



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 15, 2014

Ms. Brandi M. Youngkin
Assistant City Attorney
City of Plano
P.O. Box 860358
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2014-18558

Dear Ms. Youngkin:

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# 539386.

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for seven categories of information pertaining to the city's ICMA retirement plans. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.143 of the Government Code. You state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified International City Management Association Retirement Corporation ("ICMA-RC") of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information 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 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, we have not received comments from ICMA-RC explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude ICMA-RC has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (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), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest ICMA-RC may have in it.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from 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, protected under common-law privacy). However, information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee’s qualifications and performance and the circumstances of public employee’s resignation or termination), 423 at 2 (1984).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city has failed to demonstrate, however, how the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You argue some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.143 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) All information prepared or provided by a private investment fund and held by a governmental body that is not listed in Section 552.0225(b) is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021.

(b) Unless the information has been publicly released, pre-investment and post-investment diligence information, including reviews and analyses,

prepared for or maintained by a governmental body or a private investment fund is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021, except to the extent it is subject to disclosure under Subsection (c).

(c) 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(a)-(c). You contend some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.143. You state the information at issue consists of personal financial information of individual employees. However, upon review, you do not explain how the information at issue was prepared or provided by a private investment fund or constitutes pre-investment or post-investment due diligence information. Accordingly, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.143 of the Government Code, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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 responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 539386

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ken S. Wedemeyer
ICMA-RC
777 North Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20002
(w/o enclosures)