



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 2, 2008

Ms. J. Middlebrooks
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
Criminal Law and Police Section
1400 South Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2008-04393

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

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# 306325.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for all e-mail communications sent to and from a named department officer during a specified time period. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

You contend that the officers' cellular telephone numbers are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from required public disclosure an internal record of a law enforcement agency maintained for internal use

¹We assume that 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.

in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution if "release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution." Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body that seeks to withhold information under section 552.108(b)(1) must sufficiently explain how and why the release of the information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, 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 Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 531 at 2 (1989). In Open Records Decision No. 506 (1988), this office determined that the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b) excepted from disclosure "cellular mobile phone numbers assigned to county officials and employees with specific law enforcement responsibilities." ORD 506 at 2. We noted that the purpose of the cellular telephones was to ensure immediate access to individuals with specific law enforcement responsibilities and that public access to these numbers could interfere with that purpose. *Id.*

You inform us that the officers' cellular telephone numbers are used by the officers in the field to carry out law enforcement responsibilities. You assert that the release of this information would interfere with law enforcement because it would interfere with the ability of the officers to perform their duties. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the department may withhold the cellular telephone numbers you have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

You seek to withhold portions of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which 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." 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 that 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 that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *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 consultant. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (1995) (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). 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 at 9.

You state that portions of the requested information consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions of department and City of Dallas personnel in addressing the daily operations of the property room. We note that the submitted information reveals that the department hired a third party consultant to assist the department. Based upon your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information was either communicated with a party with whom you have not demonstrated the department shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process, or you have not demonstrated that any of this information consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations that implicate the department's policymaking processes. We therefore conclude that the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue on the basis of the deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

You next claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security number, and family member information regarding a peace officer regardless of whether the officer elected under section 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code to keep such

information confidential.² In Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001), we determined that a governmental body may withhold a peace officer's personal information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to the applicability of the exception in section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §552.117(a)(2); ORD 670; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a)). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 (b) states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. You inform us that an employee's identification number is also used as an employee's credit union bank account number. Additionally, the submitted information contains a credit card number. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). You state that the owners of the e-mail addresses have not consented to their release. Therefore, based on your representations and our review, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code and the information we have marked under section 552.111. The department must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.117(a)(2), 552.136, and 552.137 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

²"Peace officer" is defined by Article 2.12 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure.

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 challenge 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Melanie J. Villars
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/jh

Ref: ID# 306325

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tanya Eiserer
Dallas Morning News
508 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)