



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 4, 2007

Ms. Renee Mauzy
General Counsel
Texas Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2007-06929

Dear Ms. Mauzy:

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# 280228.

The Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to "the development of information systems for local, intra-state, and inter-state criminal justice data sharing projects including but not limited to fusion centers and the TDEX system between January 2004 and March 21, 2007[.]" including the following: (1) information pertaining to RFO No: DIR-TOHS-TDEX; (2) all communications between department employees, other state agency employees, contractors, the Texas Office of Homeland Security, and the Texas Department of Public Safety regarding TDEX or fusion centers; and (3) all audits and correspondence relating to the compliance of the data sharing project, fusion center, and TDEX with federal and state law. You state that some of the requested information will be released to the requestor. You claim that the requested information may contain the proprietary information of Software Performance Systems, Inc. ("SPS") and Knowledge Computing Corporation ("KCC"). Although you take no position on the proprietary nature of the information, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified the interested third parties of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested

information should not be released to the requestor. *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 the applicability of exception to disclose under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered your 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, SPS and KCC have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, SPS and KCC have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 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. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest SPS and KCC may have in the information.

The department asserts that some of the information at issue may not be disclosed because it is confidential by designation or by agreement. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise. As you raise no exceptions to disclosure, 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,



Jaime L. Flores
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLF/ma

Ref: ID# 280228

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jake Bernstein
Executive Editor
the Texas Observer
307 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sid Chowdhary,
Vice President
State and Local Government Division
Software Performance Systems, Inc.
3141 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 850
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Griffin
Knowledge Computing Corporation
6601 East Grant Road, Suite 201
Tucson, Arizona 85715
(w/o enclosures)