



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 18, 2022

Mr. Trenton M. Dietz
Assistant City Attorney
City of Abilene
P.O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2022-31916

Dear Mr. Dietz:

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# 977999 (Ref. No. 22-1590).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to certain operations or facilities. You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, including section 418.182 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Section 418.182 provides, in relevant 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 be related to a security system does not make such 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 exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive records fall 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 explain some of the information at issue reveals the location, capabilities, and use of surveillance cameras at the city's police department. We understand the surveillance cameras at issue relate to a security system used to protect public property, members of the public, and city employees from acts of terrorism or related criminal activity. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked is related to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. *See Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (recorded images necessarily relate to specifications of security system that recorded them, and thus, are confidential under section 418.182). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information 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. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd* on other grounds, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov't Code

§ 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACB/mo

Ref: ID# 977999

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)