



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 10, 2020

Mr. Neal Falgoust
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2020-01118

Dear Mr. Falgoust:

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# 811861 (PIR Nos. X004588 and X004596).

The City of Austin (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for video recordings related to a specified incident.¹ 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 representative sample of information.²

¹ We note the city sought and received clarification of the first request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 exception encompasses 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 (the “HSA”). Section 418.182(a) of the Government Code provides in relevant part, “information . . . 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 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 state the submitted information consists of surveillance video recordings at the Austin Bergstrom International Airport (the “airport”). You state the release of the submitted information would reveal the locations and capabilities of the airport’s video surveillance system. Upon review, we find the submitted surveillance video recordings relate 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. *See Tex. Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (recorded images of Texas Department of Public Safety video taken from Capitol security cameras relate to specifications of security system used to protect public property from act of terrorism or related criminal activity). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted video recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code.

You also ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold surveillance camera video footage pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Neal". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/gw

Ref: ID# 811861

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)