



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 28, 2012

Ms. Cary Grace
Assistant City Attorney
Law Department
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2012-13622

Dear Ms. Grace:

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# 463257.

The City of Austin's Police Monitor's Office (the "police monitor's office") received a request for information regarding critical incidents, complaints, and allegations from a specified time period, and two specified investigations.¹ You state you have no information responsive to a portion of the request.² You further state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant

¹We note the police monitor's office sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request).

²We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

to sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You inform us the City of Austin (the “city”) is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code.

Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer’s civil service file and another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a), (g). Under section 143.089(a), the officer’s civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer’s supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in any instance in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer’s misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer’s civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *See Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.).

All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or are in the possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer’s civil service file if the police department determines there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of

³We assume the “representative sample” of information 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.

misconduct or the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(b)-(c).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. *See id.* § 143.089(g). Section 143.089(g) provides as follows:

A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department's use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

Id. § 143.089(g). In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer's personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *See City of San Antonio*, 851 S.W.2d at 949; *see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g) to "information reasonably related to a police officer's or fire fighter's employment relationship"); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You contend the information you have marked as Exhibit A is confidential under section 143.089(g). At the time of the creation of the information at issue, you inform us the city and the Austin Police Association were parties to a Meet and Confer Agreement (the "agreement") under subchapter I of chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.301 *et seq.* Subchapter I includes section 143.307, which provides as follows:

- (a) An agreement under this subchapter supersedes a previous statute concerning wages, salaries, rates of pay, hours of work, or other terms and conditions of employment to the extent of any conflict with the statute.
- (b) An agreement under this subchapter preempts any contrary statute, executive order, local ordinance, or rule adopted by the state or a political subdivision or agent of the state, including a personnel board, a civil service commission, or a home-rule municipality.

(c) An agreement under this subchapter may not diminish or qualify any right, benefit, or privilege of an employee under [chapter 143 of the Local Government Code] or other law unless approved by a majority vote by secret ballot of the members of the association recognized as a sole and exclusive bargaining agent.

Id. § 143.307; *see id.* § 143.302(1) (defining “association”). You explain the agreement establishes a citizen oversight system to review complaints of alleged misconduct by city police officers. You further explain the system includes the police monitor’s office and, under the agreement, the police monitor’s office’s records have the same confidential character as records in the city’s police department’s (the “department”) file kept under section 143.089(g). Section 8 of article 16 of the agreement, titled “Access to Section 143.089(g) Files,” provides in part:

(a) Information concerning the administrative review of complaints against [police] officers, including but not limited to Internal Affairs Division files and all contents thereof, are intended solely for the [d]epartment’s use pursuant to Section 143.089(g) of the Texas Local Government Code (the 143.089(g) file.). All records of the Police Monitor’s Office that relate to individual case investigations and the [department] 143.089(g) file, although same are not [department] files or records, shall have the same statutory character in the hands of the Police Monitor, and shall not be disclosed by any person, unless otherwise authorized by law. Public access to such information is strictly governed by this agreement and Texas law. To the extent necessary to perform their duties, individuals involved in the Citizen Oversight process are granted a right of access to the information contained within the 143.089(g) files of police officers.

Agreement art. 16, § 8(a); *see generally id.* art. 16 (“Citizen Oversight of the Austin Police Department”). You state Exhibit A consists of records of internal investigations of complaints against city police officers maintained by the police monitor’s office and the department. You state the investigations did not result in disciplinary action against the officers at issue under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the police monitor’s office must withhold Exhibit A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g).

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 with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this privilege is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and 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, and opinions 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. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (Gov't Code § 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). Moreover, 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).

This office also has concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. See *id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. See *id.* at 2.

You claim the deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 for the information you have marked as Exhibit B. You inform us Exhibit B consists of a draft report prepared by the police monitor's office concerning an annual review of complaints and critical incidents. You state Exhibit B will be released to the public in its final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have established the deliberative process privilege is applicable to Exhibit B. Accordingly, the police monitor's office may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the police monitor's office must withhold Exhibit A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The police monitor's office may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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 http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jennifer Burnett".

Jennifer Burnett
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/tch

Ref: ID# 463257

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)