



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 28, 2014

Ms. Lauren M. Wood
Counsel for the Collin County Community College District
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin, P.C.
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2014-09090

Dear Ms. Wood:

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# 523978.

The Collin County Community College District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You state you have released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of CampusLogic, Inc. ("CLI"); EdFinancial Services ("EdFinancial"); Financial Aid Services ("FAS"); Global Financial Aid Services ("Global"); and Socle Education ("Socle"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties 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 received comments from EdFinancial. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from CLI, FAS, Global, or Socle explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of these third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest these third parties may have in the information.

The district and EdFinancial assert the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We note section 552.110 protects the interests of third parties that provide information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Thus, we do not address the district's arguments under section 552.110. However, we will address EdFinancial's arguments under section 552.110. 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, 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 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* *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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. 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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). We 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 also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (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).

Upon review, we find EdFinancial has demonstrated portions of its information constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.² However, we find EdFinancial has not demonstrated the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *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

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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

²As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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 EdFinancial's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Upon review, we find EdFinancial has established a *prima facie* case that portions of its information constitute trade secret information. Therefore, the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, to the extent the customer information we have marked is available on the company's website, the district may not withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a). We conclude EdFinancial has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find EdFinancial has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of EdFinancial's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

The submitted documents also include information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136 provides, "[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"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁴

We note some of the materials at issue may 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁴Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, to the extent the customer information we have marked is available on the company's website, the district may not withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/bhf

Ref: ID# 523978

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Shannon Webb
Edfinancial Services
298 North Seven Oaks Drive
Knoxville, Tennessee 37922
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Greg Scoresby
CampusLogic, Inc.
1325 North Fiesta Boulevard, Suite 102
Gilbert, Arizona 85233
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jon Hazelgren
Socle Education
6 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 400
Santa Ana, California 92707
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Nicole Verrett
Financial Aid Services
180 Interstate North Parkway, Suite 550
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(w/o enclosures)