ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 12, 2008

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

OR2008-16979

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# 329873.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received two requests for copies of the top three proposals, the proposal scoring analysis and other related information.[1] You state that you have released some of the information to the requestor. You take no position with respect to the public availability of the remaining requested information, but believe that the request may implicate the proprietary rights of Aetna Behavioral Health, L.L.C. ("Aetna") and Alliance Work Partners ("Alliance"). Accordingly, you notified these companies of these requests for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the 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). Aetna responded to the notice and argues that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Alliance has not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the information at issue

[1] We note that Deer Oaks EAP Services, L.L.C., and FEI Behavioral Health agreed to the release of their proposals.

would affect its proprietary interests. Therefore, Alliance has not provided us with any basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Therefore, the commission may not withhold any portion of the submitted information related to Alliance on the basis of any proprietary interest this party may have in the information.

Next, we address the arguments that we received from Aetna. Among other things, Aetna argues that its contract terms and conditions are "by agreement proprietary." We note, however, that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submitted the information anticipated or requested confidentiality. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act by agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Therefore, unless the submitted information relating to Aetna falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Aetna argues a portion of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. 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.* § 552.110(b); *see also Nat'l Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); ORD 661.

Aetna seeks to withhold its references, grievance procedure, and cost proposal. Upon review of the submitted arguments and information at issue, we find that Aetna has established that release of some of the information, which we have marked, would cause substantial competitive injury to the company; therefore, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). We find, however, that Aetna has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *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), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) states that "[n]otwithstanding 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 that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. We have marked the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note that some of the submitted information appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted information unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information must also comply with copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* A member of the public who wishes to make copies of copyrighted information 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 at 8-9 (1990).

In summary, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(b) and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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

---

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

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,

Chris Schulz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CS/ma

Ref: ID# 329873

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark R. Chulick
Regional Counsel
2777 Stemmons Freeway
Dallas, Texas 75207
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karen Lorince
Aetna Behavioral Health LLC
5607 Richmond Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75206
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rick Dielman
Alliance Work Partners
2525 Wallingwood Drive
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)