



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 9, 2020

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the City of Weatherford
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2020-25429

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 848170 (ORR #3639).

The City of Haltom City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a particular tax increment reinvestment zone, including a specified plan and specified agreements. The city states it is withholding motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ The city further states it is withholding certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² The city states it is releasing some of the requested information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Additionally, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Goodwin & Marshall; JHP Architecture; Petty

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

² Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

& Associates, Inc.; and Sage Group, Inc. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified the third parties of the request for information and of the 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 reviewed the submitted arguments and the submitted information.

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 any of the third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the third parties have 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the third parties 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 protected by other statutes. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act ("HSA"). The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 418.181 and 418.182 of the Government Code. 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; *see also 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, and functions vital to the state or the nation"). Section 418.182 provides in part:

(a) Except as provided by Subsections (b) and (c), information, including access codes and passwords, 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 relate to a governmental body's security concerns or emergency management activities 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 pertains to the locations of the city's water and sewer systems. Upon review, we agree the city's water system is part of the city's critical infrastructure. *See id.* § 421.001(2). The city argues public disclosure of the information "could facilitate the introduction of contaminants into the city's water system." Thus, the city claims the information could be used to identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city's water and sewer systems to an act of terrorism. Based on these representations and our review, we agree some of the submitted information, which we have marked, identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.³ However, the city has not demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 or section 418.182 of the Government Code to any portion of the remaining information, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on either of those bases.

You note, and 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.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have 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 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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/eb

Ref: ID# 848170

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

4 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)