



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 27, 2015

Ms. Halfreda Anderson Nelson
Public Information Officer
Senior Assistant General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2015-17915

Dear Ms. Nelson:

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# 577240 (DART ORR 11635).

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for the audio and video recordings associated with a named police officer on a specified date, DART police department (the "department") power squad detail sheet for the same date, and all information relating to the internal investigation of its police officers for a violation a specified general order.¹ DART claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions DART claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹We note DART sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify 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 over-broad 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).

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.108(b) excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section 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.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department’s use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (former section 552.108 does not protect Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques submitted were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

DART contends releasing the submitted information would reveal department law enforcement policies, methods, techniques, and strategies concerning the operation of emergency vehicles during an emergency response. DART further asserts the release of this information could endanger the lives of department police officers and give clear advantage to criminals by allowing them to exploit weaknesses in department procedures. Upon review, we find DART has demonstrated release of some of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, DART may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³ However, DART has failed to demonstrate how the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, DART may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address DART’s remaining argument against disclosure of this 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 418.176 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act. Section 418.176(a) reads as follows:

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 the staffing requirements of an emergency response provider, including a 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.

Id. § 418.176(a). The fact that information may generally be related to emergency preparedness does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.176. *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 confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.176 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

DART asserts the remaining information is confidential under section 418.176 because it relates to special orders on the operation of emergency vehicles used and maintained by the department for law enforcement tactical situations. DART further states this information relates to tactical planning by the department for purposes of responding to criminal activity that may arise out of a terrorist situation. Upon review, we find DART has failed to establish the remaining information was collected, assembled, or maintained for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and relates to the staffing requirements, relates to a tactical plan, or consists of a list or compilation of pager or telephone numbers of an emergency response provider. *See id.* § 418.176(a). Thus, the remaining information is not confidential under section 418.176, and DART may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. See Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find DART has failed to demonstrate the information it has indicated is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, DART may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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, we determined 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, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions 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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); 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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

DART asserts the remaining information is protected under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we note the information at issue pertains to internal affairs matters concerning only the police officers at issue. DART has not demonstrated how this information involves policymaking pertaining to personnel matters of a broad scope. Therefore, DART may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to sections 552.117 and 552.130 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with section 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁵ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117 also protects a peace officer's personal cellular telephone number if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. *See* Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001) (section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure peace officer's cellular telephone or pager number if officer pays for cellular telephone or pager service). Accordingly, DART must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service at issue.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find DART must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and the discernible license plate numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, DART may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. DART must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service at issue. DART must withhold the information we have marked and the discernible license plate numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code. DART must release the remaining information.

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.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁵Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found in article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 577240

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)