



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 16, 2015

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2015-14465

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 571697 (ORR Nos. 14062 and 14126).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received two requests from different requestors for proposals submitted by named third parties in response to a specified request for proposals. 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 Allscripts Healthcare, LLC ("Allscripts"), eClinicalWorks, Healthmaster Holdings, LLC ("Healthmaster"), Professional Software for Nurses, Inc. ("PSNI"), Quatris Health ("Quatris"), and Welligent, Inc. ("Welligent"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the requests 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) (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 received comments from eClinicalWorks. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the proposals submitted by Allscripts, eClinicalWorks, Healthmaster, Quatris, and Welligent were the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-07388 (2015). We note that in Open Records Letter No. 2015-07388, the district notified these third parties pursuant to

section 552.305 when the district received the previous request for information, and none of these third parties submitted any arguments objecting to the release of their proposals. Accordingly, we determined in our previous ruling that the district must release, among other things, the information at issue; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure, unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. *See Gov't Code § 552.007*; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the district may not now withhold the previously released information, unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. eClinicalWorks now claims portions of its proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Because information subject to section 552.110 is deemed confidential by law, we will address eClinicalWorks' claim regarding its proposal under this exception.

Next, 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 Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B)*. As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from PSNI explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude PSNI 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 any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest PSNI may have in it.

We note eClinicalWorks argues portions of its 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), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (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* 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 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.

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.

As mentioned above, eClinicalWorks' information was subject to Open Records Letter No. 2015-07388. In the prior ruling, the district notified eClinicalWorks of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. In that instance, eClinicalWorks did not object to the release of its information. Since the issuance of the previous ruling on April 16, 2015, eClinicalWorks has not disputed this office's conclusion regarding the release of the information, and we presume the district has released the information in accordance with this ruling. In this regard, we find eClinicalWorks has not taken any measures to protect its information in order for this office to conclude the information now either qualifies as a trade secret or commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause eClinicalWorks substantial harm. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* ORDs 661, 319 at 2, 306 at 2, 255 at 2. Accordingly, we conclude the district may not withhold eClinicalWorks' information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states "Notwithstanding 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."² Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted 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 district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district 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.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 571697

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

eClinicalWorks
c/o Mr. Jay L. Krystinik
Bryan Cave LLP
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 3300
Dallas, Texas 75201-7965
(w/o enclosures)

Martin M. Smith
CEO
Healthmaster Holdings, LLC
2655 Oakley Park Road, Suite 100
Walled Lake, Michigan 48390
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tony L. Railey
Regional Sales Executive
Allscripts Healthcare, Suite 2024
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60654
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Peter Redes
Vice President, Technology
Professional Software for Nurses, Inc.
4 Limbo Lane
Amherst, New Hampshire 03031
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew McGraw
President
Welligent, Inc.
5205 Colley Avenue
Norfolk, Virginia 23508
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Gallagher
Vice President of Sales
Quatris Health
2350 Airport Freeway, Suite 300
Bedford, Texas 76022
(w/o enclosures)