



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 28, 2007

Ms. Angela H. Robinson  
Law, Snakard & Gambill  
For Tarrant County College District  
1600 West Seventh Street, Suite 500  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2007-02328

Dear Ms. Robinson:

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# 272439.

The Tarrant County College District (the "district") received a request for four categories of information, including a copy of the chancellor's employment contract and information pertaining to the chancellor's compensation. You state that you have released most of the requested information. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the district's procedural obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, a governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). You state that the district received the e-mailed request on December 14, 2006. However, we note that in this e-mail the requestor states that he did not receive Part B of the chancellor's employment contract. You assert that this e-mail is a follow-up request to the requestor's original request which the district received on November 2, 2006. We find that the submitted information is responsive to the request received on November 2, 2006. We note that the district did not request a ruling from this office until December 19, 2006. Consequently, we find that the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to submit to this office the information required in section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by a showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Because sections 552.101 and 552.102 can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will address your arguments concerning these exceptions.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102(a) is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85. Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102(a) privacy claims together.

For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation*. In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685.

This office has determined that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (identifying public and private portions of state employees' personnel records), 545 at 4 (1990) ("In general, we have found the kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common law privacy to be those regarding the receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities"), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining

personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). Thus, a public employee's allocation of part of the employee's salary to a voluntary investment program offered by the employer is a personal investment decision, and information about that decision is protected by common law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (participation in TexFlex), 545 at 3-5 (deferred compensation plan). Likewise, an employee's designation of a retirement beneficiary is excepted from disclosure under the common law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 9. However, where a transaction is funded in part by a governmental body, it involves the employee in a transaction with the governmental body, and the basic facts about that transaction are not protected by common law privacy. *Id.* We find that the information at issue involves a transaction funded by the district. Accordingly, we find that the public has a legitimate interest in the information at issue. Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld on the basis of common law privacy. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the information at issue must be released to the requestor.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tamara L. Harswick". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tamara L. Harswick  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TLH/krl

Ref: ID# 272439

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Bob Mhoon  
c/o Ms. Angela H. Robinson  
Law, Snakard & Gambill  
For Tarrant County College District  
1600 West Seventh Street, Suite 500  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(w/o enclosures)