclude that State Street has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that the information at issue constitutes a trade secret under the definition adopted by the Texas Supreme Court. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. Additionally, we find that State Street has made only conclusory allegations that release of the information it seeks to withhold would cause substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations for purposes of section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6. Thus, we conclude that none of the submitted information pertaining to State Street may be withheld under section 552.110.

We note, however, that some of the submitted information may be subject to copyright law. A custodian of public records must comply with copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception

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).

applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). As such, the comptroller must release the submitted information; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the comptroller must comply with copyright law.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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,



Robert B. Rapfogel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RBR/seg

Ref: ID# 231034

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mark Chapleau
General Counsel
Upromise Investments, Inc.
117 Kendrick Street, Suite 200
Needham, Massachusetts 02494
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Phillip G. Goff
Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
Enterprise Capital Management, Inc.
3343 Peachtree Road Northeast, Suite 450
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sharon L. Freyer
Vice President & Senior Counsel
State Street Corporation
Legal
2 Heritage Drive, 4th Floor
Quincy, Massachusetts 02171
(w/o enclosures)