



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 7, 2008

Ms. Elizabeth L. DeRieux  
Brown McCarroll, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 3999  
Longview, Texas 75606-3999

OR2008-04594

Dear Ms. DeRieux:

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# 306889.

The East Texas Council of Governments (the "council"), which you represent, received a request for the following information: (1) employee names and their yearly gross salary, with the exception of employees of the Transportation Department, as of June 1, 2007 and January 1, 2008; (2) the evaluations for all Workforce Division employees within the last three years; and (3) a copy of any agreement or contract between the council and a named individual. The council states it has released some information responsive to the request, but claims that 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. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor and by several employees whose information is at issue in the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information in

a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” *Id.* § 552.102. Section 552.102 is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982) (anything relating to employee’s employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person’s employment relationship and is part of employee’s personnel file). The privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.) (addressing statutory predecessor). We will therefore consider the applicability of common-law privacy under section 552.101 together with your claim regarding section 552.102.

In *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of a legitimate concern to the public. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Industrial Foundation*, 540 S.W.2d at 681-82. In addition, this office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee’s decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, are protected under common-law privacy).

However, a public employee’s salary does not pertain to the employee’s private affairs. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow), 342 at 3 (1982) (certain information about public employees, including position, experience, tenure, salary, and educational level, has long been held disclosable). Furthermore, as a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, the public has a legitimate interest in this type of information. *See generally* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(2) (stating, among other things, that public employee’s salary is expressly public). Additionally, information that pertains to an employee’s actions as a public servant generally cannot be considered to be beyond the realm of legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees). We also note that common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee’s alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee’s job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

Upon review, we find that the submitted information does not constitute intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the submitted

information is confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 or 552.102 on that basis. Accordingly, the council must release the submitted information 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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 cursive script, appearing to read "Amy Shipp".

Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/mcf

Ref: ID# 306889

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Ann D. Reed  
P.O. Box 1195  
Lone Star, Texas 75668  
(w/o enclosures)