



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 13, 2022

Mr. Ariel San Miguel
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-368

OR2022-31482

Dear Mr. San Miguel:

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# 978208 (Ref. No. R076194).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts 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 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

¹ We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. See Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider its applicability to the submitted information. See *id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

² We assume 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.

intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, whether financial information is subject to a legitimate public interest and, therefore, is not protected by common-law privacy must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983).

Chapter 2258 of the Government Code is applicable to prevailing wage rates for public works projects. Section 2258.021(a) provides that workers, laborers, or mechanics employed by or on behalf of the state or a political subdivision of the state shall be paid "not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for work of a similar character in the locality in which the work is performed[.]" Gov't Code § 2258.021(a). Section 2258.024 requires the contractor and each subcontractor to keep a record of the name and occupation of each worker and the actual per diem wages paid to each worker employed on the project. *See id.* § 2258.024(a). Section 2258.024 also provides that this record "shall be open at all reasonable hours to inspection by the officers and agents of the public body." *Id.* § 2258.024(b); *see also id.* § 2258.058 (criminal penalty for violation of Gov't Code § 2258.024).

Upon review, we find the identities of the employees in the payroll records at issue meet the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the identities of the employees in the submitted payroll records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, after careful consideration, we find there is a legitimate public interest in knowing whether a private entity engaged in a public works project is paying the general prevailing wage to its employees pursuant to section 2258.021 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

In summary, the city must withhold the identities of the employees in the submitted payroll records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Sarah E. Reese
Attorney
Open Records Division

SER/jxd

Ref: ID# 978208

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)