



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 6, 2022

Ms. Lizet Islas
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2022-37719

Dear Ms. Islas:

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# 985327 (City Ref. No. R080325).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for specified petitions for annexation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of LA Engineering; Half Associates; and IDI Logistics. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their 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 considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ We note we asked the city to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines that information in addition that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). We have received and considered the correspondence sent by the city pursuant to that request. We also note the city did not comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See id.* § 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 its applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

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) 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 notified third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the notified third parties has 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 the notified third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by chapter 418 of the Government Code. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"), sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make confidential certain information related to terrorism. Section 418.181 of the Government Code provides the following:

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. 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 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).

You state the submitted information reveals the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. You explain the submitted information identifies the locations of components of the city's storm, sewer, water, and electrical systems. We agree the city's storm, sewer, water, and electrical systems are critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181 of the Government Code. *See generally id.* § 421.001(2) (defining "critical infrastructure" to include all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to security, governance, public health and safety, economy, or morale of state or nation). Based upon these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated release of some of the information at issue, which we have marked, would identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city to an act of terrorism. Accordingly, 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. However, we find the city has failed to establish any portion of the remaining information reveals the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical

infrastructure to an act of terrorism. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Thus, we find the city has not demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 to the remaining information, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis. 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,

Nick Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NY/mo

Ref: ID# 985327

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)