



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 29, 2012

Mr. Brian Nelson
General Counsel
Lone Star College System
5000 Research Forest Drive
The Woodlands, Texas 77381-4356

OR2012-08079

Dear Mr. Nelson:

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# 454930 (LSCS File Nos. PR12-0229-00049, PR12-0329-0054, PR12-0402-00057, PR12-0402-0057).

The Lone Star College System (the "system") received three requests for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You state the system has released some information to the requestors. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Financial Aid Services, Inc. ("FAS"); Global Financial Aid Services ("Global"); ProEducation Solutions, L.L.C. ("ProEducation"); and The Kenaly Complement ("Kenaly"). Accordingly, you state you notified these interested third parties of the requests for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why their 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 received comments from FAS and Kenaly. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, we have not received comments from either Global or ProEducation. Thus, Global and ProEducation have not demonstrated that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of their information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 system may not withhold any of Global's or ProEducation's information on the basis of any proprietary interests they may have in the information.

FAS and Kenaly assert portions of their 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* ORD 552 at 2. 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

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).

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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find FAS and Kenaly have failed to demonstrate how any portion of their information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We further note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of FAS’s or Kenaly’s information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

FAS and Kenaly also claim that their submitted information constitutes commercial information that, if released, would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find FAS and Kenaly have established that release of their pricing information would cause the companies substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the system must withhold FAS’s and Kenaly’s pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find FAS and Kenaly have made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of their remaining information would result in substantial harm to their competitive positions. *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 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). Consequently, the system may not withhold any of their remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the system must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining information.

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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/bhf

Ref: ID# 454930

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken Garrett
Director of Client Relations
Financial Aid Services
Suite 550
180 Interstate North Parkway
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Keema Echols
Founder and President
The Kenaly Complement
1117 West Pioneer Parkway, Suite 105
Arlington, Texas 76013
(w/o enclosures)