



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
G R E G A B B O T T

August 2, 2005

Mr. Carey E. Smith  
General Counsel  
Texas Health and Human Services Commission  
P.O. Box 13247  
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2005-06927

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 229269.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for "any additional amendments [that have] been signed between ACS and [the commission] after Amendment 12." You raise section 552.110 of the Government Code as a possible exception to disclosure but make no arguments regarding this exception and instead state that the commission will rely on a third party to submit arguments. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified ACS State Healthcare, LLC ("ACS") of the commission's receipt of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from ACS. We have considered ACS's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to 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." *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

ACS contends that information in Amendment 14 that reflects the identities of individual ACS personnel is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). A claim under section

552.110(b) 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. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Having carefully considered ACS's arguments, we find that ACS has only provided conclusory statements that release of the portions of Amendment 14 that it seeks to withhold under section 552.110 would harm its competitive interests, and has not provided specific factual evidence to substantiate the claim that release of this information would result in competitive harm to the company. Accordingly, we determine that none of this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (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), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). As neither the commission nor ACS makes any other argument against disclosure, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the


requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cary Grace  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ECG/jev

Ref: ID# 229269

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mike Reitz  
EDS - US Government Solutions  
5400 Legacy Drive  
A3-ID-21  
Plano, Texas 75024  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ty Clift  
ACS State Healthcare, LLC  
12357B Riata Trace Parkway  
MC-A10  
Austin, Texas 78727  
(w/o enclosures)