



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 6, 2022

Ms. Meredith Riede
City Attorney
City of Sugar Land
2700 Town Center Boulevard North
Sugar Land, Texas 77479-0110

OR2022-27098

Dear Ms. Riede:

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# 970405 (ORR# W014557).

The City of Sugar Land (the "city") received a request for specified construction plans.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted 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." Gov't Code § 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 "[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 concerns does not make the information *per se*

¹ As you have not submitted a copy of the request for information, we take our description from your brief.

² We note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nonetheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

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 confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive information falls 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 explain the submitted information relates to the improvements and repairs to a levee system. You assert, and we agree, the levee system at issue is critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181. *See generally id.* § 421.001(2). You assert release of the information at issue would reveal "technical details of the levee's design, weaknesses, vulnerabilities, and specifications." Based upon these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 to most of the information at issue. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the remaining information.

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/eb

Ms. Meredith Riede - Page 3

Ref: ID# 970405

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)