



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 24, 2014

Ms. Lisa D. Mares
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2014-21405

Dear Ms. Mares:

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# 544774 (ORR# 10-11727).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for copies of all open record requests received by the city during a specified time period, the responses provided by the city, any associated inquiries to or responses provided by this office, and the costs charged to specified requestors and for specified information.¹ You state you have released some information. You inform us you will redact information pursuant to

¹You state the city sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

sections 552.024, 552.130, 552.136 and 552.147 of the Government Code.² You also inform us you will redact email address information under section 552.137 pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).³ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, and 552.111 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007 provides, in relevant part:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

²Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.024(c)(2). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c-1)-(c-2). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

³Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), a “child” is a person who was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Thus, under section 58.007, law enforcement records relating to a juvenile engaged in delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision on or after September 1, 1997 are confidential. *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). Upon review, we find the information we marked involves a juvenile engaged in delinquent conduct on or after September 1, 1997. It does not appear that any of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 58.007 of the Family Code apply to this information. Thus, the information we marked is confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state Exhibit B-1 relates to open and pending criminal investigations, and release of the information would interfere with those investigations. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Based on these representations and our review, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to the information we marked. Thus, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how release of any of the remaining information would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) 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." See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is 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). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). You seek to withhold portions of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1). You argue release of the information at issue, "would compromise the [c]ity's ability to enforce laws, prevent crime and protect police officer safety". Based on your representations and our review, we agree the release of some of the information at issue, which we have marked, would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find you have not demonstrated how release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1).

Section 552.101 also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (the "NCIC") or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means "information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions." Gov't Code § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. See 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). See generally Gov't Code §§ 411.081-.1409. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. See *id.* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI;

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411, subchapter F. Upon review, we conclude the city must withhold the CHRI we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 and federal law. However, you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information consists of CHRI for section 411.083 purposes; thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 and federal law.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 411.192 of the Government Code, which governs the release of information maintained by DPS concerning the licensure of individuals to carry a concealed handgun. Section 411.192 provides in part as follows:

(a) [DPS] shall disclose to a criminal justice agency information contained in its files and records regarding whether a named individual or any individual named in a specified list is licensed under this subchapter. Information on an individual subject to disclosure under this section includes the individual's name, date of birth, gender, race, zip code, telephone number, e-mail address, and Internet website address. Except as otherwise provided by this section and by Section 411.193, all other records maintained under this subchapter are confidential and are not subject to mandatory disclosure under the [Act].

(b) An applicant or license holder may be furnished a copy of disclosable records regarding the applicant or license holder on request and the payment of a reasonable fee.

Id. § 411.192(a), (b). We marked information that is related to a concealed handgun license. The city appears to have obtained that information from DPS. We note the requestor is the license holder. Therefore, except for the requestor's name, date of birth, gender, race, and zip code, which must be released pursuant to section 411.192(b), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. Section 1703.306 provides as follows:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of

the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
 - (2) the person that requested the examination;
 - (3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;
 - (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
 - (5) any other person required by due process of law.
- (b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.
- (c) A polygraph examiner to whom information acquired from a polygraph examination is disclosed under Subsection (a)(4) may not disclose the information except as provided by this section.

Occ. Code § 1703.306. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, consists of information acquired from a polygraph examination subject to section 1703.306. In this instance, the requestor is the polygraph examinee. Thus, the city has the discretion to release the polygraph information we have marked to the requestor pursuant to section 1703.306(a)(1). *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 9 (1987) (predecessor to section 1703.306 permits, but does not require, examination results to be disclosed to examinees). Otherwise, we conclude the polygraph information we have marked is generally confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306(a) of the Occupations Code and must be withheld. However, in either event, we find no portion of the remaining information consists of information acquired from a polygraph examination. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be

satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.102(a) to any of the remaining submitted information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information on the basis of section 552.102(a).

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 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). 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.

You state some of the remaining information “reflect[s] the opinions, advice, recommendations, and the [c]ity’s policymaking process.” However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of routine administrative information or purely factual information or was communicated with an individual you have failed to demonstrate shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the city. You have failed to establish that any portion of the remaining information at issue constitutes advice, opinions, recommendations, or other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the CHRI we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. Except for the requestor’s name, date of birth, gender, race, and zip code, which must be released pursuant to section 411.192(b), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192 of the Government Code. The city has the discretion to release the polygraph information we marked to the requestor; otherwise, the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306(a) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/dls

Ref: ID# 544774

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)