



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
G R E G A B B O T T

December 15, 2006

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2006-14762

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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#266980.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for the following three items related to request for proposal No. B 44 2005 029362 000: Marketing and Sale of Speciality License Plates: (1) a copy of each vendors original proposal in response to this RFP, (2) a copy of oral presentation material submitted in response to this RFP, and (3) a copy of final offers submitted in response to this RFP. Although you take no position with respect to the submitted information, you claim that the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the interested third party, Effective Teleservices, of the department's receipt of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments 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) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances).* We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, the department informs us that a portion of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2006-04305 (2006). Open Records Letter No. 2006-04305 held that the

department must withhold certain client lists and pricing information submitted by vendors in response to the request for proposal under section 552.110 of the Government Code. With regard to the requested information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office in this prior ruling, we conclude that, as we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed, you must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2006-04305 as a previous determination. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We note, however, that the requested oral presentation material was not ruled upon in Open Records Letter No. 2006-04305. To the extent that the requested information was not the subject of the prior ruling, we will address the submitted arguments.

Next, we must address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state you received the request September 26, 2006. However, the department did not request a decision from this office until October 11, 2006. Accordingly, we conclude that the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

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). Normally, a compelling interest is demonstrated when some other source of law makes the information at issue confidential or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). A third party's interest can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness.

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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Effective Teleservices has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion

of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of the company, and the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, 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), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, the submitted information must be released.

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,



Holly R. Davis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

HRD/krl

Ref: ID# 266980

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Catherine Bird  
Catherine Bird Communications  
1009 Forest Trail  
Cedar Park, Texas 78613  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ronnie Mize  
Director of Program Implementation  
Effective Teleservices  
106 North John Reddit Drive  
Lufkin, Texas 75904  
(w/o enclosures)