



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 21, 2012

Mr. Matthew B. Kutac  
Counsel for Hays County Water Control and Improvement No. 1  
Barrett & Associates, PLLC  
3006 Bee Caves Road, Suite D-310  
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2012-20696

Dear Mr. Kutac:

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# 475010.

The Hays County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the written bid responses to the district's request for proposals with qualifications for the collection and disposal of solid waste and recycling. You state the district is releasing some of the requested information. Further, although you take no position as to whether the remaining requested information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Texas Disposal Systems, Inc. ("TDS") and Recon Services, Inc. ("Recon"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their 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 TDS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B)*. As of the date of this letter Recon has submitted no comments to this office explaining how release of the information at issue would affect its proprietary interests. *See id.* § 552.110(b) (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 result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information on the basis of Recon's proprietary interests.

TDS raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for the information in its proposal identified as "Section 6 References". Section 552.110 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>1</sup> This office must accept a claim that

---

<sup>1</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).

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* ORD 552 at 5. 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

TDS claims its submitted reference information, including information regarding the number of accounts, constitutes a trade secret, and that release of this information would cause TDS substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we conclude TDS has established a *prima facie* claim for most of its reference information. Accordingly, the district must withhold the reference information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we note TDS has published the identities of its remaining references on its website, making this information publicly available. Thus, we find TDS has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that this information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has TDS demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim). Furthermore, TDS has failed to demonstrate how the release of the information it has on its website would cause it substantial competitive injury. *See* ORD 661 at 5. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

TDS also contends the reference information not excepted under section 552.110 is protected by common-law and constitutional privacy. 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 section encompasses information protected by the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). We note that common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of business and governmental entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary

interests); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of TDS's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently, and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or otherwise implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of TDS's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."<sup>2</sup> Gov't Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Therefore, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110(a) and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining 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

---

<sup>2</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).

responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](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,



Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 475010

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Newton  
General Counsel  
Texas Disposal Systems  
P.O. Box 17126  
Austin, Texas 78760-7126  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Walter Biel  
Recon Services  
P.O. Box 869  
Dripping Springs, Texas 78620  
(w/o enclosures)