



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 13, 2006

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

OR2006-10645

Dear Mr. Schneider:

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# 259681.

The City of Magnolia (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a list of city cellular phone numbers and those employees to whom the phones are assigned. You state that the city has released some of the requested phone numbers, but claim that the remainder of the requested phone numbers are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 418.176 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) Information is confidential if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and:

- (1) relates to staffing requirements of an emergency response provider, including law enforcement agency, a fire-fighting agency, or an emergency services agency;
- (2) relates to a tactical plan of the provider; or
- (3) consists of a list or compilation of pager or telephone numbers, including mobile and cellular telephone numbers, of the provider.

Gov't Code § 418.176. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *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 Texas Homeland Security Act 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 claim that the city issued cellular phone numbers belonging to the city manager, the city manager's assistant, the city secretary, and the police chief are confidential under section 418.176. You state that these individuals are part of the city's emergency response plan team, which responds to terrorist and biological attacks or related criminal activity. You also contend that if these cellular phone numbers are released to the public, there is nothing to prevent massive overload of messages or calls sent to these numbers. You state that the cellular phones cannot deal with such overloads and would quickly become useless. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude that the cellular phone numbers of the city manager, the city manager's assistant, the city secretary, and the police chief are confidential under section 418.176 of the Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your arguments as to the remaining cellular phone numbers. Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure an internal record of a law enforcement agency that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution if "release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution." This provision is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.).

To prevail on its claim under section 552.108(b)(1), a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). In addition, generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *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 are not protected under law enforcement exception), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984) (construing statutory predecessor).

You argue that the city issued cellular phone numbers belonging to certain members of the city's police department and marshal's office are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(b)(1) because the release of these phone numbers would interfere with these individuals' law enforcement responsibilities. In Open Records Decision No. 506 (1988), we determined that the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b) excepted from disclosure "the cellular mobile phone numbers assigned to [Harris C]ounty officials and employees with specific law enforcement responsibilities." Open Records Decision No. 506 at 2. We noted that the purpose of the cell phones 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.* Therefore, based on your representations and our review, we conclude that you have demonstrated that the cellular phone numbers at issue would interfere with law enforcement. These phone numbers, which you have marked, may be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold those city issued cellular phone numbers belonging to the city manager, the city manager's assistant, the city secretary, and the police chief under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code. Those city issued cellular phone numbers belonging to members of the city's police department and marshal's office which you have marked may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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, 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 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 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,



James A. Person III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JAP/dh

Ref: ID# 259681

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Richard Anderson
610 Laredo
Magnolia, Texas 77354
(w/o enclosures)