



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 7, 2020

Mr. Justin S. Light
Counsel for the Tarrant Regional Water District
Pope, Hardwicke, Christie, Schell, Kelly & Taplett, L.L.P.
500 West 7th Street, Suite 600
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2020-16978

Dear Mr. Light:

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# 834153 (TRWD PIR #20.040).

The Tarrant Regional Water District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for 21 categories of information pertaining to a specified project. You state you released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ You also state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of CDM Smith, Inc. and Thalle Construction Company. Accordingly, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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

¹ Although the district raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege and work product privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code are sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, respectively. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002). In addition, we note we asked the district to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). We have received and considered the correspondence sent by the district pursuant to that request.

have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample information.²

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from either notified third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude either notified third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest either notified third party may have in the information.

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, as follows:

(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:

...

(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)(3). The information at issue consists of information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body. Information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) must be released unless such information is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, 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); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information we marked and indicated may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will address your argument under this section to the information at issue. Furthermore, we note section 552.130 of the

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

Government Code makes information confidential under the Act.³ Accordingly, we will address the applicability of this exception to the information at issue. Additionally, we will address your argument under section 552.103 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (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. *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 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specified matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.⁴ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5

³ 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).

⁴ In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for dispute payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records

(1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You argue the district reasonably anticipated litigation at the time the district received the instant request. You explain the district has an ongoing dispute with MWH Constructors, Inc. (“MWH”) regarding certain aspects of the specified project, including the assessment of potential liquidated damages owed to the district. You explain MWH has hired an attorney to handle its communications with the district in regard to the dispute. You further explain counsel for MWH and the district have been unable to reach an agreement in regard to the dispute and assert litigation is the next step to resolving the dispute. Based upon these representations and our review of the information at issue, we determine you have established the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. Further, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the district may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.⁵

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. *See* Attorney General MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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. Section 552.101 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 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

Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 state the remaining information pertains to the locations and details of components of the district's water system. You state, and we agree, the district's water system is critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181. *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 state release of the information at issue could allow an individual to launch "a cyber-attack on the [district's] water system[.]" which would reveal critical components that could be hacked. Further, you state the district's "water systems are remote-controlled and the [d]istrict currently experiences an average of five attempted cyber-attacks each month on its systems." Finally, you state "disruption to the [d]istrict's water supply system would cause disruption and shortages of water support to the municipalities, domestic, industrial and mining, and residents of North Texas who depend on the supply of safe drinking water." Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the release of some of the remaining information would identify the technical details or particular vulnerabilities of the authority's critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find none of the remaining information reveals the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 418.181.

Section 552.130 excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See id.* § 552.130. Accordingly, the district must withhold all visible license plates in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. 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 copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The district must withhold all visible license plates in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information;

however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/eb

Ref: ID# 834153

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)