



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 14, 2015

Ms. Judith N. Benton
Assistant City Attorney
City of Waco
P.O. Box 2570
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2015-19041

Dear Ms. Benton:

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# 578873 (City Ref. No. LGL-15-208).

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for the proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Brazos Riverfront Development, Ltd. ("BRD"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified BRD 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 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the circumstances). We have 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) of the Government Code 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 BRD explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude BRD 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest BRD may have in the information.

We note some of the remaining information is protected by section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.¹ Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found personal financial information not related to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 523 (1989), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). 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. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the city must release the remaining information.

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

¹The 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).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Neal', written in a cursive style.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/akg

Ref: ID# 578873

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph G. Beard
Brazos Riverfront Development, Ltd.
3100 Monticello Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75205-3439
(w/o enclosures)