



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 28, 2019

Ms. Julie P. Doshier
Counsel for the City of Allen
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, LLP
500 North Akard Street, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2019-30333

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 794019 (Reference No. 110290).

The City of Allen (the "city"), which you represent, received nine requests for information pertaining to a specified phone call involving a specified individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted on behalf of one of the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

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." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by chapter 418 of the Government Code. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"), sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make confidential certain information related to terrorism. Section 418.182(a) of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

[I]nformation . . . in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system

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 that information may 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 claim the submitted information is confidential under section 418.182 of the Government Code. You explain the information at issue consists of a security camera video recording of the lobby of the city's police department (the "department"). You state the camera at issue is part of the department's security system, which is used to protect public property from acts of terrorism or related criminal activity. You argue release of the information at issue would reveal specific information about the location and details of department security cameras and enable a criminal or terrorist to avoid detection. Based upon these representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude the city demonstrated the submitted information falls within the scope of section 418.182(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code.¹ *See generally* *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (finding confidential under section 418.182 of the HSA video recording containing images recorded by security cameras in Texas Capitol hallway because specifications of security system included cameras' capabilities and video recording demonstrated those capabilities through characteristics, quality, and clarity of images recorded).

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

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Ms. Julie P. Doshier - Page 3

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,



James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/mo

Ref: ID# 794019

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 9 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)