



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 14, 2022

Mr. Kevin Christiansen
Staff Attorney
Katy Independent School District
P.O. Box 159
Katy, Texas 77492-0159

OR2022-17068

Dear Mr. Christiansen:

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# 953282 (PIR# 21803).

The Katy Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all records involving the requestor's minor child and video recordings related to a specified incident. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, you state the district sought clarification of a portion the request. *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) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). You state you have not received a response to the request for clarification. Thus, for the portion of the requested information for which you have sought but have not

¹ 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

received clarification, we find the district is not required to release information in response to this portion of the request. However, if the requestor clarifies this portion of the request for information, the district must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387.

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 section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Section 418.182 provides, in part:

(a) [I]nformation . . . 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 generally be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *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 confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the submitted information consists of screen shots of surveillance camera recordings which are part of a security system used to protect district property from acts of terrorism or related criminal activity. You state release of the information at issue would enable a viewer to determine the camera's location and video quality and hinder the security system's ability to protect the property at issue from criminal activity. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude you have demonstrated the information at issue falls within the scope of section 418.182(a). Accordingly, the district must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. *See generally* *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (case construing section 418.182 of the HSA, which ruled recorded images necessarily relate to specifications of security system that recorded them).

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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/jm

Ref: ID# 953282

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)