



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 1, 2022

Ms. Kathryn Thiel
Counsel for the North Texas Municipal Water District
Lloyd Gosselink
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1900
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2022-33915

Dear Ms. Thiel:

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# 978021.

The North Texas Municipal Water District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for three categories of information pertaining to a specified project and insurance policies for three specified entities. You state the district will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code states a governmental body asking for an attorney general decision must, within fifteen business days of receiving a request, provide the attorney general with "a copy of the specific information requested, or *submit representative samples of information if a voluminous amount of information was requested.*" Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (emphasis added). We note you submitted a voluminous amount of information, rather than a representative sample. We have reviewed a representative sample of the voluminous information submitted.¹

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation

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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office. Additionally, to the extent the sheriff's office identifies confidential information subject to a provision not addressed in this ruling, the district should contact the Open Government Hotline.

with the agency[.]” *Id.* § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561.

Upon review, we find the information at issue is general administrative and purely factual that does not rise to the level of policymaking. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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, such as section 418.181 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Homeland Security Act (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* 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 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 assert the remaining information is made confidential by section 418.181 of the Government Code. You explain the information at issue consists of “exact locational coordinates of [d]istrict facilities and includes an assessment of vulnerabilities of the [project], including site conditions and studies relating to existing and planned [d]istrict water treatment infrastructure.” You explain the project at issue relates to the construction of a water treatment pump station. You assert, and we agree, the project at issue constitutes critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181. *See generally id.* § 421.001(2) (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 explain potential terrorists could use the information at issue to interfere with district water service management or disrupt operations relating to water treatment. Based on your arguments and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated release of some of the information at issue, which we have indicated, would identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Consequently, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) 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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section

552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the district must withhold the submitted insurance policy number under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to 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 district must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the submitted insurance policy number under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to 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,

Sarah E. Reese
Attorney
Open Records Division

SER/eb

Ref: ID# 978021

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)