



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 13, 2010

Ms. Destinee Waiters
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Community College
3100 Main Street
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2010-15614

Dear Ms. Waiters:

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# 396712.

The Houston Community College (the "college") received a request for all submissions submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state the submitted documents may contain proprietary information of third parties subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the college notified Blackboard Inc. ("Blackboard"); Instructure; it's Learning, Inc. ("it's Learning"); Moodlerooms, Inc. ("Moodlerooms"); Operitel Corporation ("Operitel"); Pearson Learning Solutions ("Pearson"); Quantum Technologies, Inc. ("Quantum"); Remote-Learner; and The rSmart Group, Inc. ("rSmart") 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). Blackboard has responded to this notice. We have considered Blackboard's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the college's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a

decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). We note that the college received the present request for information on July 21, 2010. Thus, the college's ten-business-day deadline under section 552.301(b) was August 4, 2010. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until August 6, 2010. Thus, the college has failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third-party interests may be at stake, we will consider whether any of the submitted information must be withheld on those grounds.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Instructure, it's Learning, Moodlerooms, Operitel, Pearson, Quantum, Remote-Learner, and rSmart have not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to them should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of these third parties. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld on the basis of these third parties' proprietary interests. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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).

We now address Blackboard's arguments against disclosure. We understand Blackboard to argue that its submitted information is confidential because it submitted its information to the college with the understanding that the information would remain confidential. 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 through an 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 does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to

section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Next, Blackboard claims portions of its submitted proposal is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “commercial 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(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 a “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 a single or ephemeral event 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). This office will accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument 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.¹ Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.110(b); *see also Nat'l Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Blackboard generally claims its submitted bid proposal constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). We find, however, Blackboard has not demonstrated how its information meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, the college may not withhold any part of Blackboard's bid proposal under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Blackboard also indicates the release of its information could deter vendors such as Blackboard from competing for government contracts, so as to lessen competition for such contracts and deprive governmental entities in future procurements. In advancing this argument, Blackboard appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks*. *See also Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of a kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet.

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 others 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).

denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) of the Government Code by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Blackboard's interests in its information.

Blackboard claims its bid proposal constitutes commercial information that, if released, would cause the company substantial competitive harm. After reviewing Blackboard's arguments and the information at issue, we find Blackboard has established release of its pricing information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the college must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). We find, however, Blackboard has made only general conclusory assertions that release of its remaining information at issue would cause it substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such assertions. *See generally* 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), 319 at 3. Therefore, the college may not withhold any part of Blackboard's remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the remaining information 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 (1978). 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 college must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor, but any information that is 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.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,



Christopher D. Sterner
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDSA/em

Ref: ID# 396712

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tess Frazier
Vice President - Legal
Blackboard Inc.
650 Massachusetts Avenue NW
6th Floor
Washington D.C. 20001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephan Han
Operitel Corporation
194 Sophia Street
Peterborough, Ontario, Canada
K9H 1E
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd Giorza
Pearson Learning Solutions
4900 South Monaco Street
Denver, Colorado 80237
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marshall Scott
Remote-Learner
P.O. Box 717
Fisherville, Virginia 22931
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Andreas Henschke
Quantum Technologies, Inc.
3985 Carissa Trace
Cumming, Georgia 30040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Paul Houser
The rSmart Group
4343 East Camelback Road, Suite 210
Phoenix, Arizona 85018
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christine Wyatt
Moodle Rooms Joule
1101 East 33rd Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Cory Ried
3051 Maple Loop Drive, Suite 300
Lehi, Utah 84043
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Bronder
It's Learning
83 Cambridge, St 2b
Burlington, Massachusetts 01830
(w/o enclosures)