



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 20, 2022

Ms. Rachel Saucier
Executive Assistant
City of Georgetown
P.O. Box 409
Georgetown, Texas 78627-0409

OR2022-39650

Dear Ms. Saucier:

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# 991398 (PIR No. G019219-092322).

The City of Georgetown (the "city") received a request for certain information regarding a specified area of the city. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code and protected by copyright law. Additionally, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of the following third parties: Corridor Engineering Company; KBGE; Murfee Engineering Company; and Roman Parker & Kasberg. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office. *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 submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note 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) of the Government Code 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 third party explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the third parties have 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). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any third party 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; *see also 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). 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).

The city states the submitted information reveals technical details of layouts of the city’s electrical, water, storm sewer, sanitary sewer, drainage, and fire suppression systems. The city asserts, and we agree, the city’s electrical, water, storm sewer, sanitary sewer, drainage, and fire suppression systems are critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181. *See generally id.* § 421.001(2). The city explains release of the information at issue would reveal vulnerabilities of the critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Based upon these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 to some of the information at issue, which we marked. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we 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 demonstrate the remaining information at issue identifies 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). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.

The city asserts, and we agree, some of the remaining information at issue may 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 city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The city 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,

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/pt

Ref: ID# 991398

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)