



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 22, 2016

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

OR2016-28307

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# 638972 (PIR No. 17-29848).

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for records related to a specified incident at a specified address. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.110, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company ("DuPont") of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its 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 comments from DuPont. We have considered the raised arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of records 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 that submitted to this office.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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, such as 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 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). You state DuPont marked the documents submitted as Attachment E as confidential when it provided them to the commission. Thus, Attachment E is confidential under section 382.041 to the extent this information constitutes a trade secret. The commission argues the information at issue consists of confidential trade secrets under section 552.110 of the Government Code. However, we note section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the commission’s argument under section 552.110. DuPont also argues its information is confidential pursuant to section 552.110. As such, we will consider the applicability of section 382.041 together with DuPont’s arguments under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)–(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of 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 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.<sup>2</sup> This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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 the information submitted as Attachment E constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find DuPont has established a *prima facie* case that Attachment E constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, the commission must withhold Attachment E 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.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of

---

<sup>2</sup>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 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; *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address DuPont's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The commission states the information in Attachment D consists of communications involving commission attorneys and other commission employees and officials. The commission states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the commission and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the commission has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information in Attachment D. Therefore, the commission may withhold the information in Attachment D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

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*

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

*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 that are 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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document that is 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 state the information in Attachment F consists of discussions concerning agency statements and proposed updates related to the specified incident. You state these discussions could have policy implications for other similarly situated future response actions. The commission further states the information at issue includes draft documents and handwritten notes related to the investigation of the specified incident. Thus, the commission states the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the commission pertaining to its policymaking functions. However, the commission does not indicate whether the draft documents at issue will be released to the

public in their final forms. To the extent the commission will release the draft documents to the public in their final forms, the commission may withhold them in their entirety under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, if the commission will not release the draft documents to the public in their final forms, the commission may not withhold them in their entirety under section 552.111. Nonetheless, based on your representations and our review, we find some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the commission. Thus, the commission may withhold the information we marked in Attachment F 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. Further, some of the remaining information was received from individuals with whom the commission has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find the commission has failed to show the remaining information consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the county. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information contains e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup> Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the commission must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the commission must withhold Attachment E 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. The commission may withhold the information in Attachment D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the commission will release the draft documents we marked to the public in their final forms, the commission may withhold them in their entirety under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we marked in Attachment F under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The commission must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>5</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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](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,



Ian Lancaster  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

IML/akg

Ref: ID# 638972

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)