



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 26, 2009

Ms. Retha Karnes
Associate General Counsel
Alamo Community College District
201 West Sheridan Street
San Antonio, Texas 78204-1429

OR2009-03950

Dear Ms. Karnes:

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# 338204.

The Alamo Community College District (the "district") received a request for proposals and presentation materials related to a specified request for proposals. You indicate the district takes no position on the submitted information. However, you state the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the district notified SunGard Higher Education Managed Services, Inc. ("SunGard"), Campus Works, Inc. (CWI), and SMART Business Advisory and Consulting, L.L.C. ("SMART") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information 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 reviewed the submitted information.

SunGard, CWI, and SMART assert that portions, or all, of their proposals and presentations are subject to section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 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* Open Records

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).

Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

After reviewing the submitted information and arguments, we find that SunGard has made a *prima facie* case that some of its customer information constitutes a trade secret. We note, however, that SunGard publishes the identities of some of its customers on its website. Furthermore, all of the customer information that CWI seeks to withhold now has been published on its website. In light of SunGard's and CWI's own publication of such information, we cannot conclude that the identities of these published customers qualify as trade secrets.

CWI and SMART have established a *prima facie* case that some of their methodologies and processes constitute trade secrets. Therefore, the district must withhold CWI's and SMART's methodologies and processes that we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, SunGard, CWI, and SMART have failed to demonstrate any portion of their remaining information constitutes a trade secret. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Furthermore, CWI and SMART have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of their remaining information would result in substantial competitive harm. *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), 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). Accordingly, we determine that no portion of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that section 552.136 is applicable to some of the submitted information.² Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). We have marked information that the district must withhold under section 552.136.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Finally, we note, and SunGard states, that some of the submitted 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 (1987). 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 district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The district must also withhold the information we have marked under 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor in accordance with copyright laws.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Tamara Wilcox
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TW/eeg

Ref: ID# 338204

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dawn Dieterly Rowe
Contracts Manager
SunGard Data Systems Inc.
4 Country View Road
Malvern, Pennsylvania 19355
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Darrow Neves Ph.D
Vice President & General Manager
Campus Works Inc.
330 South Pineapple Avenue, Suite 113
Sarasota, Florida 74236
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew J. Mytelka
Greer, Herz & Adams, L.L.P.
One Moody Plaza, 8th Floor
Galveston, Texas 77550
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd A. Heckman
Managing Director
SMART Business Advisory & Consulting, LLC
80 Lancaster Avenue
Devon, Pennsylvania 19333
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lawrence T. Bowman
Cozen O'Connor
2300 Bankone Center
1717 Main Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)