



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 7, 2007

Ms. Rebecca Brewer  
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin, P.C.  
City of Frisco  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2007-07136

Dear Ms. Brewer:

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# 280947.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for building plans submitted for a specified location. You claim that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party, Spring Creek Barbeque ("Spring Creek"), although the city takes no position as to whether the information is excepted from disclosure. You indicate that you notified Spring Creek of the request and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *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 applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Spring Creek. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Spring Creek claims that the submitted architectural plans and drawings revealing the design elements of their restaurant are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret

obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” 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. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: (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. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Spring Creek asserts that the submitted plans and drawings indicate common design elements exhibited by all Spring Creek restaurants, and therefore, are for continuous use in Spring Creek's restaurant business. Spring Creek has also demonstrated to this office how the submitted plans meet the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors. RESTATEMENT OF

TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). Therefore, after reviewing the arguments and the information at issue, we conclude that Spring Creek has established a *prima facie* case that the submitted plans and drawings are a trade secret. See *Taco Cabana Int'l v. Two Pesos*, 932 F.2d 1113, 1123-1125; see also *American Precision Vibrator Co. v. Nat'l Air Vibrator Co.*, 764 S.W.2d 274, 278 (Tex.App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988, no writ) (blueprints, drawings, and customer lists constitute trade secrets); *Ecolaire Inc. v. Crissman*, 542 F.Supp. 196, 206 (E.D.Pa.1982) (drawings, blueprints, and lists constitute trade secrets because such information could be obtained, through other than improper means, only with difficulty and delay). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.110(a). Because our determination on this issue is dispositive, we need not address Spring Creek's remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 280947

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Phillip G. McAdams  
406 Dodd  
Nash, Texas 75569  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob McFarland  
P.O. Box 13060  
Arlington, Texas 76013  
(w/o enclosures)