



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 30, 2005

Ms. Stephanie Bergeron Perdue
Director
Environmental Law Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2005-02680

Dear Ms. Perdue:

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# 220811.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for information pertaining to a specific Norit Americas plant. You state that the commission will provide the requestor with some of the requested information. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining requested information, you claim that portions of this information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you have notified Norit Americas, Inc. ("Norit") of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we address Norit's assertion that portions of the submitted information were the subject of previous rulings issued by this office as Open Records Letter Nos. 2003-5138 (2003) and 2004-2349 (2004). In these rulings, this office concluded that section 552.110

of the Government Code authorized the commission to withhold the information Norit had designated as trade secret information in those instances. Accordingly, so long as the relevant facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of Open Records Letter Nos. 2003-5138 and 2004-2349, we determine that the commission must continue to withhold those portions of information that were the subject of Open Records Letter Nos. 2003-5138 and 2004-2349 in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling).

We next address Norit's arguments against the disclosure of the remaining submitted information. 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 exception protects information that another statute makes confidential. Norit argues that the remaining submitted information is confidential under section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 382.041 provides in relevant part that "a member, employee, or agent of [the commission] may not disclose information submitted to [the commission] relating to secret processes or methods of manufacture or production that is identified as confidential when submitted." Health & Safety Code § 382.041(a). This office has concluded that section 382.041 protects information that is submitted to the commission if a *prima facie* case is established that the information constitutes a trade secret under the definition set forth in the Restatement of Torts and if the submitting party identified the information as being confidential in submitting it to the commission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 652 (1997). Thus, we next consider Norit's claim that the information at issue is protected as a trade secret.

Norit contends that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (2) 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.

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.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (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). 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.¹ *Id.* 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).

Upon review, we find that Norit has made a *prima facie* case that the information it has designated meets the definition of a trade secret and has demonstrated the factors necessary to establish a trade secret claim. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut this claim as a matter of law. We therefore conclude that the commission must withhold the marked information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

¹ 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.

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).

However, under the Federal Clean Air Act, emission data must be made available to the public, even if the data otherwise qualifies as trade secret information. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 7414(c). Thus, to the extent that the documents contain any information that constitutes emission data for purposes of section 7414(c) of title 42 of the United States Code, the commission must release that information in accordance with federal law. As no additional exceptions are claimed, the remaining submitted information must be released.

In summary, the commission must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2003-5138 and 2004-2349 with respect to those portions of the submitted information that were the subject of those rulings. With the exception of information constituting emission data for purposes of section 7414(c) of title 42 of the United States Code, which must be released, the commission must withhold the marked information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining 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); *Tex. 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 220811

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Paul K. Freeborn
225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2800
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1229
(w/o enclosures)

Norit Americas, Inc.
3200 University Avenue
Marshall, Texas 75671
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jennifer Keane
Baker Botts, L. L. P.
1500 San Jacinto Center
98 San Jacinto Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78701-4287
(w/o enclosures)