



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 21, 2006

Mr. Robert Martinez
Director, Environmental Law Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P. O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2006-15048

Dear Mr. Martinez:

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# 267594.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality ("TCEQ") received a request for information "associated with health or environmental hazards presented by the soil product from an Anzon or Anzon-Cookson site which is the source of the contaminated soil product that was used in the area of 'Los Arcos colonia' in Webb County, Texas, as well as the surrounding areas and the city of Laredo, Texas."¹ You state that you have released some of the requested information, but claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Additionally, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified Chemtura Corporation ("Chemtura") of the request and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why a portion of 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

¹The requestor states that he does not seek attorney work product or attorney-client communications.

to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

In this instance, you inform us that “the Office of the Attorney General represents TCEQ in a district court case involving the Anzon site in Laredo” that was pending at the time that TCEQ received the request. Furthermore, based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find that the information at issue relates to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). We therefore conclude that TCEQ's information may be withheld from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103.

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note that the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2 (1982).

We now address Chemtura's arguments against the disclosure of its information. Chemtura argues that a portion of its information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government

Code, which protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of 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, 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and

(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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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).

Chemtura claims that its descriptions of various plant processes, material balance sheets, and process flow diagrams are trade secrets. After reviewing Chemtura's arguments and the information at issue, we find that Chemtura has made a *prima facie* case that the information 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. Accordingly, we conclude that TCEQ must withhold the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, TCEQ's information may be withheld from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103. TCEQ must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, but must release Chemtura's remaining information. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Chemtura's claim under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

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,



José Vela III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JV/eb

Ref: ID# 267594

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jose Barrera
Watts Law Firm, L.L.P.
Tower II Building, 14th Floor
555 North Caraneahua Street
Corpus Christi, Texas 78478
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tracy Perkins
Chemtura Corporation
199 Benson Road
Middlebury, Connecticut 06749
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Kalanta
AI Divestitures, Inc.
22 Hedgefield Court
Orange, Connecticut 06477
(w/o enclosures)

Great Lakes Chemical Corporation
Attn: Vice President and General Counsel
P. O. Box 2200
West Lafayette, Indiana 47906
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert E. Holden
Attorney
Liskow & Lewis
701 Poydras Street, Suite 5000
New Orleans, Louisiana 70139-5099
(w/o enclosures)