



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 13, 2016

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez  
Counsel for the City of McKinney  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2016-08283

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 607078.

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for compliance reports related to backflow devices, including annual testing, name, location, e-mail address, telephone number, device information and last test date. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>You acknowledge, and we agree, the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Nonetheless, section 552.101 of the Government Code is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302. Thus, we will address the applicability of this exception to the submitted information, notwithstanding the city's violation of section 552.301 in requesting this decision.

<sup>2</sup>We assume that 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.

Initially, you state the city may have inadvertently provided some requestors access to a portion of the requested information. We note the Act does not permit selective disclosure of information to the public. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007(b), .021; Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). Information that has been voluntarily released to a member of the public may not subsequently be withheld from another member of the public, unless public disclosure of the information is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988); *but see* Open Records Decision Nos. 579 (1990) (exchange of information among litigants in "informal" discovery is not "voluntary" release of information for purposes of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.007), 454 at 2 (1986) (governmental body that disclosed information because it reasonably concluded that it had constitutional obligation to do so could still invoke statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108). In this instance, you inform us the release was inadvertent. We note a governmental body is not precluded from invoking an exception to further public disclosure of information that has been released on a limited basis through no official action and against the wishes and policy of the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 376 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 387 at 3 (1983) (information that is not voluntarily released by a governmental body, but nevertheless comes into another party's possession, is not henceforth automatically available to everyone). Based on your representations, we find there was no voluntary release of information in this instance. Accordingly, we will consider your argument against disclosure of all the information at issue.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Sections 418.176 through 418.180 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act ("HSA"). You claim the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under section 418.181 of the Government Code. Section 418.181 of the Government Code provides "[t]hose documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism." *Id.* § 418.181; *see also id.* § 421.001 (defining critical infrastructure to include "all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, and functions vital to the state or the nation"). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns or emergency management activities does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed

provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You assert the submitted information is related to the city's water system and thus pertains to critical infrastructure for the purposes of section 418.181 of the Government Code. You explain the information identifies the size, location, and manufacturer of backflow devices throughout the city and thus reveals technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city's water system. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the information is confidential under section 418.181 of the Government Code. We therefore conclude the city must withhold the submitted information on that basis under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

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](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,



Abigail T. Adams  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 607078

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)