



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 19, 2010

Mr. John Knight
Deputy City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2010-17553

Dear Mr. Knight:

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# 400847.

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for the current depository contract and a second request for the city's current merchant services provider and the charges of the current merchant services provider. Although the city takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, it states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Wachovia/Wells Fargo Bank, NA ("Wells Fargo") and Elavon, Inc. ("Elavon").¹ Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Wells Fargo and Elavon of the request for information and of their rights 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 Elavon. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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

¹We note Elavon was formerly NOVA Information Systems, Inc.

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Wells Fargo explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Wells Fargo 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 (1990). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Wells Fargo may have in the information.

Elavon argues its information should be maintained as confidential because it does not publish its pricing or other negotiated contractual provisions, and requires all of its customers to agree to keep the terms and conditions of their agreements confidential as permitted by law. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Elavon raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” We note section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (purpose of section 552.104 is to protect governmental body’s interest in competitive bidding situation). As the city does not argue section 552.104 is applicable, we will not consider Elavon’s claim under this section. *See id.* at 8 (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Elavon further argues its submitted information is 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, 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.² 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 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 (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

²The 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).

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 (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).

Elavon asserts its submitted information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude Elavon has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Elavon has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of Elavon’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Elavon further argues its submitted information contains commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Elavon has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its 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 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). Furthermore, we note the contract at issue was awarded to Elavon. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* United States Department of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act, 344-47 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public). Accordingly, none of Elavon’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

The submitted documents also include information that may be subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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). Section 552.136(a) defines “access device” as “a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). The submitted information includes routing numbers, which we have marked. The city must withhold the routing numbers we have marked under section 552.136. However, we are unable to determine whether the marked bank account numbers constitute real account numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, to the extent the marked bank account numbers constitute real account numbers, the city must withhold the marked bank account numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.³

We note some of the submitted information 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.

In summary, the city must withhold the marked routing numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent the marked bank account numbers are real bank account numbers, the city must withhold the marked bank account numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released. However, any information 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.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

³We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including bank account, and bank routing numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/tp

Ref: ID# 400847

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew Deskins
Senior Vice President
Wells Fargo Bank, NA
98 San Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 840
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lisa V. Gianneschi
Contract Attorney
Elavon, Inc.
One Concourse Parkway, Suite 300
Atlanta, Georgia 30328
(w/o enclosures)