



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2012

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

OR2012-01752

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# 444343.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for information related to request for proposals number 529-12-0001. You state you will release most of the requested information. Although you take no position on whether the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Applied Information Sciences ("AIS") and Dallas Computer Services, Inc. ("Dallas Computer Services"). Accordingly, you have notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their 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 AIS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, we have not received correspondence from Dallas Computer Services.

Thus, Dallas Computer Services has not demonstrated that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 commission may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Dallas Computer Services may have in the information.

We note AIS seeks to withhold information the commission has not submitted to this office for our review. This ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the commission. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

We understand AIS to raise section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, which 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[.]” *Id.* § 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.*; ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, however, we find AIS has made only general conclusory assertions that release of the information at issue would cause it substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such assertions. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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). Consequently, the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no further exceptions are raised, the commission must release the submitted information.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 444343

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Timothy Tenpas
Director
Applied Information Sciences
11400 Commerce Park Drive, Suite 600
Reston, Virginia 20191
(Third party w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry Graves
Dallas Computer Services, Inc.
500 North Central Expressway
Plano, Texas 75074
(Third party w/o enclosures)