



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 20, 2019

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the Town of Flower Mound
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2019-07816

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 755456 (PIR 960-18).

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for all videos pertaining to the arrest of a named individual. You state the town will redact information pursuant to sections 552.130 and 552.147 of the Government Code and in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments 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 made confidential by other statutes. The town asserts the submitted information, which consists of camera recordings from police vehicles or police buildings, is confidential under section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code.

¹We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

See Occ. Code § 1701.661. However, section 1701.661 applies to a police officer's body worn camera recording. *See id.* § 1701.651(1)(B) (“‘Body worn camera’ means a recording device that is . . . worn on the person of a peace officer[.]”) We find the submitted information does not consist of body worn camera recordings for purposes of section 1701.661. Accordingly, we conclude the submitted information is not subject to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code, and the town may not withhold any portion of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act. Section 418.182 provides in part:

(a) Except as provided by Subsections (b) and (c), information, including access codes and passwords, in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

Id. § 418.182(a). The fact information may generally be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *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 confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the information you indicated consists of security camera footage from the Flower Mound Jail (the “jail”). You assert the surveillance cameras at issue are part of the jail's security system. You state the release of the submitted surveillance camera footage would reveal the specifications, layout, design, and capabilities of the jail's security camera system. You state the system is necessary to “protect the [jail's] inmates and jail staff from terroris[m] and other criminal activities.” Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the submitted surveillance camera footage is related to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. *See Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (recorded images necessarily relate to specifications of security system that recorded them, and thus, are confidential under section 418.182). Accordingly, the town must withhold the submitted surveillance camera footage, which you indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code.

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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. See *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Thus, the town must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the town must withhold the submitted surveillance camera footage, which you indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. The town must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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,



D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMC/gw

Ref: ID# 755456

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)