



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 22, 2008

Ms. Marianna M. McGowan  
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin P.C.  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2008-14429

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 325384.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received requests from Stewart Geotechnologies, Inc. ("Stewart"), Infotech Enterprises America, Inc. ("Infotech"), and DQSI Corporation ("DQSI") for information related to RFP No. 0805-050. While you raise section 552.110 of the Government Code, you only do so on behalf of RAMTeCH Software Solutions Inc. ("Ramtech"). You also indicate the requested information may contain proprietary information. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified the following companies of their opportunities to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestors: Applied Geospatial Technology Solutions, L.L.C.; Avineon, Inc.; Byers Engineering Company; DQSI; FPM Group LTD; Infotech; NTB Associates, Inc.; PBS&J; Ramtech; Stewart; and Weston Solutions, Inc.<sup>1</sup> 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 Act in certain circumstances). A representative from Ramtech has submitted comments to our office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the requestors have a right of access to their own companies' proposals.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a 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 that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Ramtech is the only company that has submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information should not be released to the requestors. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to the other companies would implicate their proprietary interests. *See id.* § 552.110; 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). Therefore, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld based on the proprietary interests of these companies.

Ramtech asserts its employee information is protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Upon review of the information at issue, we determine that no portion of Ramtech's information is protected by common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

We also understand Ramtech to raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of its submitted proposal. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (a) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.* § 552.110(b); *See also* ORD 661 at 5.

Ramtech raises section 552.110(a) for its quality assurance/quality control information. After reviewing the submitted information and arguments, we find Ramtech has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret,

---

<sup>2</sup>The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret: (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of the company; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in the company's business; (3) the extent of measures taken by the company to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to the company and its competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by the company in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Ramtech raises section 552.110(b) for its employee information, references, project list, and financial statements. Upon review of the arguments and the information at issue, we find that release of some of Ramtech's client information, project list, and financial statements, which we have marked, would cause it substantial competitive harm. However, we note that Ramtech has made some of its client information publicly available on its website. Because Ramtech has published this information, we find Ramtech has failed to demonstrate that it treats this information as confidential proprietary information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any client information that has been published on Ramtech's website under section 552.110(b). Further, we determine that Ramtech has not demonstrated that any portion of its remaining information is excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (business entity must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We therefore conclude the city must only withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that a portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we also note that a portion of the submitted information is 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 protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials protected by copyright, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making 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).

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,



Jordan Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JH/jb

Ref: ID# 325384

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ron Patterson  
c/o Ms. Marianna M. McGowan  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Arif Quadir  
RAMTeCH Software Solutions, Inc.  
5291 Layton Drive  
Venice, Florida 34293  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry Konty  
Infotech Enterprises America, Inc.  
11605 Southwest Penn court  
Tigard, Oregon 97223  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Nirav Shah  
Applied Geospatial Technology Solutions  
8701 Bedford-Eules Road, Suite 301  
Hurst, Texas 76053  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Shelly Stubbs  
DQSI Corporation  
19218 North 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Covington, Louisiana 70433  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Karlu Rambhala  
Avineon, Inc.  
4825 Mark Center Drive, Suite 700  
Alexandria, Virginia 22311  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gaby Atik  
FPM Group, Ltd.  
153 Brooks Road  
Rome, New York 13441  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Carl Martin  
Byers Engineering company  
6285 Barfield Road  
Atlanta, Georgia 30328  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brad Daugherty  
NTB Associates, Inc.  
9101 LBJ Freeway, Suite 420  
Dallas, Texas 75243  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas Brown, Jr.  
PBS & J  
18383 Preston Road, Suite 110  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Patricia Ingram  
Stewart Geo Technologies, Inc.  
5730 Northwest Parkway, Suite 500  
San Antonio, Texas 78249  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Anderson  
Weston Solutions, Inc.  
2705 Bee Cave Road, suite 100  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)