



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 29, 2020

Ms. T. Trisha Dang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Sugar Land
2700 Town Center Boulevard North
Sugar Land, Texas 78749-0110

OR2020-18899

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# 837486 (ORR# W009488).

The City of Sugar Land (the "city") received a request for drawings pertaining to a private street and two specified addresses.¹ You state the city does not have information responsive to a portion of the request.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code and protected under federal copyright law. You also state you notified Clark Condon; Molior Strategies, LLC; Muller Law Group; Pinnacle Structural Engineers; Telios; Tramonte + Johnson; Ward, Getz & Associates; and Windrose of the request 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

¹ The city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (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) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

² The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). 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 info 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 any of the third parties. Thus, we have no basis to conclude a 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 city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest a third party 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. 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 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 and sewer systems are 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 state the submitted information identifies the physical locations of water and sewer lines, manholes, and backflow devices. You state, if released, the submitted information could be used by "criminal actors and terrorists in gaining control of the critical infrastructure when try to carry out a terroristic or other violent act against the local populace[.]" Further, you state release would show "points in the critical infrastructure where the placement of explosives, corrosives, or contaminants can cause the most damage to the [c]ity's infrastructure[.]" Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated some of the submitted information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city's water system to an act of terrorism. Thus, 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. However, we find the remaining information at issue does not identify

the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure for the purpose of section 418.181 of the Government Code, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

You assert the remaining 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.

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. 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/jm

Ref: ID# 837486

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)