



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 8, 2019

Ms. Megan R. Santee
Counsel for City of Schertz
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2019-06603

Dear Ms. Santee:

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# 753431 (PIA 18-282).

The City of Schertz (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for fourteen categories of information related to the city's police department.¹ You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.130, and 552.136

¹We note the city 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 when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the date of the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

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

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

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

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

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also* Fam. Code § 51.03(a) (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1304, § 22. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We find some of the information at issue involves juvenile offenders, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear that

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.

any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply; therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.³ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining responsive information identifies an individual who is ten years of age or older and under the age of seventeen as a suspect or offender of delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008 of the Family Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code 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 . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). 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.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, 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). This office has concluded section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989)* (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., ORDs 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 argue some of the information is subject to section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. You state the release of the information at issue would “make it more difficult for police officers to perform their mission.” You also state “[r]elease of the information at issue

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

would provide criminals with invaluable intelligence and operation information in specialized operations and illustrate methods used to detect and respond to criminal activity.” Upon review, we find you have demonstrated release of some of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find you have not demonstrated release of any of the remaining responsive information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Consequently, the city may not withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

You also claim the remaining responsive information is subject to section 552.108(a)(2) and (b)(2) of the Government Code. Section 552.108 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

...

(b) An 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 is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must

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

provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). Upon review, you have not demonstrated the information at issue pertains a specific investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of either section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act, sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make confidential certain information related to terrorism. Section 418.177 of the Government Code provides:

Information is confidential if the information:

(1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and

(2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Id. § 418.177. The fact that information may relate to 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 of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, an entity 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). The city argues some of the remaining information consists of bulletins and notifications "between other local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies as well as communications relating to criminal activity, terroristic threats[,] and the vulnerability of persons or property". However, upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the information at issue is confidential under section 418.177 of the Government Code. Consequently, the city may not withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides:

(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 the information we have marked constitutes information that was acquired from a polygraph examination and is, therefore, within the scope of section 1703.306. It does not appear the requestor falls into any of the categories of individuals who are authorized to receive the polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.⁵ However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information consists of information acquired from a polygraph examination. Thus, 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.

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

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state some of the remaining responsive information consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city officials. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the some of the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining responsive information consists of privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1).

Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600* (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Upon review, we find portions of the remaining responsive information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked 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*, 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, 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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (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, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You assert the remaining responsive information consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions regarding the city's policymaking matters. However, we find this information is either factual in nature or consists of internal administrative or personnel matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining responsive information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Consequently, city may not withhold the remaining responsive under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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 sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁶ See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). We note section 552.117(a)(2) protects a peace officer's personal cellular telephone number only if the officer pays for the cellular telephone or pager service with his or her personal funds. See Open Records Decision Nos. 670 at 6 (2001) (Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure peace officer's cell phone or pager number if officer pays for cell phone or pager service), 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the city must withhold information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the government

⁶The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). As previously mentioned, section 552.117(a) is applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* ORD 506 at 5-6. Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with

a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be the type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining responsive information.⁷

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/>

⁷The information being released contains social security numbers. 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. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.147(b).

[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,



Jahna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/gw

Ref: ID# 751431

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)