



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 29, 2017

Ms. Captoria Brown
Paralegal
City of Carrollton
1945 East Jackson Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2017-19735

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 673261 (City ID# 10413).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for specified building permits, forms, plans, or documents relating to a specified neighborhood. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act ("HSA"). You claim the submitted information is excepted 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 contend, and we agree, the city's water supply and sanitary sewer system are part of the city's critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181. *See generally id.* § 421.001(2) (defining "critical infrastructure" to include "all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, economy, or morale of the state or the nation"). You state that public release of the submitted information "identifies particular vulnerabilities and strong and weak points in the design of the city's water main located at a high-traffic intersection." Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 to the information we marked. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 418.181 to the remaining information. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information to be highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest; thus, it may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 418.181 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 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,



Ian Lancaster
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

IML/tdw

Ref: ID# 673261

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)