



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 18, 2007

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

OR2007-13654

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# 292827.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for all documents related to deliberations with the United States Environmental Protection Agency regarding permits issued to two specified facilities. You state that the commission has released information pertaining to one of the facilities, but you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You assert that release of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of Inland Paperboard and Packaging, Inc. ("Inland"). Accordingly, you have notified Inland of the request and of its opportunity to submit arguments to this office. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990)* (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 allows a governmental body to rely on an interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of the exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from Inland. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed 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." This exception protects information that another statute makes confidential. The commission and

Inland claim that the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with 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). The commission informs us that the submitted information was designated as being confidential when it was submitted to the commission. Thus, we next consider whether Inland has established a *prima facie* case that any portion of the submitted information constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code in conjunction with the definition set forth in the Restatement of Torts.

Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a). Under section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, 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), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

The following six factors are relevant to the determination of whether information qualifies as a trade secret under section 757 of the Restatement of Torts:

- (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). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a person’s trade secret claim 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, in this instance, we find that a *prima facie* case has not been established that any portion of the submitted information constitutes a trade secret under the definition set forth in the Restatement of Torts. Accordingly, we conclude that the commission may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under either section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code or section 552.110 of the Government Code. As no other exceptions are claimed, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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,



L. Joseph James  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LJJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 292827

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tara Flynn  
Drinker Biddle  
1000 Westlakes Drive  
Berwyn, Pennsylvania 19312  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Paul Liebman  
Assistant General Counsel and  
Director of Compliance  
Temple-Inland  
1300 South MoPac Expressway  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)