



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 23, 2015

Fernando C. Gomez, J.D., Ph.D.
Vice Chancellor and General Counsel
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407

OR2015-12352

Dear Dr. Gomez:

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# 568815 (University File No. 15-0323).

Sam Houston State University (the "university") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals.¹ Although you take no position as to whether the requested information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Amegy Bank, Bank of America, BBVA Compass, First National Bank of Huntsville ("FNBH"), Frost Bank ("Frost"), JPMorgan Chase Bank, Wells Fargo Bank, and Woodforest National Bank ("Woodforest"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 FNBH, Frost, and Woodforest. 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

¹The university states it sent a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code and a demand for a deposit of such charges pursuant to section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.2615, .263.

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 only received comments from FNBH, Frost, and Woodforest explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 university may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

FNBH and Frost assert their information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies such as the university, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as FNBH or Frost. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the university does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the information under section 552.104 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. 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).

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.

FNBH, Frost, and Woodforest assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find FNBH, Frost, and Woodforest have failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret. *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. We note pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Consequently, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

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

FNBH and Frost assert some of their information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find FNBH and Frost have failed to demonstrate the release of the information at issue would result in substantial harm to their competitive positions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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 information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”³ Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information). Upon review, we find the information we indicated satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we are unable to determine whether this information pertains to actual living individuals or fictitious individuals created as samples for purposes of responding to the university’s request for proposals. Therefore, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the information we indicated pertains to living individuals, the university must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information we indicated does not pertain to living individuals, that information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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”). The remaining information contains ABA numbers, account numbers, and routing numbers. However, we are unable to determine if these ABA numbers, account numbers, and routing numbers are fictitious numbers created as a sample for purposes of responding to the request for proposals at issue.

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

Thus, to the extent the ABA numbers, account numbers, and routing numbers in the remaining information constitute actual ABA numbers, account numbers, and routing numbers, the university must withhold them under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent these ABA numbers, account numbers, and routing numbers are fictitious, they may not be withheld under section 552.136.


Some of the remaining information is 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, to the extent the information we indicated pertains to living individuals, the university must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the ABA numbers, account numbers, and routing numbers in the remaining information constitute actual ABA numbers, account numbers, and routing numbers, the university must withhold them under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Paige Thompson". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 568815

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christine Kohut
Mr. Glenn Baird
Amegy Bank
c/o Fernando C. Gomez, J.D., Ph.D.
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Carlene Plummer
Ms. Kathaleen Ford-Smith
Bank of America
c/o Fernando C. Gomez, J.D., Ph.D.
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Angela Cowan
Ms. Monica McGaskey
BBVA Compass
c/o Fernando C. Gomez, J.D., Ph.D.
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John M. Dowell
Senior Vice President
First National Bank of Huntsville
P.O. Box 659
Huntsville, Texas 77342-0659
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Bernal
Vice President
Public Funds Concurrence / T-16
Frost Bank
P.O. Box 1600
San Antonio, Texas 78296
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sarah Dunagin
JPMorgan Chase Bank
c/o Fernando C. Gomez, J.D., Ph.D.
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ann Battaglia
Mr. Don Petton
Wells Fargo Bank
c/o Fernando C. Gomez, J.D., Ph.D.
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Heidi M. Stone
Associate Counsel
Woodforest National Bank
25231 Grogan's Mill Road, Suite 100
The Woodlands, Texas 77380
(w/o enclosures)