



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 7, 2005

Mr. Leonard Schneider
Ross Banks May Cron & Cavin
2 Riverway, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77056-1918

OR2005-00260

Dear Mr. Schneider:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 218535.

The City of League City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for "[c]opies of the memos written by police officers from the jail at the request of Chief Andrew Daniels." You claim that the submitted information, or portions thereof, is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The city raises section 552.108(b) of the Government Code for the submitted information. An internal record of a law enforcement agency maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution may be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1) if it is demonstrated that "release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution." *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet. h.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws); Open Records Decision No. 636 at 2-3 (1995). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See*,

¹Two of the submitted memoranda reference an attached letter from League City Municipal Judge K. Foley to Captain Don Allen of the Galveston County Sheriff's Office regarding an agreement to transfer prisoners. The city did not submit the letter that was attached to the memoranda for our review. Therefore, we assume the letter has been released to the extent it exists. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would interfere with law enforcement), 456 (1987) (release in advance of information regarding location of off-duty police officers would interfere with law enforcement), 413 (1984) (release of sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution would interfere with law enforcement), 409 (1984) (information regarding certain burglaries protected if it exhibits pattern that reveals investigative techniques), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from DPS would interfere with law enforcement because disclosure would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers' licenses), 252 (1980) (statutory predecessor was designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). The predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). A governmental body that relies on section 552.108(b)(1) must sufficiently explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. See Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 531 at 2 (1989); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 434 at 2 (1986) (circumstances of each case must be examined to determine whether release of particular information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention), 409 at 2 (1984) (whether disclosure of particular records will interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention must be decided on case-by-case basis).

You state that disclosure of the information at issue "may impair the security of prisoners." After reviewing the information at issue, we find that the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) as the release of this information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Section 552.111 does not, however, except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 4-5 (1993).

You state that the issues raised in the submitted memoranda consists of advice, opinion, or recommendations on "policymaking matter of the City in regards to working with the [Galveston County Sheriff's Office] in the holding and/or transport of prisoners." You further assert that the issues raised do not "pertain solely to internal administration but involves the City's mission to prosecute crime, protect its citizens and assist the [Galveston County Sheriff's Office] in the prosecution of crime and holding of prisoners." After reviewing the submitted information, we find that portions of the submitted memoranda are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.111 as intraagency communications consisting of advice, opinion, or recommendation on policymaking matters. We have marked the information that may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.108(b)(1) and 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Amanda Crawford
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 218535

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sarah Viren
The Galveston Daily News
3000 FM 1764
La Marque, Texas 77568
(w/o enclosures)