ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 7, 2006

Mr. Ronald J. Bounds
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal, P.C.
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2006-07214

Dear Mr. Bounds:

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# 253342.

The Alamo Area Council of Governments (the "AACOG"), which you represent, received a request for the winning bid and proposal for the Orbis Online reverse auction for Ozone and Meteorological Monitoring. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the responsive information is excepted from disclosure. You, instead, indicate that this information may implicate third party proprietary interests. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified Air Quality Solutions, Inc ("Air Quality") of the request and its 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) (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 under Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the system's procedural obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). While the submitted documentation reflects that the AACOG received the request for information on April 13, 2006, you did not request a decision from this office until May 1, 2006. Thus, the AACOG failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally, a compelling reason exists when third party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will address whether the documents at issue must be withheld to protect the interests of third parties.

We next note that section 552.305 of the Government Code allows an interested third party ten business days from 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 letter, we have not received arguments from Air Quality for withholding the requested information. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the release of the submitted information would harm the proprietary interests of Air Quality. *See* Gov't Code § 551.110(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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). Accordingly, we conclude that the AACOG may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that Air Quality may have in the information. Therefore, the 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/sdk

Ref: ID# 253342

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim McCraw
Dios Dado Enviromental, Ltd.
9330 Corporate Drive, Suite 301
Selma, Texas 78154-1253
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rogelio Ramon, M.S.E.
Air Quality Solutions Incorporated
1301 South IH 35, Suite 107
Austin, Texas 78741
(w/o enclosures)