



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 20, 2015

Mr. Guillermo Trevino
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
Office of the City Attorney
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2015-14745

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 572000 (Fort Worth request# W042305).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for specified bid proposals for request for proposals number 15-0026. You state the city has released some of the requested information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Alere Wellbeing; American Healthways Services, LLC; Arauco Medical Consultants; ACAP Health Consulting; EB Employee Solutions, LLC; Harris, Rothenburge

International; InScope Health, LCC; Limeade, Inc.; MHBT, Inc.; Provant; Quest Diagnostics; and Ultimate Health Matters (“UHM”) 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 UHM. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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

Next, UHM claims its information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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. *See* 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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (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).

Having considered UHM’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that UHM has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that 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 business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the

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).

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). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of UHM’s submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of UHM’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that UHM has established that its pricing information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold UHM’s pricing information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find UHM has failed to make the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) for its remaining information. Thus, UHM has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. 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). Accordingly, none of UHM’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

The city states 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 city must withhold UHM’s pricing information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with federal 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/cbz

Ref: ID# 572000

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cindy Pius
Alere Wellbeing
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington 98104
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jesus Arauco
Arauco Medical Consultants
13250 Branch View Lane
Dallas, Texas 75234
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Austin Wilcox
Senior Consultant
ACAP Health Consulting
12712 Park Central Drive, Suite 100
Dallas, Texas 75251
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wally H. Gomaa
Chief Executive Officer
ACAP Health Consulting
12712 Park Central Drive, Suite 100
Dallas, Texas 75251
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jaime C. Burnham
Vice President of Business Development
Provant
P.O. Box 901
East Greenwich, Rhode Island 02818
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert L. Matthews
Limeade, Inc.
10885 Northeast 4th Street, Suite 400
Bellevue, Washington 98004
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Bruce
InScope Health, LLC
12018 Sunrise Valley Parkway, Suite 100
Reston, Virginia 20191
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lisa G. Choate
Owner and Partner
Ultimate Health Resources, LLC
9101 LBJ Freeway, Suite 680
Austin, Texas 75243
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard Stephenson
Sales Executive
American Healthways Services, LLC
701 Cool Spring Boulevard
Franklin, Tennessee 37067
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steven Jones
Harris, Rothenberg International
d/b/a Humana Wellness
2001 West John Carpenter Freeway, Bldg. 2
Irving, Texas 75063
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Keith Carmichael
President
MHBT, Inc.
301 Congress Avenue, Suite 1000
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jana B. Long
Owner and Partner
Ultimate Health Resources, LLC
9101 LBJ Freeway, Suite 680
Austin, Texas 75243
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Wendy Brighton
Account Manager
EB Employee Solutions, LLC
245 Main Street, Suite 605
White Plains, New York 10601
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Annette Cundith
Strategic Account Executive
Quest Diagnostics
10101 Renner Boulevard
Lenexa, Kansas 66219
(w/o enclosures)