

**United States Department of Energy**  
**Office of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of Torres Consulting & Law Group, LLC	)		
	)		
Filing Date: October 28, 2014	)	Case No.:	FIA-14-0070
	)		
_____	)		

Issued: November 20, 2014

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Decision and Order**  
\_\_\_\_\_

On October 28, 2014, Torres Consulting & Law Group, LLC (Appellant) filed an Appeal from a determination issued to it by the Richland Operations Office (Richland) of the Department of Energy (DOE) (Request No. FOI 2014-01731). In that determination, Richland responded to a request filed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, as implemented by the DOE in 10 C.F.R. Part 1004. Richland released 26 pages of documents but redacted portions of those released documents under Exemptions 4 and 6 of the FOIA. This Appeal, if granted, would release wage information from the redacted documents.

**I. Background**

On August 13, 2014, the Appellant filed two requests with Richland for “[c]ertified payroll records for Real Centric Solutions, LLC, covering the time period from June 30, 2014 to current” and “[c]ertified payroll records for RAM Mechanical covering when this contractor started work on this project to current” for work performed under Contract No. 53553, Release 001, the Field Route Injection & Extraction Well Equipment, at the Hanford Nuclear Site. Request Letters dated August 13, 2014, from Anna L. Clark, Senior Compliance Specialist, Appellant, to Dorothy Riehle, FOIA Officer, Richland. In its determination, Richland combined the two requests and released 26 pages of documents but withheld portions of those documents under Exemptions 4 and 6 of the FOIA. Determination Letter dated September 18, 2014, from Dorothy Riehle to Appellant. The Appellant challenges only the Exemption 4 claim, stating that Richland improperly applied Exemption 4. Appeal Letter dated October 27, 2014, from Appellant to Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA), DOE.

## II. Analysis

The FOIA requires that documents held by federal agencies generally be released to the public upon request. The FOIA, however, lists nine exemptions that set forth the types of information that may be withheld at the discretion of the agency. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(1)-(9). Those nine categories are repeated in the DOE regulations implementing the FOIA. 10 C.F.R. § 1004.10(b)(1)-(9). We must construe the FOIA exemptions narrowly to maintain the FOIA's goal of broad disclosure. *Dep't of the Interior v. Klamath Water Users Prot. Ass'n*, 532 U.S. 1, 8 (2001) (citation omitted). The agency has the burden to show that information is exempt from disclosure. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B).

Exemption 4 shields from mandatory disclosure "trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential." 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(4); 10 C.F.R. § 1004.10(b)(4). Accordingly, in order to be withheld under Exemption 4, a document must contain either (a) trade secrets or (b) information that is "commercial" or "financial," "obtained from a person," and "privileged or confidential." *Nat'l Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (*Nat'l Parks*). If the agency determines that the material is a trade secret for the purposes of the FOIA, its analysis is complete and the material may be withheld under Exemption 4. *Public Citizen Health Research Group v. FDA*, 704 F.2d 1280, 1286, 1288 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (*Public Citizen*). If the material does not constitute a "trade secret," a different analysis applies. The agency must determine whether the information in question is "commercial or financial," "obtained from a person" and "privileged or confidential."

The first requirement is that the withheld information be "commercial or financial." Federal courts have held that these terms should be given their ordinary meanings and that records are commercial as long as the submitter has a "commercial interest" in them. *Public Citizen*, 704 F.2d at 1290. The information submitted by the contractors, *i.e.*, payroll records, clearly satisfies the definition of commercial or financial information. The second requirement is that the information be "obtained from a person." It is well-established that "person" refers to a wide-range of entities, including corporations and partnerships. *See Comstock Int'l, Inc., v. Export-Import Bank*, 464 F. Supp. 804, 806 (D.D.C. 1979); *see also Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.*, Case No. TFA-591 (2000).<sup>\*/</sup> The two contractors satisfy that definition. Finally, in order to be exempt from disclosure under Exemption 4, the information must be "confidential."

In this case, the contractors were required to submit the payroll records pursuant to the requirements of their contracts with Richland. *See* Email from Dorothy Riehle to Janet R. H. Fishman, Attorney-Examiner, OHA (November 17, 2013). Accordingly, we find that the withheld information was "involuntarily submitted." Hence, as the information was "involuntarily submitted," the *National Parks* test must be met to find the information withheld to be confidential. Under *National Parks*, involuntarily submitted information is considered confidential if its release would be likely to either (a) impair the government's ability to obtain such information in the future, or (b) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of submitters. 498 F.2d at 770. "Courts generally defer to an agency's predictions concerning the

---

<sup>\*/</sup> OHA FOIA decisions issued after November 19, 1996, may be accessed at <http://energy.gov/oha/foia-cases>

repercussions of disclosure, acknowledging that predictions about competitive harm are not capable of exact proof.” *SACE v. Dep’t of Energy*, 853 F. Supp. 2d 60, 71 (D.D.C. 2012). In applying Exemption 4 to the documents at issue, Richland determined that release of the information would likely cause the contractors substantial competitive harm.

In the present case, Richland withheld the work classification, hours worked each day, total hours worked each week, rate of pay, gross amount earned, deductions, and net wages paid. We have considered a similar issue in an October 19, 2012, appeal decision issued to the same Appellant, where we found that release of information in payroll records, specifically the total hours worked daily and weekly and wage rates, would provide competitors with an undue advantage, and therefore, that information was confidential and exempt from release. *Torres Consulting & Law Group, LLC*, Case No. FIA-12-0056 (2012); *see also Nat’l Parks*, 498 F.2d at 770. Moreover, release of that information would give the contractors’ competitors an undue advantage in bidding on future contracts. Accordingly, we conclude that Exemption 4 has been properly invoked as to the commercial or financial information contained in the payroll records because the contractors would likely suffer substantial competitive harm from release of the information. Therefore, we will deny the Appeal.

### **III. Conclusion**

After considering the Appellant’s arguments, we are convinced that the information redacted from the payroll records was properly withheld under Exemption 4. Accordingly, the Appeal should be denied.

It Is Therefore Ordered That:

- (1) The Appeal filed by Torres Consulting & Law Group, LLC, Case No. FIA-14-0070, is hereby denied.
- (2) This is a final order of the Department of Energy from which any aggrieved party may seek judicial review pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B). Judicial review may be sought in the district in which the requester resides or has a principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, or in the District of Columbia.

The 2007 FOIA amendments created the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) to offer mediation services to resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation. Using OGIS services does not affect your right to pursue litigation. You may contact OGIS in any of the following ways:

Office of Government Information Services  
National Archives and Records Administration  
8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS  
College Park, MD 20740  
Web: [ogis.archives.gov](http://ogis.archives.gov)  
E-mail: [ogis@nara.gov](mailto:ogis@nara.gov)  
Telephone: 202-741-5770

Fax: 202-741-5769  
Toll-free: 1-877-684-6448

Poli A. Marmolejos  
Director  
Office of Hearings and Appeals

Date: November 20, 2014