



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 13, 2020

Ms. T. Trisha Dang
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Sugar Land
P.O. Box 110
Sugar Land, Texas 77487-0110

OR2020-17332

Dear Ms. Dang:

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# 835263 (ORR# W009301).

The City of Sugar Land (the "city") received a request for plans for a specified address. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. You further claim the submitted information is subject to copyright law. Additionally, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Castles Design Group ("Castles") and Jordan & Skala Engineers, Inc. ("Engineers"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Castle and Engineers of the request for information and of their 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 have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 Castles or Engineers explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude those parties have protected proprietary interests 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 city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information related to Castles or Engineers on the basis of any proprietary interest they may have in the 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.” *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information that is made confidential by other statutes. The city raises 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:

Those 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 concerns 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 by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain 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).

The city states the submitted information identifies the physical locations and technical details of critical infrastructure. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the submitted information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Therefore, the submitted information at issue is not confidential under section 418.181 of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

We agree some of the materials at issue 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 the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. The city must release the submitted 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,

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/mo

Ref: ID# 835263

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)