



June 7, 2001

Ms. Nanette G. Williams
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
2 Civic Center Plaza
El Paso, Texas 79901-1196

OR2001-2379

Dear Ms. Williams:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 148158.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received two requests for certain information relating to a Request for Proposal ("RFP"). First, you advise this office that the requested information may include the proprietary information of third parties, including PeopleSoft and eVerge Group, Inc. You have submitted to this office a copy of the letters notifying these third parties of the request for information as required by section 552.305(d) of the Government Code. *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 Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act in certain circumstances). You also advise us that eVerge has withdrawn its claim that the submitted information is confidential. On behalf of PeopleSoft you claim that the submitted information is excepted from required public disclosure under section 552.110. We have considered the exception you raise and have reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that, with respect to the first request, the city failed to request a ruling from this office within the ten business day period required in section 552.301 of the Government Code. Subsections 552.301(a) and (b) provide:

(a) A governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold from public disclosure and that it considers to be within one of the [act's] exceptions . . . must ask for a decision from the attorney general about whether the information is within that exception if there has not been a previous determination about whether the information falls within one of the exceptions.

(b) The governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the 10th business day after the date of receiving the written request.

Because the request for a decision was not timely received, the requested information is presumed to be public information. Gov't Code § 552.302.

In order to overcome the presumption that the requested information is public information, a governmental body must provide compelling reasons why the information should not be disclosed. *Id.*; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ); see Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Compelling reasons exist when the information is made confidential by law or affects the interest of a third party. Open Records Decision No. 630 at 3 (1994). In this instance, you raise section 552.110 of the Government Code on behalf of a third party, PeopleSoft. The applicability of section 552.110 presents a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness.

With respect to the information you have identified as possible proprietary information, we note that, as of the date of this letter, none of the third parties you notified pursuant to section 552.305 has submitted to this office any comments explaining why the requested information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the responsive information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Therefore, the city must release the requested information to both requestors.

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 Department of Public 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 General Services 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. 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,



Kay H. Hastings
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KHH/DKB/seg

Ref: ID# 148158

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Ms. Michelle Mosley
EpicEdge, Inc.
5508 Highway 290 West, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78735
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sophronia Johnson
Arthur Andersen
901 Main Street, Suite 5600
Dallas, Texas 75202-3799
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom Reidy
Vice President
eVerge Group
2805 Dallas Parkway, Suite 240
Plano, Texas 75093
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Spencer
Contracts Administrator
PeopleSoft USA
6101 Stoneridge Drive
Pleasanton, California 94588-3283
(w/o enclosures)