ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 19, 2011

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

OR2011-10298

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# 424682 (PIR # 11.05.03.08).

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for correspondence to and from a named company and the commission or the United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 6 regarding a specified facility during a specified period of time. You state the commission has released some of the information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Exide Technologies ("Exide"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, you have notified Exide of the request and of its right to submit comments to this office as to why the requested 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 to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received arguments on behalf of Exide. We

have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[1]

Initially, you inform us that the commission asked for clarification regarding the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed). You inform us the commission has not received a response from the requestor. We note that a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate a request for information to information that the governmental body holds. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this case, as you have submitted information for our review and raised an exception to disclosure for this information, we consider the commission to have made a good faith effort to identify the information that is responsive to the request, and we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Both the commission and Exide claim the submitted information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, including section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides "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 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 when submitting it to the commission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 652 (1997). The commission represents Exide marked the submitted documents as confidential when it provided them to the commission.[2] Thus, the information at issue is confidential under section 382.041 to the extent that this

---

[1]We assume the "representative sample" of information 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than those submitted to this office.

[2]We note information is ordinarily not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110).

information constitutes a trade secret. Because section 552.110(a) of the Government Code also protects trade secrets from disclosure, we will consider the applicability of section 382.041 together with Exide's arguments under section 552.110(a).

Exide claims portions of its submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, which protects trade secrets obtained from a person that are privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a "trade secret" to be

> 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). This office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if that 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, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable 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.[3] Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

---

[3]The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors 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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Exide argues a portion of its information, which consists of a manufacturing process flow diagram and information pertaining to Exide's facility's capacities, constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Based on Exide's arguments and our review of its submitted information, we conclude Exide has established this information constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, the commission must generally withhold the portions of Exide's information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 382.041 of the Health & Safety Code and section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.[4] We note, 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). Emission data is only subject to the release provision in section 7414(c) of title 42 of the United States Code if it was collected pursuant to subsection (a) of that section. *Id.* Thus, to the extent any of Exide's information constitutes emission data for the purposes of section 7414(c) of title 42 of the United States Code, the commission must release such information in accordance with federal law. As no further exceptions are raised for the remaining information, it must be released.

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,

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/eb

[4]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Exide's remaining argument against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 424682

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jennifer Keane
Baker Botts L.L.P.
1600 San Jacinto Center
98 San Jacinto Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78701-4039
(w/o enclosures)