



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 5, 2020

Ms. YuShan Chang
Mr. Joseph R. Crawford
Assistant City Attorneys
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2020-15527

Dear Ms. Chang and Mr. Crawford:

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# 829848 (GC Nos. 26541, 26604).

The City of Houston (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified water main. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. You also state you notified Huff & Mitchell ("Huff") and Lockwood, Andrews & Newman, Inc. ("LAN") of the requests for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from LAN. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from Huff. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Huff has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating applicability of exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Huff may have in the information.²

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108; [and]

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1), (3). The submitted information includes a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by a governmental body that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The city must release the completed report pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Although the city raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov’t Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022, which we marked, under section 552.103. However, because sections 552.101, 552.110, and 552.136 of the Government Code can make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information subject to section 552.022.¹ Further, we will address the city’s argument against disclosure of the remaining 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 that is made confidential by other statutes. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the HSA. Section 418.181 provides “[t]hose documents

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security measures 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 of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a claim under section 418.181 must be accompanied by an adequate explanation of 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, and we agree, the city’s water system is critical infrastructure. *See generally 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, economy, or morale of the state or the nation”). You explain the submitted information “consists of reports, assessments, tests, inspections, and works orders of an existing 96-inch water transmission line, which is one of the largest transmission main line and is critical to the [c]ity’s daily system operation.” You state the submitted information contains the “location, structural diagrams, interior and exterior design of the water line pipe[.]” and identifies in detail “the physical location of the water line pipe.” You state, if released, the submitted information could be used by terrorists and criminals to “pinpoint vulnerable aspects of the [c]ity’s storm, sewer, and freshwater systems; thereby making it easier to disable or contaminate them.” Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the submitted information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city’s water system to an act of terrorism. Thus, the information we marked must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find the remaining information does not identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states “information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See id.* § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

- (1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and
- (2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). LAN argues its information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). However, we find LAN has failed to provide specific factual evidence

demonstrating any portion of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” *Id.* § 552.110(c). LAN argues its information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). However, we find LAN has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter, and the governmental body represents the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the

requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state, and submit documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the second request, the city received a notice of claim letter from an attorney on behalf of his client. You inform us the claim letter complies with the TTCA. You state the remaining information is directly related to the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the remaining information is related to litigation reasonably anticipated at the time the city received the request at issue. Therefore, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, we find the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to copyright law. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. With the exception of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining

information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/mo

Ref: ID# 829848

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)