



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 17, 2005

Ms. Cynthia Villarreal-Reyna
Section Chief, Agency Counsel
Legal and Compliance Division
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714

OR2005-09389

Dear Ms. Villarreal-Reyna:

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# 234548.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for the Independent Review Organization ("IRO") applications filed by Comppartners, Inc. ("Comppartners") and Texas Medical Foundation ("TMF"). You state that you will release some of the requested information, but claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. You have submitted arguments in support of these exceptions. Furthermore, you note that Comppartners may have a proprietary interest in a portion of the submitted information. Although you make no arguments and take no position as to whether this information is excepted from disclosure on this basis, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Comppartners of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

You inform us that the responsive information pertaining to TMF was the subject of two prior rulings from this office. In Open Records Letter Nos. 98-0366 (1998) and 2004-10558 (2004), we concluded that the department may withhold portions of TMF's IRO application pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. Therefore, assuming that the four criteria for a "previous determination" established by this office in Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) have been met, we conclude that the department may continue to rely on our decisions in Open Records Letter Nos. 98-0366 and 2004-10558 with respect to the requested information pertaining to TMF's application.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.301(f); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

We next address your arguments for Comppartners' application. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. The department claims that some of the submitted information is confidential under article 21.58A of the Insurance Code. Article 21.58A relates to Health Care Utilization Review Agents and provides in part:

(i) Each utilization review agent shall utilize written medically acceptable screening criteria and review procedures which are established and periodically evaluated and updated with appropriate involvement from physicians, including practicing physicians, dentists, and other health care providers Such written screening criteria and review procedures shall be available for review and inspection to determine appropriateness and compliance as deemed necessary by the commissioner and copying as necessary for the commissioner to carry out his or her lawful duties under this code, provided, however, that any information obtained or acquired under the authority of this subsection and article is confidential and privileged and not subject to the open records law or subpoena except to the extent necessary for the commissioner to enforce this article.

Ins. Code art. 21.58A § 4(i). You explain that the submitted screening criteria and review procedures are part of the utilization review plan, and are the types of information that are confidential under section 4(i) of article 21.58A. Based on your representations, we agree that the information you have marked is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 21.58A of the Insurance Code.

¹The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

You also claim that some of the submitted information is confidential pursuant to article 21.58C of the Insurance Code. Section 2(a) of article 21.58C provides that “[t]he commissioner shall . . . promulgate standards and rules for . . . (A) the certification, selection, and operation of independent review organizations to perform independent review described by Section 6, Article 21.58A of this code; and (B) the suspension and revocation of the certification[.]” Section 2(h) of article 21.58C provides as follows:

(h) Information that reveals the identity of a physician or individual health care provider who makes a review determination for an independent review organization is confidential.

Ins. Code art. 21.58C § 2(h). You state that some of the submitted information constitutes a list of the identities of the physicians “that will be part of the panel providing review determinations.” Based on your representations and our review, we agree that this information is confidential pursuant to section 2(h) of article 21.58C of the Insurance Code, and therefore must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 59.001 of the Occupations Code provides as follows:

The social security number of an applicant for or holder of a license, certificate of registration, or other legal authorization issued by a licensing agency to practice in a specific occupation or profession that is provided to the licensing agency is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

Occ. Code § 59.001.² You explain that the submitted biographical affidavit must be filed as part of the application to be licensed as a utilization review agent. Based on your representation, we agree that the social security number contained in the affidavit is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 59.001 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that the following types of

²This section was renumbered from Occ. Code § 58.001 by the Act of May 25, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., H.B. 2018, § 23.001(68).

information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We agree that the personal financial information you have marked is confidential under common law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101.

You assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state that some of the submitted information consists of correspondence and notations that “address the handling of regulation matters, recommended actions, and opinions and

analyses of regulatory matters.” Having considered your arguments and representations and having reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that the department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

You also argue that the submitted information contains an e-mail address that is excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). You further state that the department has not received consent to release the submitted e-mail address. Therefore, the department must withhold the e-mail address you have marked pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code.

We turn now to the arguments submitted by Comppartners. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a). A “trade secret”

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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. 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review of Comppartners’ arguments, we find that Comppartners has not established a trade secret claim. We therefore determine that none of Comppartners application is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Comppartners also contends that its proposal contains commercial and financial information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). However, we find that Comppartners has not provided specific factual evidence to substantiate the claim that release of the information Comppartners seeks to withhold under section 552.110 would result in competitive harm to the company. Accordingly, we determine that the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) and may not be withheld on that basis. *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).

In summary, the department must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with articles 21.58A and 21.58C of the Insurance Code. The social security numbers that you have marked are confidential under section 59.001 of the Occupations Code and must be withheld under section 552.101. The personal financial information you have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the doctrine of common law privacy. The correspondence and notations you have marked may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The e-mail address you have marked must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining 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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 234548

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Charles Brawner
1819 Firman Drive, #143
Richardson, Texas 75081
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James A. Fishback
CompPartners, Inc.
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 900
Irvine, California 92612
(w/o enclosures)