



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 14, 2005

Mr. Dan Junell
Assistant General Counsel
Teacher Retirement System of Texas
1000 Red River Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2698

OR2005-08390

Dear Mr. Junell:

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# 231280.

The Teacher Retirement System of Texas (the "system") received a request for specified categories of information pertaining to system real estate investments, including information that pertains to the Red River Limited Partnership ("Red River").¹ You indicate that the system does not have information responsive to some of the requested categories of information.² You state that some of the requested information has been produced or been made available to the requestor, but claim that the submitted responsive information is

¹The system sought and received a clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed).

²We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist when the request for information was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ *dism'd*); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

excepted from disclosure under section 552.143 of the Government Code.³ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.0225 of the Government Code.⁵ Section 552.0225 provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Under the fundamental philosophy of American government described by section 552.001, it is the policy of this state that investments of government are investments of and for the people and the people are entitled to information regarding those investments. The provisions of this section shall be liberally construed to implement this policy.

(b) The following categories of information held by a governmental body relating to its investments are public information and not excepted from disclosure under this chapter:

(1) the name of any fund or investment entity the governmental body is or has invested in;

...

(10) the names of the principals responsible for managing any fund or investment entity in which the governmental body is or has invested;

...

(12) a description of all of the types of businesses a governmental body is or has invested in through a fund or investment entity[.]

³See Act of May 20, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S. S.B. 121, § 2, § 552.143 (to be codified at Tex. Gov't Code § 552.143).

⁴We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

⁵Added by Act of May 20, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S. S.B. 121, § 1, sec. 552.0225 (to be codified at Tex. Gov't Code § 552.0225).

Gov't Code § 552.0225(a), (b)(1), (b)(10), (b)(12). Section 552.143(c) excepts from release information subject to these subsections; therefore, we must address whether the information subject to these subsections, as well as the remaining submitted information, is excepted under section 552.143(c).

Subsection 552.143(c) of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

All information regarding a governmental body's direct purchase, holding, or disposal of restricted securities that is not listed in Section 552.0225(b)(2)-(9), (11), (13)-(16) is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. This Subsection does not apply to a governmental body's purchase, holding, or disposal of, restricted securities for the purpose of reinvestment nor does it apply to a private investment fund's investment in restricted securities.

Gov't Code § 552.143(c). We note that a governmental body cannot be a "private investment fund" for purposes of section 552.143. *See* Gov't Code § 552.143(d)(1) (defining private investment fund). Thus, because subsection 552.143(c) does not apply to a private investment fund's investment in restricted securities, we must determine whether Red River is a government body for purposes of the Act or a private investment fund entity for purposes of section 552.143.

Under the Act, the term "governmental body" includes several enumerated kinds of entities and "the part, section, or portion of an organization, corporation, commission, committee, institution, or agency that spends or that is supported in whole or in part by public funds[.]" *Id.* § 552.003(1)(A)(xii). The phrase "public funds" means funds of the state or of a governmental subdivision of the state. *Id.* § 552.003(5).

Both the courts and this office previously have considered the scope of the definition of "governmental body" under the Act and its statutory predecessor. In *Kneeland v. National Collegiate Athletic Association*, 850 F.2d 224 (5th Cir. 1988), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recognized that opinions of this office do not declare private persons or businesses to be "governmental bodies" that are subject to the Act "simply because [the persons or businesses] provide specific goods or services under a contract with a government body." *Kneeland*, 850 F.2d at 228; *see* Open Records Decision No. 1 (1973). Rather, the *Kneeland* court noted that in interpreting the predecessor to section 552.003 of the Government Code, this office's opinions generally examine the facts of the relationship between the private entity and the governmental body and apply three distinct patterns of analysis:

The opinions advise that an entity receiving public funds becomes a governmental body under the Act, unless its relationship with the government imposes "a specific and definite obligation . . . to provide a measurable

amount of service in exchange for a certain amount of money as would be expected in a typical arms-length contract for services between a vendor and purchaser.” Tex. Att’y Gen. No. JM-821 (1987), quoting ORD-228 (1979). That same opinion informs that “a contract or relationship that involves public funds and that indicates a common purpose or objective or that creates an agency-type relationship between a private entity and a public entity will bring the private entity within the . . . definition of a ‘governmental body.’” Finally, that opinion, citing others, advises that some entities, such as volunteer fire departments, will be considered governmental bodies if they provide “services traditionally provided by governmental bodies.”

Kneeland, 850 F.2d at 228. The *Kneeland* court ultimately concluded that the National Collegiate Athletic Association (the “NCAA”) and the Southwest Conference (the “SWC”), both of which received public funds, were not “governmental bodies” for purposes of the Act, because both provided specific, measurable services in return for those funds. *See id.*, 850 F.2d at 230-31. Both the NCAA and the SWC were associations made up of both private and public universities. Both the NCAA and the SWC received dues and other revenues from their member institutions. *Id.* at 226-28. In return for those funds, the NCAA and the SWC provided specific services to their members, such as supporting various NCAA and SWC committees; producing publications, television messages, and statistics; and investigating complaints of violations of NCAA and SWC rules and regulations. *Id.* at 229-31. The *Kneeland* court concluded that although the NCAA and the SWC received public funds from some of their members, neither entity was a “governmental body” for purposes of the Act, because the NCAA and SWC did not receive the funds for their general support. Rather, the NCAA and the SWC provided “specific and gaugeable services” in return for the funds that they received from their member public institutions. *See id.* at 231; *see also A.H. Belo Corp. v. S. Methodist Univ.*, 734 S.W.2d 720 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1987, writ denied) (athletic departments of private-school members of SWC did not receive or spend public funds and thus were not governmental bodies for purposes of Act).

In exploring the scope of the definition of “governmental body” under the Act, this office has distinguished between private entities that receive public funds in return for specific, measurable services and those entities that receive public funds as general support. In Open Records Decision No. 228 (1979), we considered whether the North Texas Commission (the “commission”), a private, nonprofit corporation chartered for the purpose of promoting the interests of the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area, was a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 288* at 1. The commission’s contract with the City of Fort Worth obligated the city to pay the commission \$80,000 per year for three years. *Id.* The contract obligated the commission, among other things, to “[c]ontinue its current successful programs and implement such new and innovative programs as will further its corporate objectives and common City’s interests and activities.” *Id.* at 2. Noting this provision, this office stated that “[e]ven if all other parts of the contract were found to represent a strictly arms-length transaction, we believe that this provision places the various governmental bodies which

have entered into the contract in the position of 'supporting' the operation of the Commission with public funds within the meaning of section 2(1)(F)." *Id.* Accordingly, the commission was determined to be a governmental body for purposes of the Act. *Id.*

In Open Records Decision No. 602 (1992), we addressed the status of the Dallas Museum of Art (the "DMA") under the Act. The DMA was a private, nonprofit corporation that had contracted with the City of Dallas to care for and preserve an art collection owned by the city and to maintain, operate, and manage an art museum. *See* Open Records Decision No. 602 at 1-2. The contract required the city to support the DMA by maintaining the museum building, paying for utility service, and providing funds for other costs of operating the museum. *Id.* at 2. We noted that an entity that receives public funds is a governmental body under the Act, unless the entity's relationship with the governmental body from which it receives funds imposes "a specific and definite obligation . . . to provide a measurable amount of service in exchange for a certain amount of money as would be expected in a typical arms-length contract for services between a vendor and purchaser." *Id.* at 4. We found that "the [City of Dallas] is receiving valuable services in exchange for its obligations, but, in our opinion, the very nature of the services the DMA provides to the [City of Dallas] cannot be known, specific, or measurable." *Id.* at 5. Thus, we concluded that the City of Dallas provided general support to the DMA facilities and operation, making the DMA a governmental body to the extent that it received the city's financial support. *Id.* Therefore, the DMA's records that related to programs supported by public funds were subject to the Act. *Id.*

We additionally note that the precise manner of public funding is not the sole dispositive issue in determining whether a particular entity is subject to the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-821 at 3 (1987). Other aspects of a contract or relationship that involve the transfer of public funds between a private and a public entity must be considered in determining whether the private entity is a "governmental body" under the Act. *Id.* at 4. For example, a contract or relationship that involves public funds, and that indicates a common purpose or objective or that creates an agency-type relationship between a private entity and a public entity, will bring the private entity within the definition of a "governmental body" under section 552.003(1)(A)(xii) of the Government Code. The overall nature of the relationship created by the contract is relevant in determining whether the private entity is so closely associated with the governmental body that the private entity falls within the Act. *Id.*

You explain that when the Red River partnership was established, the system gave Red River over \$480,000,000 in commercial real estate mortgages in the year 2000 in exchange for more than 99% interest in the partnership, and the system is the only limited partner. However, you inform us that the system transferred the real estate management functions to Red River. These functions do not comprise services traditionally provided by governmental bodies. *See* Open Records Decision 621 at 8 n.10 (1993). You also inform us that Red River's only source of income is from assessing management fees against the system. We

find this to be a specific and definite obligation to provide a measurable amount of service in exchange for a certain amount of money in a typical arms-length contract for services between a vendor and purchaser. *See* Tex. Att’y Gen. No. JM-821 (1987); Open Record Decision No. 228 (1979). Accordingly, based on your arguments and the information submitted, we conclude that Red River is not a governmental body for purposes of the Act.

Although Red River is not a governmental body, we are also unable to determine that Red River is a private investment fund for purposes of section 552.143. *See id.* § 552.143(c) (subsection 52.143(c) not applicable to private investment fund’s investment in restricted securities). Nevertheless, even if Red River is a private investment fund for purposes of section 552.143, we find that the submitted information does not consist of Red River’s investment in restricted securities. Rather, we conclude that the submitted documents consist of information regarding the system’s direct purchase, holding, or disposal of restricted securities for purposes of subsection 552.143(c). Therefore, after review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that the system must withhold the submitted information under section 552143.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/seg

Ref: ID# 231280

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Dianne Wood
Capital Stewardship Program
Service Employees International Union AFL-CIO, CLC
77901 Oakport Street
Oakland, California 94621
(w/o enclosures)