



Office of the Attorney General
State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

July 23, 1997

Ms. Mary Keller
Senior Associate Commissioner
Legal and Compliance, MC110-1A
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR97-1681

Dear Ms. Keller:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 108063.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for the test results of three companies that received product approval from the department. You raise a concern that the requested information may be proprietary and therefore excepted from required public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.305. You have submitted for our review the test reports at issue for the three requested companies, Certainteed Corporation, Alside, Inc., and Variform, Inc.

Since the property and privacy rights of third parties may be implicated by the release of the requested information, this office notified the three companies whose test results were requested. *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 Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances).

Certainteed Corporation did not respond to our notice; therefore, we have no basis to conclude that this company's information is excepted from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 639 (1996) at 4 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure), 552 (1990) at 5 (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 (1990) at 3. The test results of Certainteed Corporation, which did not respond, must, therefore, be released to the requestor.

Alside, Inc. and Variform, Inc. responded to our notification and raise section 552.110 as an exception to disclosure of their test reports which contain the requested test results. Variform, Inc., however, does not object to release of report NER-460 issued by the National Evaluation Service. Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of "trade secret" from the Restatement of Torts, section 757, 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 a single or ephemeral event 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the "trade secrets" branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we 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 one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990) at 5.¹

In Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996), this office announced that it would follow the federal courts' interpretation of exemption 4 to the federal Freedom of Information Act when applying the second prong of section 552.110 for commercial and financial information. In *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765


¹The 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 other 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 (1982) at 2, 306 (1982) at 2, 255 (1980) at 2.

(D.C. Cir. 1974), the court concluded that for information to be excepted under exemption 4 to the Freedom of Information Act, disclosure of the requested information must be likely either to (1) impair the Government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future, or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained. *National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). A business enterprise cannot succeed in a *National Parks* claim by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996) at 4. To prove substantial competitive harm, the party seeking to prevent disclosure must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure. *Id.*

After reviewing the arguments presented by Alside, Inc., we find that it has established that its test reports are protected under section 552.110. The department must therefore withhold this information received from Alside, Inc. However, after a review of Variform, Inc.'s arguments, we conclude that Variform, Inc. has not demonstrated that its test reports are protected by section 552.110. The department must therefore release this information received from Variform, Inc.

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/rho

Ref: ID# 108063

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. John Pinkerton
Process Manager
Master Shield Building Products
1202 N. Bowie Drive
Weatherford, Texas 76086-1598
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken Mieure
Research & Development Manager
Variform, Inc.
P.O. Box 559
Kearney, Missouri 64060
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sally L. Crawford
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
2300 Trammell Crow Center
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Carol Lowe
Certainteed Corporation
803 Belden Road
Jackson, Michigan 49203
(w/o enclosures)