

POLICE DEPARTMENT Office of Deputy Commissioner, Legal Matters One Police Plaza, Room 1406A New York, New York 10038

August 15, 2016

Rachel Levinson-Waldman, Senior Counsel Liberty and National Security Program Brennan Center for Justice 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW 11<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 1150 Washington, DC 20036

RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION LAW REOUEST: LBF # 16PL6946

Dear Ms. Levinson-Waldman:

This is in response to your letter dated July 29, 2016, appealing the determination of the Records Access Officer (RAO), dated June 29, 2016, regarding certain records related to Palantir Technologies that were requested from the New York City Police Department pursuant to the Freedom of Information Law ("FOIL") by letter dated June 14, 2016.

Your appeal is denied pursuant to Public Officers Law (POL) Section 87(2)(i) because disclosure of the requested records, which are related to NYPD information management and security technology, would jeopardize the NYPD's capacity to guarantee the security of its information technology assets, including both electronic information systems and infrastructures. The appeal is also denied pursuant to POL Section 87(2)(d) because it seeks records that contain trade secrets and proprietary information submitted by a commercial enterprise which if disclosed would cause substantial injury to the competitive position of the subject enterprise. Also, the requested records are exempt from disclosure under Public Officers Law Section 87(2)(e)(iv) because disclosure thereof would reveal non-routine criminal investigative techniques or procedures. In addition, to the extent that the requested record contains opinions and recommendations, the appeal is further denied under POL Section 87(2)(e)(iii), inasmuch as these records are exempt from disclosure pursuant to POL Section 87(2)(e)(iii), inasmuch as these records are confidential in nature and cannot be disclosed under FOIL.

Other exemptions under FOIL also may apply.

You may seek judicial review of this determination by commencing an Article 78 proceeding within four months of the date of this decision.

Sincerely,

Jonathan David

Records Access Appeals Officer