



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 28, 2009

Mr. Robert R. Sanders
Sanders Baker
One Maxor Plaza
320 South Polk Street, Suite 700
Amarillo, Texas 79101

OR2009-01084

Dear Mr. Sanders:

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# 333401.

Amarillo College (the "college"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to vendor responses to a request for proposals for learning management system software. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Angel Learning, Blackboard, Inc., Moodlerooms, Desire2Learn, and rSmart Group, (collectively, the "third parties"). You notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, the college informs us that some of the submitted information is marked as confidential and proprietary, and some of the third parties have included confidentiality clauses in their information. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept

confidential. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act by agreement or contract. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [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 did not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, the submitted information must be released unless it falls within an exception to disclosure, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Next, we note that 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 any of the third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, the third parties have not provided us with any basis to conclude that they 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. Thus, we address the college’s argument under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

The college raises section 552.110 of the Government Code on behalf of the third parties for portions of the submitted information. 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 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

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).

You contend all of the third parties' pricing information, Blackboard Inc.'s exhibit setting forth the structure of its software program, and section 6.4.3 of Desire2Learn's proposal are trade secrets. Upon review of the college's arguments, we conclude that the college has failed to establish that any of the third party information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret. The college has also failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal 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 (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Therefore, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

The college also argues that certain sections of the third parties' information are excepted under section 552.110(b). Upon review of the college's arguments we find that the college has failed to provide a specific factual or evidentiary showing that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure of any particular portion of the submitted information for purposes of section 552.110(b). *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). Thus, we conclude that the college has not adequately demonstrated that the submitted information either consists of trade secrets or would harm the third parties' competitive interests if released. Consequently, the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

We note 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. 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). As no further exceptions against the disclosure of the submitted information are raised, the college must release the submitted information 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 information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Laura E. Ream
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LER/jb

Ref: ID# 333401

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marc Bagley
Angel Learning
6510 Telecom Drive, Suite 400
Indianapolis, Indiana 46278
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wade Howard
Blackboard, Inc.
2011 South Washington
Amarillo, Texas 79109
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Martin G. Knolt
Moodlerooms
1101 East 33rd Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard Watts
D2L, Ltd.
715 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rick Fanger
The rSmart Group
4343 East Camel Back Road, Suite 210
Phoenix, Arizona 85018
(w/o enclosures)