



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 28, 2010

Ms. Cary Grace
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2010-07781

Dear Ms. Grace:

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# 381081.

The Austin Fire Department (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for hazardous material information statements concerning hazardous materials contained in three specified facilities for the past six years. While you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state that the request may implicate the proprietary interests of Freescale Semiconductor ("Freescale") and Spansion LLC ("Spansion"). Accordingly, you notified these companies of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *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 arguments from a representative of Spansion. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request because it does not pertain to either of the three facilities specified in the request. We have marked this non-responsive information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the department need not release that information in response to the request.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, that the department has not complied with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). A governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake, or when information is confidential by law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because the third-party interests at issue here can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act.

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, this office has not received comments from Freescale explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that Freescale has 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 department may not withhold any portion of the submitted responsive information on the basis of the proprietary interests of Freescale. As the department raises no exceptions to disclosure for this information, it must be released to the requestor.

Spancion asserts its submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.110(a). 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. 1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. Section 757 provides 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); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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 RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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. ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown 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).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[c]ommercial 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Spancion argues its submitted hazardous materials inventory summary consists of protected trade secrets. Upon review, we find Spancion has established a *prima facie* case that its hazardous materials inventory summary constitutes a trade secret. Accordingly, the department must withhold this information, which we have marked, pursuant to

¹The 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.² The remaining responsive information must be released to the requestor.

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.

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, 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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 381081

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we do not address Spansion's remaining argument against disclosure.

c: Ms. Natalie Wright
Senior Environmental Associate
Freescale Semiconductor
3501 Ed Bluestein Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78721
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jennifer Keane
Attorney for Spansion, LLC
Baker Botts, L.L.P.
1500 San Jacinto Center
98 San Jacinto Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78701-4078
(w/o enclosures)