



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 12, 2004

Ms. Carrie S. Kenward
Assistant Director of General Law
Public Utility Commission of Texas
P.O. Box 13326
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2004-6816

Dear Ms Kenward:

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# 207001.

The Public Utility Commission of Texas (the "commission") received a request for "[a]ny annual registration or re-registration form of [a particular] pay telephone provider" for a specified time period. You state that you have provided the requestor with some of the requested information. You also state that you do not have a responsive Pay Telephone Provider Registration Statement for 1999 or 2000.¹ Although you take no position with respect to the remaining requested information, you claim that portions of the requested information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the commission notified the interested third party, ETS Payphones, Inc. ("ETS"), of the commission's receipt of the request and of its right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code §552.305(d); *see also* 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

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received, nor does it require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.— San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered all arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

ETS asserts that the locations of its pay telephones contained in the submitted information are commercial or financial information which is excepted from release 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). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure 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 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

After carefully reviewing the arguments presented to us by ETS and the information at issue, we find that ETS has failed to make a specific factual or evidentiary showing that the release of the locations of its pay telephones would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b), and 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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the

governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 207001
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Nicholas J. Rosenberg
Edwards & Angell, L.L.P.
101 Federal Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(w/o enclosures)

c: Mr. Michael McClellan
ETS Payphones, Inc.
1490 Westfork Drive, Suite G
Lithia Springs, Georgia 30122
(w/o enclosures)