



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 14, 2015

Ms. Kathleen Decker
Director
Litigation Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2015-21594

Dear Ms. Decker:

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# 583154 (Commission PIR No. 15-22925).

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for information pertaining to the Lannate Unit at a specified facility.¹ You state the commission released some information. You claim some of the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state release of some of the remaining information may implicate the proprietary interests of E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company ("DuPont"). Accordingly, you state you notified DuPont of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 comments from DuPont. We have also received comments from the Chemours Company FC, LLC; however, its

¹We note the commission asked for and received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

information is not responsive to the clarified request and, thus, we need not consider its assertions. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information are not responsive to the instant request because they do not pertain to the Lannate Unit. The commission need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in 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 section 382.041 protects information 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 states, as does DuPont, that some of the submitted information was designated confidential when it was provided to the commission as required by section 382.041.² Thus, the information at issue is confidential under section 382.041 to the extent this information constitutes a trade secret. Because section 552.110(a) of the Government Code also protects trade secrets, we will address DuPont's claims for the information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code 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. 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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides a trade secret to be as follows:

²We note information is ordinarily not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests confidentiality for the information. *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 did not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110).

[A]ny 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) (citation omitted); *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.³ *See* 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 5-6. 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).

DuPont claims section 552.110(a) for some of the responsive information, arguing some of it constitutes trade secrets of the company. Upon review, we find DuPont has made a *prima facie* case that the information it has indicated meets the definition of a trade secret.

³There are six factors the Restatement gives as indicia of 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 the 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information Dupont has indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 382.041 of the Health and 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 the information DuPont has indicated 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.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

⁴As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address DuPont’s remaining argument against its disclosure.

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You seek to withhold Attachment E under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state Attachment E consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of commission employees and officials regarding policymaking matters. We understand the draft documents included in Attachment E were intended to be released in their final form. Upon review, we find the commission may withhold the information we have marked in Attachment E under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any portion of the remaining information in Attachment E under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

We note some of the remaining information consists of personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁵ Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the commission must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure.

In summary, the commission must withhold the information DuPont has indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code and section 552.110(a) of the Government Code; however, to the extent any of this 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. The commission may withhold the information we have marked in Attachment E under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the


⁵The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure. The remaining responsive information 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 583154

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Whit Swift
For E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1000
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bradley Aulick
Chemours Company
1007 Market Street, D-7056
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(w/o enclosures)