



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 6, 2009

Mr. Scott A. Kelly
Deputy General Counsel
Texas A&M University System
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079
College Station, Texas 77845

OR2009-00111

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 331844.

Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for all solicitations, award contracts, cost and technical proposals submitted, award evaluations/score sheets, and award letters pertaining to the Funds Disbursal Program (Aggie Bucks Unlimited) RFP Main 08-0006. You state the university will release some of the requested information. The university takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Citibank, JP Morgan Chase, Sallie Mae, Higher One, and Nelnet, (collectively, the "third parties"). You notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their 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); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received arguments from representatives of Higher One and Sallie Mae. We have considered the submitted arguments and have 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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received any arguments from Citibank, JP Morgan Chase, or Nelnet. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of these companies' information constitutes their proprietary 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 information relating to Citibank, JP Morgan Chase, and Nelnet must be released.

Next, Higher One states that portions of its information were marked as "confidential" or "internal" and are only shared with parties agreeing to keep it confidential." We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act by agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information did not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, Higher One's information must be released unless it falls within an exception to disclosure, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Higher One and Sallie Mae argue that portions of their requested information are excepted from disclosure 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. *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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *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 (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. 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.* § 552.110(b); *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6

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).

(business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Higher One generally contends that the portions of its proposal marked as “confidential and proprietary” are trade secrets excepted under section 552.110(a). However, Higher One has failed to demonstrate that any of the information it has marked in its proposal fits within the definition of a trade secret. Higher One has also not established any of the trade secret factors with respect to the information it has marked in its proposal. Thus, none of the marked information in Higher One’s proposal may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Sallie Mae contends that portions of its proposal are trade secrets excepted under section 552.110(a). Having considered Sallie Mae’s arguments, we conclude that Sallie Mae has established a *prima facie* case that the customer information in its proposal and attachment, which we have marked, constitute trade secrets. Therefore, the university must withhold the information we have marked in Sallie Mae’s information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, Sallie Mae has failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information it seeks to withhold in its proposal fits within the definition of a trade secret. Sallie Mae has also not established any of the trade secret factors with respect to the remaining information at issue in its proposal. Thus, none of the remaining information at issue in Sallie Mae’s proposal may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Higher One and Sallie Mae both contend that portions of their proposals are excepted under section 552.110(b). Upon review of the submitted arguments and information at issue, we find that Higher One and Sallie Mae have established that their pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, Higher One and Sallie Mae have made only conclusory allegations that the release of the remaining information at issue in their proposals would result in substantial damage to each companies’ competitive position. Thus, Higher One and Sallie Mae have not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information at issue. *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). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that some of the remaining information appears to 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception 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).

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked in Higher One's proposal and Sallie Mae's proposal under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information at issue must be released, but only in accordance 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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. 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,



Laura E. Ream
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LER/jb

Ref: ID# 331844

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Guy Yancey
Area Retail Manager
Citibank
1111 Briarcrest Drive
Bryan, Texas 77802
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Volchek
Chief Financial Officer
Higher One
25 Science Park
New Haven, Connecticut 06511
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Deneige Soileau
JP Morgan Chase
707 Travis Street, Floor 9 North
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Siva Gowrishankar
Sallie Mae
12061 Bluemont Way
Reston, Virginia 20190
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ronald E. King
Nelnet
1425 East Busch Parkway
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089
(w/o enclosures)