ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 23, 2004

Ms. Anne M. Constantine
Legal Counsel
Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport
P. O. Box 619428
DFW Airport, Texas 75261-9428

OR2004-2189

Dear Ms. Constantine:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197988.

The Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Board (the "board") received a request for (1) a copy of the proposal from the company that was awarded a specified contract, (2) a copy of the resulting contract, and (3) a copy of a specified maintenance agreement. The board takes no position with regard to the public availability of the requested information. You believe, however, that the request for this information implicates the proprietary interests of a private party to whom the submitted information relates. You have submitted the requested information, along with a letter in which Tiburon, Inc. ("Tiburon") advises the board that it considers certain identified portions of its information confidential.[1] You also state that the board is in the process of releasing those portions of the responsive information to which Tiburon does not object. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the board's responsibilities under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). As you acknowledge, the board was not timely in requesting this decision.

[1]*See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No.542 (1990) (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 certain circumstances).

Section 552.301(b) of the Government Code provides that a governmental body that wishes to withhold requested information 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." Pursuant to section 552.301(e), the governmental body must, within fifteen business days of receiving the request, submit to this office (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You state that the board received the present request on November 3, 2003. However, you did not request a decision from this office or submit the required materials until January 14, 2004. Thus, you did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this ruling.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *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 section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally speaking, 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 are at stake in this instance, we will address the third party's arguments. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977).

Tiburon states that it considers certain portions of its information confidential, and that such information is labeled as "Confidential and Proprietary." However, information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests confidentiality. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 676-78 (Tex. 1976). Further, it is well-settled that a governmental body's promise to keep information confidential is not a basis for withholding that information from the public, unless the governmental body has specific authority to keep the information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 at 1 (1988), 476 at 1-2 (1987), 444 at 6 (1986). Consequently, the submitted information must fall within an exception to disclosure in order to be withheld.

We note, however, that Tiburon does not cite any exception to disclosure for the submitted information. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that Tiburon has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 551.110(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. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Consequently, the submitted information must be released, subject to the caveat below.

Some of the submitted information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *See id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making such copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

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,

Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 197988

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Christine L. Weet
1178 N. Vermont St.
Arlington, VA 22201
(w/o enclosures)

Loren Hopper
Tiburon, Inc.
39350 Civic Center Drive
Freemont, CA 94538
(w/o enclosures)