



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 14, 2017

Mr. George Gooch
Chief Executive Officer
Texas Health Services Authority
5900 Southwest Parkway, Building 2, Suite 201
Austin, Texas 78735

OR2017-05302

Dear Mr. Gooch:

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# 648848.

The Texas Health Services Authority (the "authority") received a request for all responses and evaluations pertaining to a specified request for proposal ("RFP"). Although the authority takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Mosaica Partners ("Mosaica"), Medicity, Inc. ("Medicity"), Iatric Systems ("Iatric"), Health Management Associates ("HMA"), CedarBridge Group, LLC ("CedarBridge"), Cumberland Consulting Group ("Cumberland"), Accenture, LLP ("Accenture"), Waterloo Research and Consulting, LLC ("WRC"), and Gartner, Inc. ("Gartner"). 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 Accenture, Iatric, and Medicity. 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

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Mosaica, HMA, CedarBridge, Cumberland, WRC and Gartner explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude these third parties have 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 authority may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Mosaica, HMA, CedarBridge, Cumberland, WRC or Gartner may have in it.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party’s property interest, a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at 841. Accenture and Iatric state they have competitors. In addition, Accenture and Iatric state release of the information they have indicated would give an advantage to their competitors and seek to withhold the information at issue. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Accenture and Iatric have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the authority may withhold the information Accenture and Iatric have indicated under section 552.104(a).¹

Medicity claims some of its 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

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 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; *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 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,

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).

not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

In advancing its arguments, we understand Medicity to rely, in part, 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 & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body's ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d at 765. 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. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that 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) 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 the interest of the third party in the information at issue.

Medicity argues some of its information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Medicity has established a *prima facie* case its customer information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the authority must generally withhold the customer information we have marked under section 552.110(a). However, to the extent Medicity's customer information within the submitted information is publicly available on Medicity's website, the authority may not withhold the information under section 552.110(a).

Medicity further argues some of its information consists of commercial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Medicity has demonstrated the information we have marked constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the authority must withhold this information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Medicity has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any of its remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661. Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the remaining 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 authority may withhold the information Accenture and Iatric have indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. To the extent Medicity's customer information within the submitted information is not publicly available on Medicity's website, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The authority must release the remaining information; 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.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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KSM/sdk

Ref: ID# 648848

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 4 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

5 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)