



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 5, 2005

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

OR2005-09050

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# 233630.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for information pertaining to a specific Solutia, Inc. ("Solutia") plant. You state that the commission has provided 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 Solutia 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 representative sample of information.¹

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See Open Records Decision* Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we address Solutia's arguments against the disclosure of the 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. Solutia argues that the portions of the submitted information are 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 Solutia's claim that the information at issue is protected as a trade secret.

Solutia 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.² *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 Solutia 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.³

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 at issue 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.

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

² 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).

³ As our ruling under section 552.110(a) is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments.

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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 233630

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. W.R. Crowley
Competitive Analysis Technologies
11702-B Grant Road, #333
Cypress, Texas 77429
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Patrick Lee
Bracewell & Giuliani, L.L.P.
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 2300
Austin, Texas 78701-4061
(w/o enclosures)