



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

January 22, 2010

Mr. B. Chase Griffith  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
Attorney for City of Flower Mound  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2010-01043

Dear Mr. Griffith:

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# 367951.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Further, you state that the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state that you notified the interested third parties of the requests for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> *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 received comments from National Research objecting to the release of its information. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>The notified third parties are: National Research Center, Inc. ("National Research"); RTS Marketing Research, LLC; The Julian Group; Quality Data Surveyors, LLC; Prism Technical Management & Marketing Services, LLC; PMG Associates, Inc.; National Service Research; Metrix Matrix, Inc.; Market Decisions, LLC; Issues & Answers Network, Inc.; Four Square Research, Inc.; Evergreen Solutions, LLC; ETC Institute; EMH Opinion Sampling; Decision Analyst, Inc.; Creative Consumer Research; Burke, Inc.; and Rabin Research Company.

Although the town argues that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the town's argument under section 552.110. 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) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, only National Research has submitted comments to this office explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. See *id.* § 552.110; 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. Accordingly, the town may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of the remaining third parties.

National Research raises section 552.110(a) of the Government Code to withhold its information. This section protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 552.110(a). The Supreme Court of Texas has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a "trade secret" to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as, for example, the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as, for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217

(1978). 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); *see also* ORD 232. This office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552. 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). We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3.

Having considered the submitted arguments, we conclude National Research has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information constitutes a trade secret. Thus, the town may not withhold any portion of National Research's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note that 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. 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 copyrighted materials, 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). Therefore, the submitted information must be released to the requestor, but any information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

---

<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.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Adam Leiber  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACL/rl

Ref: ID# 367951

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christian Riepe  
RTS Marketing Research, LLC  
16350 Park Ten Place, Suite 100-11  
Houston, Texas 77084  
(w/o enclosures)

The Julian Group  
7402 Marquette Street  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Michelle Elster  
Rabin Research Company  
150 East Huron Street, Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60611  
(w/o enclosures)

Quality Data Surveyors, LLC  
1400 Preston Road, Suite 400  
Plano, Texas 75093  
(w/o enclosures)

Lafayette L. Crump  
Prism Technical Management & Marketing Services  
6114 West Capitol Drive, Suite 200  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53216  
(w/o enclosures)

PMG Associates, Inc.  
4171 West Hillsboro Boulevard, Suite 8  
Coconut Creek, Florida 33073  
(w/o enclosures)

Andrea Thomas  
National Service Research  
2601 Ridgmar Plaza, Suite 9  
Fort Worth, Texas 76116  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry W. Cordle  
Metrix Matrix, Inc.  
785 Elmgrove Road  
Rochester, New York 14624  
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. Brian Robertson  
Market Decisions, LLC  
75 Washington Avenue, Suite 206  
Portland, Maine 04101  
(w/o enclosures)

Carla Lindemann  
Issues & Answers Network, Inc.  
5151 Bonney Road  
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23462  
(w/o enclosures)

Four Square Research, Inc.  
2296 Henderson Mill Road, Suite 304  
Atlanta, Georgia 30345  
(w/o enclosures)

Evergreen Solutions, LLC  
2852 Remington Green Circle, Suite 101  
Tallahassee, Florida 32308  
(w/o enclosures)

Chris Tatham  
ETC Institute  
725 West Frontier Circle  
Olathe, Kansas 66061  
(w/o enclosures)

Tami Dunning  
EMH Opinion Sampling  
1401 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Suite 370  
Sacramento, California 95811  
(w/o enclosures)

J. Scott Hanson, P.H.D.  
Decision Analyst, Inc.  
604 Avenue H East  
Arlington, Texas 76011-3100  
(w/o enclosures)

Patricia Pratt  
Creative Consumer Research  
3945 Greenbriar Drive  
Stafford, Texas 77477  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rocky Shook  
Burke, Inc.  
6565 North MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 1060  
Irving, Texas 75039  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rachel Cooper  
National Research Center, Inc.  
3005 30<sup>th</sup> Street  
Boulder, Colorado 80301  
(w/o enclosures)