



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 18, 2013

Ms. Kristi Ward
Public Information Officer
UMC Health System
602 Indiana Avenue
Lubbock, Texas 79415

OR2013-12332

Dear Ms. Ward:

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# 493726.

The Lubbock County Hospital District d/b/a University Medical Center (the "district") received a request for the district's contract with LVM Systems, Inc. ("LVM"), and all proposals submitted for request for proposals number 2012-17, Tele-Triage Software System; the district's contract with IBM and all proposals submitted for request for proposals number 2012-01, Enterprise Master Patient Index Software; and the district's contract with Cerner and all proposals submitted for PO# 2033977. Although you take 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 Cerner, GE Healthcare IT ("GE"), IBM, InfoMagnetics Technologies USA Corporation ("IMT"), LVM, QuadraMed Corporation ("Quadramed"), and RelayHealth. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Cerner, GE, IBM, IMT, LVM, QuadraMed, and RelayHealth of the request for information and of the right of each 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 Cerner, LVM, and RelayHealth. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note 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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from GE, IBM, IMT, or QuadraMed explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude either GE, IBM, IMT, or QuadraMed 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. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest GE, IBM, IMT, or QuadraMed may have in the information.

RelayHealth raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. 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 district does not argue section 552.104 is applicable, we will not consider RelayHealth's claim under this section. *See id.* (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, Cerner and RelayHealth argue, and we understand LVM to argue, portions of their information are 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.¹ 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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 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.

Cerner, LVM, and RelayHealth each assert portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude RelayHealth has established a *prima facie* case that portions of its information constitute trade secret information. Therefore, the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we conclude Cerner, LVM, and

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

RelayHealth have each failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Cerner, LVM, and RelayHealth have not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information. See ORD 402. Therefore, none of Cerner's, LVM's, or RelayHealth's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

Cerner, LVM, and RelayHealth further argue portions of their information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find RelayHealth has demonstrated portions of its information constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Cerner, LVM, and RelayHealth have made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of the remaining information at issue would result in substantial harm to their competitive positions. 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 contracts at issue were awarded to Cerner and LVM. 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 Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (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); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, none of Cerner's, LVM's, or RelayHealth's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the materials 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 (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 district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information that is 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 493726

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kristina Boudreault
Acting RFP Support Manager
GE Healthcare IT
540 West Northwest Highway
Barrington, Illinois 60010-3076
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Russ Seacat
Area Representative
IBM
1503 Lyndon B. Johnson Freeway
Dallas, Texas 75234
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Dafnis
VP Professional Services
InfoMagnetics Technologies USA Corporation
14-1320 Tower Road
Schaumburg, Illinois 60173
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Aaron A Brooks
Vice President
QuadraMed Corporation
12110 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 600
Reston, Virginia 20190
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marc E. Elkins
Cerner Corporation
2800 Rockcreek Parkway
Kansas City, Missouri 64117
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert E. Cluff
LVM Systems, Inc.
4262 East Florian Avenue
Mesa, Arizona 85206
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Bennett
Legal Specialist
McKesson Corporation
5995 Windward Parkway
Alpharetta, Georgia 30005
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lawrence R. Tarnoff
RelayHealth
1145 Sanctuary Parkway
Alpharetta, Georgia 30009
(w/o enclosures)