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October 9, 2019

Kevin Wymore
Kevinw111657@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Wymore:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your electronic correspondence, dated October 1, 2019, in which you asked for DOJ’s “assistance in compelling the UW School of Medicine and Public Health’s Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) to follow the terms of Circuit Court Judge Rhonda Lanford’s public records ruling this summer.” We are also aware of your telephone message from October 8, 2019 related to the same issue.

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) appreciate your concern about your public records request. However, DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel regarding this matter, as DOJ represented OAC in the underlying litigation, Dane County Case No. 2017CV291. For the same reason, DOJ cannot assist you with any enforcement action in this matter.

You may wish to contact an attorney. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-oper-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin Public Records Law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.
DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin's proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:AMB:pmf
October 10, 2019

Todd Gray
Corporate Analytics, LLC
Waukesha, WI 53188

Dear Mr. Gray:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated April 3, 2019, regarding your public records request for “Rock Koshkonong Lake District’s most recent audit reports.” You wrote that you were “provided no actual audit reports noted in the annual meeting minutes” and you were “directed to compilation reports located on the website in lieu of actual audit reports.” You asked, “Would a quasi-governmental [sic] body [a lake district] that can levy fees or taxes, be allowed to avoid providing an actual audit report as clearly required by state statute, by submitting a compilation report in place of it?”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) are committed to increasing government openness and transparency. The OOG works in furtherance of this with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. The OOG is only authorized to provide assistance within this scope. While a portion of your correspondence pertained to the public records law, it also discussed matters outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities. As a result, we are unable to offer you assistance or insight regarding your question relating to Wis. Stat. § 33.29. However, we can provide you with some general information about the public records law that you may find helpful.

The Attorney General has previously advised that agencies may not use online record posting as a substitute for their public records responsibilities; and that publication of documents on an agency website does not qualify for the exceptions for published materials set forth in Wis. Stat. §§ 19.32(2) or 19.35(1)(g). See Muench Correspondence (July 24, 1998). However, providing public access to records via the internet can greatly assist agencies in complying with the statute by making posted materials available for inspection and copying, since that form of access may satisfy many requesters. Essentially, while nothing in the public records law requires that records be maintained online or accessible through a web portal, easily accessible online records can help increase government transparency.
The public records law authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of "records" created or maintained by an "authority." Therefore, records maintained by an authority can still be requested by making a public records request, regardless of whether those records are readily available online. Under the public records law, the public can either ask to inspect a record at the authority's facilities, or ask to obtain a copy of the record. Wis. Stat. §§ 19.35(1) and 19.35(2).

The public records law defines a "record" as any material on which written, drawn, printed, spoken, visual, or electromagnetic information or electronically generated or stored data is recorded or preserved, regardless of physical form or characteristics, which has been created or is being kept by an authority. Wis. Stat. § 19.32(2). A record includes handwritten, typed, or printed documents; maps and charts; photographs, films, and tape recordings; tapes, optical disks, and any other medium on which electronically generated or stored data is recorded or preserved; and electronic records and communications. A record, however, does not include "drafts, notes, preliminary documents, and similar materials prepared for the originator's personal use or by the originator in the name of a person for whom the originator is working." Wis. Stat. § 19.32(2).

Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

The public records law also "does not require an authority to provide requested information if no record exists, or to simply answer questions about a topic of interest to the requester." Journal Times v. City of Racine Board of Police and Fire Commissioners, 2015 WI 56, ¶ 55 (citation omitted) ("While a record will always contain information, information may not always be in the form of a record."); see also State ex rel. Zinigrabe v. Sch. Dist. of Sevastopol, 146 Wis. 2d 629, 431 N.W.2d 734 (Wis. Ct. App. 1988). An authority cannot fulfill a request for a record if the authority has no such record. While the public records law does not require an authority to notify a requester that the requested record does not exist, it is advisable that an authority do so.

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b), "If an authority denies a written request in whole or in part, the requester shall receive from the authority a written statement of the reasons for denying the written request." Specific policy reasons, rather than mere statements of legal conclusion or recitation of exemptions, must be given. Pangman & Assocs. v. Zellmer, 163 Wis. 2d 1070, 1084, 473 N.W.2d 538 (Wis. Ct. App. 1991); Vill. of Butler v. Cohen, 163 Wis. 2d 819, 824-25, 472 N.W.2d 579 (Wis. Ct. App. 1991). In every written denial, the authority must also inform the requester that "if the request for the record was made in writing, then the
determination is subject to review by mandamus under s. 19.37(1) or upon application to the attorney general or a district attorney.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b).

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a written public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf at this time. However, we are sending a copy of this letter to the authority to make them aware of your concerns.

You may also wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and DOJ’s OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.
The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:amh:lah

cc:    Mark Meyer, Treasurer, Rock Koshkonong Lake District
October 10, 2019

Ann Lewandowski
Waunakee, WI 53597

Dear Ms. Lewandowski:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated April 16, 2019, May 28, 2019, and May 30, 2019, regarding your open meetings and public records concerns in the Village of Waunakee. We will address all three of your emails to DOJ in this letter.

In your April 16, 2019 correspondence, you wrote that the 4th of July committee “uses village resources and is referred to as a ‘committee’. However, the committee listing on the official village website does not have any agendas, meeting times, or minutes listed, nor can one apply for a committee position.” You asked, “how can I tell if it meets the criteria for a committee?”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. While the OOG works to increase government openness and transparency, we do so with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. Based on the limited information contained in your April 16, 2019 correspondence, it appears that certain issues—for example, applying for a committee—fall outside of this scope. Consequently, we cannot advise you on those matters, as they fall outside of the scope of the OOG’s authority and responsibilities. However, to the extent your correspondence concerns the open meetings law, we can provide some information that you may find helpful.

The open meetings law acknowledges that the public is entitled to the fullest and most complete information regarding government affairs as is compatible with the conduct of governmental business. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1). All meetings of governmental bodies shall be held publically and be open to all citizens at all times unless otherwise expressly provided by law. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(2). The provisions of the open meetings law are to be construed liberally to achieve that purpose. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(4).
The open meetings law applies to every "meeting" of a "governmental body." Wis. Stat. § 19.83. An entity that fits within the definition of governmental body must comply with the requirements of the open meetings law. The definition of a "governmental body" includes a "state or local agency, board, commission, council, department or public body corporate and politic created by constitution, statute, ordinance, rule or order." Wis. Stat. § 19.82(1). The list of entities is broad enough to include essentially any governmental entity, regardless of what it is labeled. Purely advisory bodies are subject to the law, even though they do not possess final decision making power, as long as they are created by constitution, statute, ordinance, rule, or order. See State v. Swanson, 92 Wis. 2d 310, 317, 284 N.W.2d 655 (1979).

If a committee is a "formally constituted subunit" of the governmental body, then it is also subject to the open meetings law. A "formally constituted subunit" of a governmental body is itself a "governmental body" within the definition in Wis. Stat. § 19.82(1). A subunit is a separate, smaller body created by a parent body and composed exclusively of members of the parent body. See 74 Op. Att'y Gen. 38, 40 (1985). If, for example, a fifteen member county board appoints a committee consisting of five members of the county board, that committee would be considered a "subunit" subject to the open meetings law. This is true despite the fact that the five-person committee would be smaller than a quorum of the county board. Even a committee with only two members is considered a "subunit," as is a committee that is only advisory and that has no power to make binding decisions. See Dziki Correspondence (Dec. 12, 2006).

Groups that include both members and non-members of a parent body are not "subunits" of the parent body. Nonetheless, such groups frequently fit within the definition of a "governmental body"—e.g., as advisory groups to the governmental bodies or government officials that created them.

As already noted, the open meetings law applies to every "meeting" of a "governmental body." A meeting occurs when a convening of members of a governmental body satisfies two requirements. See State ex rel. Newspapers, Inc. v. Showers, 135 Wis. 2d 77, 398 N.W.2d 154 (1987). The first requirement under the so-called Showers test is that there must be a purpose to engage in governmental business (the purpose requirement). Second, the number of members present must be sufficient to determine the governmental body's course of action (the numbers requirement).

Regarding the purpose requirement, a body is engaged in governmental business when its members gather to simply hear information on a matter within the body's realm of authority. See State ex rel. Badke v. Vill. Bd. of Vill. of Greendale, 173 Wis. 2d 553, 573-74, 494 N.W.2d 408 (1993). Thus, mere attendance at an informational meeting on a matter within a body's realm of authority satisfies the purpose requirement. The members of the body need not discuss the matter or even interact. Id. at 574-76. This applies to a body that is only advisory and that has no power to make binding decisions. See State v. Swanson, 92 Wis. 2d 310, 317, 284 N.W.2d 655 (1979).

Regarding the numbers requirement, a quorum is the minimum number of a body's membership necessary to act. Certainly a majority of the members of a governmental body constitutes a quorum. However, a negative quorum, the minimum number of a body's
membership necessary to prevent action, also meets the numbers requirement. As a result, determining the number of members of a particular body necessary to meet the numbers requirement is fact specific and depends on the circumstances of the particular body.

The open meetings law requires that public notice of all meetings of a governmental body must be given by communication from the governmental body’s chief presiding officer or his or her designee to the following: (1) the public; (2) to news media who have filed a written request for such notice; and (3) to the official newspaper (designated under Wis. Stat. §§ 985.04, 985.05, and 985.06) or, if there is no such paper, to a news medium likely to give notice in the area. Wis. Stat. § 19.84(1). In addition to these requirements, other statutes may also set forth the type of notice required for a meeting of a governmental body.

Public notice of every meeting of a governmental body must be provided at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of such a meeting. Wis. Stat. § 19.84(3). If, for good cause, such notice is impossible or impractical, shorter notice may be given, but in no case may the notice be less than two hours in advance of the meeting. Wis. Stat. § 19.84(3). Furthermore, the law requires separate public notice for each meeting of a governmental body at a time and date “reasonably proximate to the time and date of the meeting.” Wis. Stat. § 19.84(4).

Public notice of a meeting must provide the “time, date, place and subject matter of the meeting, including that intended for consideration at any contemplated closed session.” Wis. Stat. § 19.84(2). The notice must be in such a form so as to reasonably apprise the public of this information. Id. For additional information on the notice requirements of the open meetings law, please see DOJ’s Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide available through DOJ’s website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government).

In an effort to increase transparency, DOJ recommends that governmental bodies keep minutes of all meetings. However, there is no requirement under the open meetings law for a governmental body to do so. The open meetings law only requires a governmental body to create and preserve a record of all motions and roll-call votes at its meetings. Wis. Stat. § 19.88(3). Meeting minutes are a common method that governmental bodies use to do so. However, as long as the governmental body is maintaining some type of record of all motions and roll-call votes, the Wis. Stat. § 19.88(3) requirement is satisfied. Nevertheless, a governmental body may choose to go beyond these requirements. Easily accessible agendas and minutes—such as through links on the body’s website—and more detailed minutes are ways in which the body can increase government transparency.

In your May 28, 2019 correspondence regarding public records requests for electronic files, you asked: “if records are in an electronic format and [an] employee runs a search and records are located instantaneously, may the requester be charged for time spent reviewing these records for inclusion to the request (possibly falling under review), or should the requester only be charged for the actual time spent running the searches (location costs)?” You asked for “assistance clarifying ‘review’ vs ‘location’ in an electronic formats [sic].”

Under the public records law, “[A]n authority may charge a fee not exceeding the actual, necessary, and direct costs of four specific tasks: (1) ‘reproduction and transcription’;

The amount of such fees may vary depending on the authority. However, an authority may not profit from complying with public records requests. WIREdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex, 2008 WI 69, ¶¶ 103, 107, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736 (an authority may not profit from its response to a public records request, but may recoup all of its actual costs). An authority may not charge for the time it takes to redact records. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, 2012 WI 65, ¶ 1 & n.4, 6, 58 (Abrahamson, C.J., lead opinion); Id. ¶ 76 (Roggensack, J., concurring).

The law also permits an authority to impose a fee for locating records if the cost is $50.00 or more. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(c). “Locating” a record means to find it by searching, examining, or experimenting. After the search has been completed, an authority may review the search results in order to locate responsive records. Once responsive records are located within the search results, however, subsequent review and redaction of those responsive records are separate processes for which a requester may not be charged.

Additionally, an authority may require prepayment for the costs associated with responding to a public records request if the total amount exceeds $5.00. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(f). Generally, the rate for an actual, necessary, and direct charge for staff time (such as for locating a record) should be based on the pay rate of the lowest paid employee capable of performing the task. For more information on permissible fees, please see the Office of Open Government Advisory: Charging Fees under the Wisconsin Public Records Law, which was issued on August 8, 2018 and can be found on DOJ’s website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/oog-advisories-and-attorney-general-opinions).

Finally, in your May 30, 2019 correspondence you wrote, “I have requested access to review records [in the authority’s electronic database] in order to avoid the location fees associated with a request.” You “have been denied access as these records are electronic.” You stated that you “strenuously object” to “being unable to access and review records on [your] own AND being charged a fee for staff to conduct the search on [your] behalf.” You asked DOJ to “provide clarification on fees in this situation.”

The public records law authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.” Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian
determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact
that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

Wisconsin Stat. § 19.35(1)(k) permits an authority to impose reasonable restrictions
on the manner of access to original records if they are irreplaceable or easily damaged.
Concerns for protecting the integrity of original records may justify denial of direct access to
an agency's operating system or to inspect a public employee's assigned computer, if access
is provided instead on an alternative electronic storage device, such as a CD-ROM. Security
concerns may also justify such a restriction. WIREDATA, INC. v. VILL. OF SUSSEX, 2008 WI 69,
¶¶ 97-98, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736 (authorities may deny requesters direct access to
an authority's electronic database if "such direct access . . . would pose substantial risks"). If
an authority imposes reasonable restrictions on the manner of access to records under Wis.
Stat. § 19.35(1)(k), and instead provides copies of those records in another format, an
authority is permitted to charge permissible fees under Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3), including actual,
necessary, and direct costs of locating records.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an
authority's response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an
action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the
records. Wis. Stat. § 13.71(1)(a). Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request
for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to
The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally
exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of
statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an
action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus
on your behalf at this time.

Under the open meetings law, the Attorney General and the district attorneys have
authority to enforce the law. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(1). Generally, the Attorney General may elect
to prosecute complaints presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide
concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an enforcement
action, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to file an enforcement action on your behalf.

More frequently, the district attorney of the county where the alleged violation
occurred may enforce the law. However, in order to have this authority, an individual must
file a verified complaint with the district attorney. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(1). If the district attorney
refuses or otherwise fails to commence an action to enforce the open meetings law within
20 days after receiving the verified complaint, the individual may bring an action in the name
of the state. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(4). (Please note a district attorney may still commence an
enforcement action even after 20 days have passed.) Such actions by an individual must be
commenced within two years after the cause of action accrues. Wis. Stat. § 893.93(2)(a).

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of
Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a
private attorney may charge attorney's fees. You may reach the service using the following
contact information.
The Attorney General and DOJ's Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and open meetings law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide and Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide, and provides recorded webinars and associated presentations documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin's proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. §§ 19.39 and 19.98 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:amh:lah
October 10, 2019

Anthony Sleek
Phillis, WI 54555
dreamweaver1957@hotmail.com

Dear Mr. Sleek:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated April 22, 2019, regarding your public records request to your town clerk for “copies of invoices for the township expenses.” You wrote the town clerk is “telling [you] that [you] have to make an appointment and if [you] want copies of anything, that [you] will be charged $.25 per copy.” You asked, “Is this legal, or is there some other way of getting this done?”


A request for records is sufficient if it is directed to an authority and reasonably describes the records or information requested. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(h). There are no “magic words” that are required, and no specific form is permitted to be required in order to submit a public records request. Under the public records law, there is no requirement that a request must be made or fulfilled in person. See Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(i) (“Except as authorized under this paragraph, no request . . . may be refused because the person making the request is unwilling to be identified or to state the purpose of the request”). Generally, an authority may not refuse a request because the request is received by mail unless prepayment of a fee is required under Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(f). Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(i).

The public records law does not prohibit an authority from working with a requester to schedule a time for an in-person inspection of records that is convenient to both. For example, under Wis. Stat. § 19.34(2)(a), “[e]ach authority which maintains regular office hours at the location where records in the custody of the authority are kept shall permit access to the records of the authority at all times during those office hours, unless otherwise specifically authorized by law.”
Under the public records law, however, a requester generally may choose to inspect a record and/or to obtain a copy of the record. As stated in Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(b), "Except as otherwise provided by law, any requester has a right to inspect a record and to make or receive a copy of a record. If a requester appears personally to request a copy of a record that permits copying, the authority having custody of the record may, at its option, permit the requester to copy the record or provide the requester with a copy substantially as readable as the original." Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(b) (emphasis added). A requester must be provided facilities for inspection and copying of requested records comparable to those used by the authority’s employees. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(2). A records custodian, however, may impose reasonable restrictions on the manner of access to an original record if the record is irreplaceable or easily damaged. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(k).

DOJ's Office of Open Government encourages authorities and requesters to maintain an open line of communication. This helps to avoid misunderstandings between an authority and a requester. It is often mutually beneficial for a requester and an authority to work with each other regarding a request. This can provide for a more efficient processing of a request by the authority while ensuring that the requester receives the records that he or she seeks.

Regarding fees under the public records law, "[A]n authority may charge a fee not exceeding the actual, necessary, and direct costs of four specific tasks: (1) ‘reproduction and transcription’; (2) ‘photographing and photographic processing’; (3) ‘locating’; and (4) ‘mailing or shipping.’" Milwaukee Journal Sentinel v. City of Milwaukee, 2012 WI 65, ¶ 54 (citation omitted) (emphasis in original).

The amount of such fees may vary depending on the authority. However, an authority may not profit from complying with public records requests. WIxEdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex, 2008 WI 69, ¶¶ 103, 107, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736 (an authority may not profit from its response to a public records request, but may recoup all of its actual costs). An authority may not charge for the time it takes to redact records. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, 2012 WI 65, ¶¶ 1 & n.4, 6, 58 (Abrahamson, C.J., lead opinion); Id. ¶ 76 (Roggensack, J., concurring).

The law also permits an authority to impose a fee for locating records if the cost is $50.00 or more. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(c). Additionally, an authority may require prepayment for the costs associated with responding to a public records request if the total amount exceeds $5.00. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(f). Generally, the rate for an actual, necessary, and direct charge for staff time (such as for locating a record) should be based on the pay rate of the lowest paid employee capable of performing the task. For more information on permissible fees, please see the Office of Open Government Advisory: Charging Fees under the Wisconsin Public Records Law, which was issued on August 8, 2018 and can be found on DOJ’s website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/oog-advisories-and-attorney-general-opinions).

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).
Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority only in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf at this time.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the following contact information:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:amh:lah
October 15, 2019

Paul Newton
paul.allen.newton@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Newton:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated April 30, 2019, regarding your open meetings law concerns with the Dane County Parent Council. You wrote that “the Board of Directors (aka Head Start Policy Council, HSPC) of Dane County Parent Council closes all of their meetings, refuses to hear employee or community concerns, and delegates all authority to manage payroll funds to one individual person, with little oversight.”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. Based on the information you provided in your correspondence, it appears that some of the subject matter of your correspondence is outside this scope. Therefore, we are unable to offer you assistance regarding your concerns that are outside the scope of the OOG’s authority and responsibilities. However, to the extent your correspondence concerns the open meetings law, we can provide some information that you may find helpful.

The open meetings law acknowledges that the public is entitled to the fullest and most complete information regarding governmental affairs as is compatible with the conduct of governmental business. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1). All meetings of governmental bodies shall be held publicly and be open to all citizens at all times unless otherwise expressly provided by law. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(2). The provisions of the open meetings law are to be construed liberally to achieve that purpose. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(4).

The open meetings law applies to every meeting of a governmental body. A “governmental body” is defined as:

[A] state or local agency, board, commission, council, department or public body corporate and politic created by constitution, statute, ordinance, rule or order; a governmental or quasi-governmental corporation except for the Bradley Center sports and entertainment corporation; a local exposition district under subch. II of ch. 229; a long-term care district under s. 46.2895; or a formally
constituted subunit of any of the foregoing, but excludes any such body or committee or subunit of such body which is formed for or meeting for the purpose of collective bargaining under subch. I, IV, V, or VI of ch. 111.

Wis. Stat.  § 19.82(1). The list of entities is broad enough to include essentially any governmental entity, regardless of what it is labeled. Purely advisory bodies are subject to the law, even though they do not possess final decision-making power, as long as they are created by constitution, statute, ordinance, rule, or order. See State v. Swanson, 92 Wis. 2d 310, 317, 284 N.W.2d 655 (1979). An entity that fits within the definition of governmental body must comply with the requirements of the open meetings law.

The definition of a governmental body includes a “quasi-governmental corporation,” which is not defined in the statute, but the Wisconsin Supreme Court discussed the definition of “quasi-governmental corporation” in State v. Beaver Dam Area Development Corp. (“BDADC”). State v. Beaver Dam Area Dev. Corp., 2008 WI 90, 312 Wis. 2d 84, 752 N.W.2d 295. In that decision, the Court held that a “quasi-governmental corporation” does not have to be created by the government or be per se governmental, but rather is a corporation that significantly resembles a governmental corporation in function, effect, or status. Id. ¶¶ 33-36. The Court further held that each case must be decided on its own particular facts, under the totality of the circumstances. The Court set forth a non-exhaustive list of factors to be examined in determining whether a particular corporation sufficiently resembles a governmental corporation to be deemed quasi-governmental, while emphasizing that no single factor is outcome determinative. Id. ¶¶ 7-8, 63 n.14, and 79. The factors set out by the Court in BDADC fall into five basic categories: (1) the extent to which the private corporation is supported by public funds; (2) whether the private corporation serves a public function and, if so, whether it also has other, private functions; (3) whether the private corporation appears in its public presentations to be a governmental entity; (4) the extent to which the private corporation is subject to governmental control; and (5) the degree of access that government bodies have to the private corporation’s records. Id. ¶ 62.

Turning now to the specific concerns in your correspondence, we cannot conclude with certainty that the Dane County Parent Council (DCPC) is a quasi-governmental corporation as defined in Wis. Stat.  § 19.82(1), based on the limited information provided in your correspondence. If it does qualify as a quasi-governmental corporation, it would be subject to the provisions of the Wisconsin open meetings law. We can also give you some additional general information regarding the open meetings law that you might find helpful.

With respect to closed sessions, Wis. Stat.  § 19.85 lists exemptions in which meetings may be convened in closed session. Any exemptions to open meetings are to be viewed with the presumption of openness in mind. Such exemptions should be strictly construed. State ex rel. Hodge v. Turtle Lake, 180 Wis. 2d 62, 71, 508 N.W.2d 603 (1993). The exemptions should be invoked sparingly and only where necessary to protect the public interest and when holding an open session would be incompatible with the conduct of governmental affairs. “Mere government inconvenience is . . . no bar to the requirements of the law.” State ex rel. Lynch v. Conta, 71 Wis. 2d 662, 678, 239 N.W.2d 313 (1976).

Every meeting must be initially convened in open session. At an open meeting, a motion to enter into closed session must be carried by a majority vote. No motion to convene
in closed session may be adopted unless an announcement is made to those present the nature of the business to be considered at the proposed closed session and the specific exemption or exemptions by which the closed session is claimed to be authorized. Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1).

Notice of a contemplated closed session (and any motion to enter into closed session) must contain the subject matter to be considered in closed session. Merely identifying and quoting a statutory exemption is not sufficient. The notice or motion must contain enough information for the public to discern whether the subject matter is authorized for closed session. If a body intends to enter into closed session under more than one exemption, the notice or motion should make clear which exemptions correspond to which subject matter.

Furthermore, some specificity is required since many exemptions contain more than one reason for authorizing a closed session. For example, Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(c) provides an exemption for the following: “Considering employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility.” Merely quoting the entire exemption, without specifying the portion of the exemption under which the body intends to enter into closed session, may not be sufficient. Only aspects of a matter that fall within a specific exemption may be discussed in a closed session. If aspects of a matter do not properly fall within an exemption, those aspects must be discussed in an open meeting.

With respect to public participation in meetings, although Wisconsin law requires that meetings of governmental bodies be open to the public so that citizens may attend and observe open session meetings, the law does not require a governmental body to allow members of the public to speak or actively participate in the body’s meetings. While the open meetings law allows a governmental body to set aside a portion of a meeting for public comment, it does not require a body to do so. Wis. Stat. §§ 19.83(2), 19.84(2). Under the open meetings law, a governmental body is free to determine for itself whether and to what extent it will allow citizen participation at its meetings. For example, a body may choose to limit the time each citizen has to speak.

There are some other state statutes that may require governmental bodies to hold public hearings on specified matters, and those statutes may also impact public comment periods, but the OOG is not authorized to give legal advice or counsel on matters outside the scope of the open meetings law and public records law. If you have further questions about how other laws may interact with the open meetings law, you may wish to consult with private counsel.

Under the open meetings law, the Attorney General and the district attorneys have authority to enforce the law. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(1). Generally, the Attorney General may elect to prosecute complaints presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. While you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an enforcement action, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an enforcement action at this time.

More frequently, the district attorney of the county where the alleged violation occurred may enforce the law. However, in order to have this authority, an individual must file a verified complaint with the district attorney. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(1). For further
information, please see DOJ’s Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide and Wis. Stat. § 19.97, provided on DOJ’s website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). Appendix B of the Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide provides a template for a verified open meetings law complaint. If the district attorney refuses or otherwise fails to commence an action to enforce the open meetings law within 20 days after receiving the verified complaint, the individual may bring an action in the name of the state. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(4). (Please note a district attorney may still commence an enforcement action even after 20 days have passed.) Such actions by an individual must be commenced within two years after the cause of action accrues. Wis. Stat. § 893.93(2)(a).

Additionally, you may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin open meetings law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, maintains an Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.

Thank you for your correspondence. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.98 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:amh:lah
October 15, 2019

Orville Seymer
CRG Network
Post Office Box 371086
Milwaukee, WI 53237
legal@execpc.com

Dear Mr. Seymer:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated April 29, 2019, regarding your public records requests made to the Milwaukee County Sheriff’s Office starting on February 18, 2019. You wrote, “they seem to be stonewalling my requests and ignoring my demands for the information.” You asked DOJ to “please contact the Milwaukee County Sheriff’s office and ask that they release the records immediately.”


Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test, determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 152, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

The public records law does not require a response to a public records request within a specific timeframe. In other words, after a request is received, there is no set deadline by which the authority must respond. However, the law states that upon receipt of a public
records request, the authority “shall, as soon as practicable and without delay, either fill the request or notify the requester of the authority’s determination to deny the request in whole or in part and the reasons therefor.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(a). A reasonable amount of time for a response “depends on the nature of the request, the staff and other resources available to the authority to process the request, the extent of the request, and other related considerations.” WIREdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex, 2008 WI 69, ¶ 56, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736; see Journal Times v. Police & Fire Comm’rs Bd., 2015 WI 56, ¶ 85, 362 Wis. 2d 577, 866 N.W.2d 563 (an authority “can be swamped with public records requests and may need a substantial period of time to respond to any given request”).

While the law requires an authority to fill a request or notify the requester of a determination to deny a request, the law does not require an authority to respond to a requester if the authority has no records responsive to a request. However, DOJ advises that an authority notify a requester if they have no responsive records. See Journal Times, 2015 WI 56, ¶ 102 (“While it might be a better course to inform a requester that no record exists, the language of the public records law does not specifically require such a response.”).

The Office of Open Government encourages authorities and requesters to maintain an open line of communication. It appears from the email chain you provided that you have been in communication with the Milwaukee County Sheriff’s Office’s Public Records Unit regarding your requests, including a “time frame clarification” and an update regarding the authority’s response timeline. This helps to avoid misunderstandings between an authority and a requester. It is often mutually beneficial for a requester and an authority to work with each other regarding a request. This can provide for a more efficient processing of a request by the authority while ensuring that the requester receives the records that he or she seeks.

I contacted the Milwaukee County Sheriff’s Office’s Public Records Unit to follow up on the status of your requests, and they informed me that they now have fulfilled the requests. Therefore, it appears that the concerns you raised in your April 29, 2019 correspondence have now been resolved. However, I am also sending a copy of this letter to the Milwaukee County Sheriff’s Office and the Milwaukee County Corporation Counsel to make them aware of your concerns.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority only in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf at this time.
You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney's fees. You may reach the service using the following contact information:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government: openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin Public Records Law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

cc: Records Custodian, Milwaukee County Sheriff’s Office
Milwaukee County Corporation Counsel
October 23, 2019

Sheriff Dale Schmidt
Dodge County Sheriff's Office
124 West Street
Juneau, WI 53039

Dear Sheriff Schmidt:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated August 1, 2019, and follow up correspondence, dated September 18 and 23, 2019, regarding the public records request you submitted to Dodge County Supervisor Kira Sheahan-Malloy on June 24, 2019. You wrote that Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy “has failed to respond to my open records request.” You requested DOJ’s assistance in resolving the matter “up to and including [a] Writ of Mandamus.”

The Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39, authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.” The purpose of the public records law is to shed light on the workings of government and the official acts of public officers and employees. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Waunakee Cnty. Sch. Dist., 221 Wis. 2d 575, 582, 585 N.W.2d 726 (Ct. App. 1998). The public records law defines an “authority” as any of the following having custody of a record:

- a state or local office, elective official, agency, board, commission, committee, council, department or public body corporate and politic created by the constitution or by any law, ordinance, rule or order; a governmental or quasi-governmental corporation except for the Bradley center sports and entertainment corporation; a special purpose district; any court of law; the assembly or senate; a nonprofit corporation which receives more than 50% of its funds from a county or a municipality, as defined in s. 59.001(3), and which provides services related to public health or safety to the county or municipality; a university police department under s. 175.42; or a formally constituted subunit of any of the foregoing.

Wis. Stat. § 19.32(1) (emphasis added). Only an entity that falls within this definition of “authority” is subject to the provisions of the public records law. As an elective official, Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy is an “authority,” and thus, subject to the law.
Sheriff Dale Schmidt
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Under the public records law, the “legal custodian” is vested by the authority with full legal power to render decisions and carry out the authority’s statutory public records responsibilities. Wis. Stat. § 19.33(4). An elective official is the legal custodian of his or her records and the records of his or her office although an elective official may designate an employee to act as the legal custodian. Wis. Stat. § 19.33(1).

The public records law defines a “record” as any material on which written, drawn, printed, spoken, visual, or electromagnetic information or electronically generated or stored data is recorded or preserved, regardless of physical form or characteristics, which has been created or is being kept by an authority. Wis. Stat. § 19.32(2). This definition encompasses electronic records and communications, including emails. Emails sent or received on an authority’s computer system are records, as are emails conducting government business sent or received on the personal email account by an authority’s officer or employee.

Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

The public records law does not require a response to a public records request within a specific timeframe. In other words, after a request is received, there is no set deadline by which the authority must respond. However, the law states that upon receipt of a public records request, the authority “shall, as soon as practicable and without delay, either fill the request or notify the requester of the authority’s determination to deny the request in whole or in part and the reasons therefor.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(a). A reasonable amount of time for a response “depends on the nature of the request, the staff and other resources available to the authority to process the request, the extent of the request, and other related considerations.” WIREdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex, 2008 WI 69, ¶ 56, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736; see Journal Times v. Police & Fire Comm’s Bd., 2015 WI 56, ¶ 85, 362 Wis. 2d 577, 866 N.W.2d 563 (an authority “can be swamped with public records requests and may need a substantial period of time to respond to any given request”).

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b), “If an authority denies a written request in whole or in part, the requester shall receive from the authority a written statement of the reasons for denying the written request.” Specific policy reasons, rather than mere statements of legal conclusion or recitation of exemptions, must be given. Pangman & Assocs. v. Zellmer, 163 Wis. 2d 1070, 1084, 473 N.W.2d 538 (Ct. App. 1991); Vill. of Butler v. Cohen, 163 Wis. 2d 819, 824-25, 472 N.W.2d 579 (Ct. App. 1991). In every written denial, the authority must also inform the requester that “if the request for the record was made in writing, then the determination is subject to review by mandamus under s. 19.37(1) or upon application to the attorney general or a district attorney.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b).
The public records law "does not require an authority to provide requested information if no record exists, or to simply answer questions about a topic of interest to the requester." *Journal Times v. City of Racine Board of Police and Fire Commissioners*, 2015 WI 56, ¶ 55 (citation omitted) ("While a record will always contain information, information may not always be in the form of a record."); *see also State ex rel. Zinnegrabe v. Sch. Dist. of Sevastopol*, 146 Wis. 2d 629, 431 N.W.2d 734 (Ct. App. 1988). An authority cannot fulfill a request for a record if the authority has no such record. While the public records law does not require an authority to notify a requester that the requested record does not exist, it is advisable that an authority do so.

I contacted Dodge County Supervisor Kira Sheahan-Malloy regarding your public records request. We discussed your complaint and the circumstances surrounding it. We also discussed the public records law's definition of "authority," the timeframe for responding to public records requests, and when emails sent or received from a personal email account fall under the definition of "records" under the public records law. Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy informed me that your request was fulfilled on July 31, 2019. However, she said that she would respond again once she checked to ensure that everything responsive had been gathered. (Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy said that she believed you received all records responsive to your request.)

Following our telephone conversation, I re-reviewed the material you submitted to DOJ with your complaint. I located a July 31 email from Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy to you. In the email, Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy wrote, "Once Corporation Counsel has reviewed the matter I will forward the documents to you." In the materials you provided to me, there is no indication that Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy fulfilled the request, either on July 31 or at some other time. Such a record may exist, however, it was not provided to DOJ.

It appears communication in this matter has not been optimal and the relationship between you and Supervisor Sheahan-Mallory is strained. DOJ’s Office of Open Government encourages authorities and requesters to maintain an open line of communication. This helps to avoid misunderstandings between an authority and a requester. If it becomes apparent to an authority that a public records request may require a longer response time, it may be prudent for the authority to send the requester a letter providing an update on the status of the response and, if possible, indicating when a response might be anticipated. Similarly, if an authority receives an inquiry from a requester seeking an update on the status of the request, it is advisable for the authority to respond to the requester with an update.

Due to communication issues, I suggested that Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy’s planned follow-up response to you be sent via Corporation Counsel. I have copied Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy and Dodge County Corporation Counsel Kimberly Nass on this letter. If she has not already done so, I expect Supervisor Sheahan-Malloy will send you a prompt response, and it is my hope that this matter will be resolved.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).
Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. As your matter does not appear to present novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf at this time.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding your matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

cc: Dodge County Supervisor Kira Sheahan-Malloy
Dodge County Corporation Counsel Kimberly Nass
October 29, 2019

Keondrey Simmons
Milwaukee, WI 53221

Dear Mr. Simmons:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated May 17, 2019 and July 12, 2019, regarding your public records request to your employer for “all reports/emails related to a recent discipline [you] received.” Your employer denied “the email portion” of your request because you are “a current employee” and are not “entitled to those emails regarding disciplinary statements and conclusions regarding [your] discipline.” You asked, “Can my employer legally do this?”


Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b), “If an authority denies a written request in whole or in part, the requester shall receive from the authority a written statement of the reasons for denying the written request.” Specific policy reasons, rather than mere statements of legal conclusion or recitation of exemptions, must be given. Pangman & Assocs. v. Zellmer,
163 Wis. 2d 1070, 1084, 473 N.W.2d 538 (Ct. App. 1991); Vill. of Butler v. Cohen, 163 Wis. 2d 819, 824-25, 472 N.W.2d 579 (Ct. App. 1991). In every written denial, the authority must also inform the requester that “if the request for the record was made in writing, then the determination is subject to review by mandamus under s. 19.37(1) or upon application to the attorney general or a district attorney.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b).

Wisconsin Stat. § 19.36(10)(d) states, in part, an authority shall not provide access to records containing information that an authority uses for staff management planning, including performance evaluations, judgments, or recommendations concerning future salary adjustments or other wage treatments, management bonus plans, promotions, job assignments, letters of reference, or other comments or ratings relating to employees.

Wisconsin Stat. § 19.36(10)(d), however, does not apply to records of investigations into alleged employee misconduct, and does not create a blanket exemption for disciplinary and misconduct investigation records. Kroepelin v. Wis. Dep’t of Nat. Res., 2006 WI App 227, ¶¶ 20, 32, 297 Wis. 2d 254, 725 N.W.2d 286.

As noted above, your employer is required to provide you with a written statement of the reasons for denying your written request for certain records. However, DOJ has insufficient information to evaluate whether the explanations provided by your employer are sufficient. Nevertheless, we hope that you found this general information helpful.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a). To obtain a writ of mandamus, the requester must establish four things: “(1) the petitioner has a clear legal right to the records sought; (2) the government entity has a plain legal duty to disclose the records; (3) substantial damages would result if the petition for mandamus was denied; and (4) the petitioner has no other adequate remedy at law.” Watton v. Hegerty, 2008 WI 74, ¶ 8, 311 Wis. 2d 52, 751 N.W.2d 369.

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf at this time. While the public records issue that you raised is important, it does not appear to present novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:
The Attorney General and the OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.

Thank you for your correspondence. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government
October 31, 2019

William Platt
Attorney at Law
Post Office Box 88
Washburn, WI 54891

Dear Mr. Platt:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated May 28, 2019, regarding Recreation & Fitness Resources Inc.’s (RFR) management of the Bayfield Recreation Center and swimming pool under contract with the Bayfield School District. You requested DOJ’s “advice and opinion as to whether RFR, a Chapter 181, non profit corporation is a private corporation or a quasi-governmental corporation subject to Chapter 19, Subchapter V. The Open Meeting Law.”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government appreciate your concern and your request for an opinion. Wisconsin law provides that the Attorney General must, when asked, provide the legislature and designated Wisconsin state government officials with an opinion on legal questions. Wis. Stat. § 165.015. The Attorney General may also provide formal legal opinions to district attorneys and county corporation counsel under certain circumstances. Wis. Stat. §§ 165.25(3) and 59.42(1)(c). The Attorney General cannot provide you with the opinion you requested because you do not meet these criteria. However, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.98, we can provide you with some general information about the open meetings law that you may find helpful.

The Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, acknowledges that the public is entitled to the fullest and most complete information regarding government affairs as is compatible with the conduct of government business. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1). All meetings of governmental bodies shall be held publicly and be open to all citizens at all times unless otherwise expressly provided by law. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(2). The provisions of the open meetings law are to be construed liberally to achieve that purpose. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(4). The open meetings law applies to every meeting of a governmental body. A governmental body is defined as:

[A] state or local agency, board, commission, council, department or public body corporate and politic created by constitution, statute, ordinance, rule or order; a governmental or quasi-governmental corporation except for the Bradley Center sports and entertainment corporation; a local exposition district under
subch. II of ch. 229; a long-term care district under s. 46.2895; or a formally constituted subunit of any of the foregoing, but excludes any such body or committee or subunit of such body which is formed for or meeting for the purpose of collective bargaining under subch. I, IV, V, or VI of ch. 111.

Wis. Stat. § 19.82(1). The list of entities is broad enough to include essentially any governmental entity, regardless of what it is labeled. Purely advisory bodies are subject to the law, even though they do not possess final decision making power, as long as they are created by constitution, statute, ordinance, rule, or order. See State v. Swanoeon, 92 Wis. 2d 310, 317, 284 N.W.2d 555 (1979). An entity that fits within the definition of governmental body must comply with the requirements of the open meetings law.

The definition of a governmental body includes a “quasi-governmental corporation” which is not defined in the statutes. The Wisconsin Supreme Court discussed the definition of “quasi-governmental corporation” in State v. Beaver Dam Area Development Corp. (“BDADC”). State v. Beaver Dam Area Dev. Corp., 2008 WI 90, 312 Wis. 2d 84, 752 N.W.2d 295. In that decision, the Court held that a “quasi-governmental corporation” does not have to be created by the government or be per se governmental, but rather is a corporation that significantly resembles a governmental corporation in function, effect, or status. Id. ¶¶ 33-36. The Court further held that each case must be decided on its own particular facts, under the totality of the circumstances. The Court set forth a non-exhaustive list of factors to be examined in determining whether a particular corporation sufficiently resembles a governmental corporation to be deemed quasi-governmental, while emphasizing that no single factor is outcome determinative. Id. ¶¶ 7-8, 63 n.14, and 79. The factors set out by the Court in BDADC fall into five basic categories: (1) the extent to which the private corporation is supported by public funds; (2) whether the private corporation serves a public function and, if so, whether it also has other, private functions; (3) whether the private corporation appears in its public presentations to be a governmental entity; (4) the extent to which the private corporation is subject to governmental control; and (5) the degree of access that government bodies have to the private corporation’s records. Id. ¶ 62.

In analyzing the BDADC decision further, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals has held that, while all the non-exhaustive factors set forth in BDADC are relevant and no one factor is outcome determinative, a “primary consideration” is whether the private corporation is funded exclusively on public tax dollars or interest generated on those dollars. State ex rel. Flynn v. Kemper Ctr., Inc., 2019 WI App 6, ¶¶ 14–16, 385 Wis. 2d 811, 924 N.W.2d 218. Therefore, in applying the BDADC analysis to any matter, a court would look at all relevant factors before making a determination of whether the entity is a “quasi-governmental corporation” under Wis. Stat. § 19.82(1), and it is important that all relevant information be available.

Given the complexity and fact-specific nature of the law governing quasi-governmental corporations, we cannot make a determination as to whether the RFR is a “quasi-governmental corporation” subject to the requirements of the open meetings law, based on the limited information you have provided in your correspondence. Nevertheless, we hope that you found this information helpful.

If you would like to learn more about the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, DOJ's Office of Open Government offers several open government resources through the Wisconsin DOJ website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ
provides the full Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, maintains an Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. The Attorney General and DOJ's Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and we are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. If you have additional questions, you may contact the Office of Open Government's Public Records Open Meetings (PROM) Help Line at (608) 267 2220. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.98 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:lah
November 6, 2019

Dennis Hughes
Chicago, IL 60642
hughesdp@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Hughes:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated May 28, 2019, in which you asked several related questions including “Can a no-contact order be enforced to prevent a criminal defendant from attending and making public comment at an open, public hearing of the Milwaukee County Board or its committees, if not otherwise expressly provided by law?”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) are committed to increasing government openness and transparency. The OOG works in furtherance of this with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. However, DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel concerning your open meetings law question, as it appears DOJ is currently prosecuting the criminal matter related to your inquiry.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney fees. You may reach it using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-
government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin open meetings law, maintains an Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide, and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.98 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:amh:lah
November 6, 2019

Paul Penkalski
Madison, WI 53715

Dear Mr. Penkalski:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated June 1, 2019, regarding your public records request to the UW-Madison Police Department. You wrote, “I ask that you please obtain unredacted copies of all records related to the case (see attached), as well as an unredacted copy of the night report, and provide them to me ASAP (or direct the UW to do so).”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) appreciate your concerns regarding the Wisconsin public records law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. However, DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel concerning your public records request as DOJ may be called upon to represent the UW-Madison Police Department. However, by way of copying on this letter, DOJ is making the UW-Madison Police Department aware of your concerns.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). As explained above, DOJ may be called upon to represent the UW-Madison Police Department. Therefore, although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding your matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a
private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/offices-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide and provides a recorded webinar and associated presentation documentation.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:lah

Cc: UW-Madison Police Department
November 20, 2019

Ken Kratz
kratzlawfirm@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Kratz:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated July 12, 2019, regarding your public records request to the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR). You requested “the DOJ assist [you] in filing a lawsuit in Dane County Circuit Court regarding OLR’s denial of [your] request.”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) appreciate your concerns about your public records request to OLR. However, DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel concerning your request, as DOJ may be called upon to represent OLR. Via copy of this letter, DOJ is informing OLR Director Keith L. Sellen of your concerns. Although DOJ cannot assist you with this matter, we can provide you with some general information regarding the public records law that you may find helpful.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a). Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b).

The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority only in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. DOJ construed your letter as a request for the Attorney General to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf. As explained above, however, DOJ may be called upon to represent OLR. Therefore, we respectfully decline your request.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding your matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:
Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin Public Records Law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, and provides various other open government resources.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah

Cc: OLR Director Keith L. Sellen
November 27, 2019

Scott Karcher

Elkhorn, WI 53121

Dear Mr. Karcher:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated May 22, 2019, in which you asked, “Are archived ‘Lists of tax Liens’ which are recorded with and by a County Clerk of the Circuit Court . . . subject to public viewing, inspection, and/or subject to a release of specific information such as a request for the case file number, and the legal land description upon the delivery of a written public records request?” In your follow up correspondence, dated August 13, 2019, you wrote that you have “exhausted [your] public remedy regarding public records requests in this matter” and requested DOJ’s assistance in filing a petition for writ of mandamus.

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government appreciate your concern about your public records request to the Department of Health Services (DHS). DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel concerning your public records request, as DOJ may be called upon to represent DHS. However, I did contact DHS to make them aware of your concerns, and I am also copying them on this letter. Although DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel regarding this matter, we are providing you with the following information regarding the public records law that you may find helpful.

The Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39, authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.” The public records law defines an “authority” as any of the following having custody of a record:

a state or local office, elective official, agency, board, commission, committee, council, department or public body corporate and politic created by the constitution or by any law, ordinance, rule or order; a governmental or quasi-governmental corporation except for the Bradley center sports and entertainment corporation; a special purpose district; any court of law; the assembly or senate; a nonprofit corporation which receives more than 50 percent of its funds from a county or a municipality, as defined in s. 59.001(3), and which provides services related to public health or safety to the county or municipality; a university police department under s. 175.42; or a formally constituted subunit of any of the foregoing.
Wis. Stat. § 19.32(1). Only an entity that falls within this definition of “authority” is subject to the provisions of the public records law.

The law defines a “record” as any material on which written, drawn, printed, spoken, visual, or electromagnetic information or electronically generated or stored data is recorded or preserved, regardless of physical form or characteristics, which has been created or is being kept by an authority. Wis. Stat. § 19.32(2). A record includes handwritten, typed, or printed documents; maps and charts; photographs, films, and tape recordings; tapes, optical disks, and any other medium on which electronically generated or stored data is recorded or preserved; and electronic records and communications.

Whether material is a “record” subject to disclosure under the public records law depends on whether the record is created or kept in connection with the official purpose or function of the agency. See OAG I-06-09, at 2 (Dec. 23, 2009). Not everything a public official or employee creates is a public record. The substance or content, not the medium, format, or location, controls whether something is a record. State ex rel. Youmans v. Owens, 28 Wis. 2d 672, 679, 137 N.W.2d 470 (1965).

The fact that a record is subject to disclosure, however, does not necessarily mean an authority must disclose the record. While records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

The public records law “does not require an authority to provide requested information if no record exists, or to simply answer questions about a topic of interest to the requester.” Journal Times v. City of Racine Board of Police and Fire Commissioners, 2015 WI 56, 55 (citation omitted); see also State ex rel. Zinngrabe v. Sch. Dist. of Sevastopol, 146 Wis. 2d 629, 431 N.W.2d 734 (Ct. App. 1988). An authority cannot fulfill a request for a record if the authority has no such record. While the public records law does not require an authority to notify a requester that the requested record does not exist, it is advisable that an authority do so.

Under the public records law, a request “is deemed sufficient if it reasonably describes the requested record or the information requested.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(h). A request “without a reasonable limitation as to subject matter or length of time represented by the record does not constitute a sufficient request.” Id. It is helpful for public records requests to be as specific as possible. This helps avoid any confusion the authority may have regarding
the request, thereby helping to ensure the requester receives the records they seek in a timely fashion.

If an authority denies a written request, in whole or in part, the authority must provide a written statement of the reasons for denying the written request. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b). Specific policy reasons, rather than mere statements of legal conclusion or recitation of exemptions, must be given. Pangman & Assoc. v. Zeilmer, 163 Wis. 2d 1070, 1084, 473 N.W.2d 538 (Ct. App. 1991); Vill. of Butler v. Cohen, 163 Wis. 2d 819, 824-25, 472 N.W.2d 579 (Ct. App. 1991). In every written denial, the authority must also inform the requester that “if the request for the record was made in writing, then the determination is subject to review by mandamus under s. 19.37(1) or upon application to the attorney general or a district attorney.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b).

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a). To obtain a writ of mandamus, the requester must establish four things: “(1) the petitioner has a clear legal right to the records sought; (2) the government entity has a plain legal duty to disclose the records; (3) substantial damages would result if the petition for mandamus was denied; and (4) the petitioner has no other adequate remedy at law.” Watton v. Hegerty, 2008 WI 74, ¶ 8, 311 Wis. 2d 52, 751 N.W.2d 369.

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. As explained above, DOJ may be called upon to represent DHS. Therefore, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf at this time.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding your matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). On its
website, DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, along with other open government resources.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

cc: Chief Legal Counsel, DHS
December 10, 2019

Tony Decker
Green Bay, WI 54311

Dear Mr. Decker:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated June 27, 2019 and November 6, 2019, in which you requested “an attorney contact [you] regarding a municipality possible violating state statutes” related to their chief of police hiring process.

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) are committed to increasing government openness and transparency. The OOG works in furtherance of this with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.39. The OOG is only authorized to provide assistance within this scope. Based on the information you provided, it appears some of the subject matter of your correspondence is outside the OOG’s scope. Therefore, the OOG cannot provide assistance regarding the chief of police hiring process. However, we can provide you with some general information about the open meetings law that you may find helpful.

The open meetings law acknowledges that the public is entitled to the fullest and most complete information regarding government affairs as is compatible with the conduct of governmental business. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1). All meetings of governmental bodies shall be held publicly and be open to all citizens at all times unless otherwise expressly provided by law. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(2). The provisions of the open meetings law are to be construed liberally to achieve that purpose. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(4).

In general, the open meetings law gives wide discretion to a governmental body to admit into a closed session anyone whose presence the body determines is necessary for the consideration of the matter that is the subject of the meeting. Schuh Correspondence (Dec. 15, 1988). If the governmental body is a subunit of a parent body, the subunit must allow members of the parent body to attend its open session and closed session meetings, unless the rules of the parent body or subunit provide otherwise. Wis. Stat. § 19.89. Where enough non-members of a subunit attend the subunit’s meetings that a quorum of the parent body is present, a meeting of the parent body occurs, and the notice requirements of

If you would like to learn more about the open meetings law, DOJ’s Office of Open Government offers several open government resources through the Wisconsin DOJ website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin open meetings law and maintains an Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.98 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of Open Government

SKL:lah
Emir Dini
DiniEmir@outlook.com

Dear Mr. Dini:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated August 20, 2019, in which you requested DOJ’s “assistance in obtaining public records that pertain to actively employed public servants (Legislative Research Analysts) in the Wisconsin Legislature.”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) appreciate your concerns regarding your public records request. However, DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel concerning this matter as DOJ may be called upon to represent the Wisconsin Legislature. Although DOJ cannot assist you with this matter, we can provide you with some general information regarding the public records law that you may find helpful.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a written public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. As explained above, DOJ may be called upon to represent the Wisconsin Legislature. Therefore, although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:
The Attorney General and the OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers numerous open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law, maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide, and provides other public records law resources.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
December 10, 2019

Jane Public
wicitizensright2know@gmail.com

Dear Ms. Public:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated May 30, 2019, regarding records you received in response to a public records request. You wrote that a portion of the responsive records were screenshots of text messages which were "unreadable (dark, small, grainy and obscured) due to the copying and scanning." After receiving the "unreadable" records you requested the text messages electronically, however, the authority denied your request, "stating they had already provided [you] with the requested records."

In your correspondence, you asked two questions. First you asked, "does Wisconsin's law or subsequent case law address readability of records provided to a written records request?" Secondly, "Can an authority/custodian purposefully obscure records by scanning, copying and emailing when a more readable version is available?"


If a requester appears personally to request a copy of a record, Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(b) requires that copies of written documents be "substantially as readable" as the original. Lueders v. Krug, 2019 WI App 36, ¶ 6, 388 Wis. 2d 147, 931 N.W.2d 898. Wisconsin Stat. § 19.35(1)(c) and (d) also require that audiotapes be "substantially as audible," and copies of videotapes be "substantially as good" as the originals.

By analogy, providing a copy of an electronic document that is "substantially as good" as the original is a sufficient response where the requester does not specifically request access in the original format. See WIREData, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex ("WIREData II"), 2008 WI 69, ¶¶ 97–98, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736 (provision of records in PDF format satisfied requests for records in "electronic, digital" format); State ex rel. Milwaukee Police Ass'n v. Jones, 2000 WI App 146, ¶ 10, 237 Wis. 2d 840, 615 N.W.2d 190 (holding that provision of an
analog copy of a digital audio tape ("DAT") complied with Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(c) by providing a recording that was "substantially as audible" as the original; see also Autotech Techs. Ltd. P'ship v. Automationdirect.com, Inc., 248 F.R.D. 556, 558 (N.D. Ill. 2008) (where litigant did not specify a format for production during civil discovery, responding party had option of providing documents in the "form ordinarily maintained or in a reasonably usable form").

Wisconsin Stat. § 19.36(4) provides, however, that material used as input for or produced as the output of a computer is subject to examination and copying. Jones ultimately held that, when a requester specifically asked for the original DAT recording of a 911 call, the custodian did not fulfill the requirements of Wis. Stat. § 19.36(4) by providing only the analog copy. Jones 2000 WI App 146, ¶ 17.

In WIREdata II, the Wisconsin Supreme Court declined to address the issue of whether the provision of documents in PDF format would have satisfied a subsequent request specifying in detail that the data should be produced in a particular format which included fixed length, pipe delimited, or comma-quote outputs, leaving open the question of the degree to which a requester can specify the precise electronic format that will satisfy a record request. WIREdata II, 2008 WI 69, ¶¶ 8 n.7, 93, 96.

Nevertheless, the court of appeals has provided some guidance in Lueders on whether an authority needs to provide records in a format specified by the requester, holding that the requester in that case was "entitled to the e-mails in electronic form" when the request was for emails "in electronic form." Lueders, 2019 WI App 36, ¶ 15. The court also stated that the authority must provide "electronic copies," not paper copies of records, to a requester who asks for records in electronic format. Id.

DOJ's Office of Open Government encourages authorities and requesters to maintain an open line of communication. This helps to avoid misunderstandings between an authority and a requester. An authority is not required to create a new record by extracting and compiling information from existing records in a new format. See Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(L). See also George v. Record Custodian, 169 Wis. 2d 573, 579, 485 N.W.2d 460 (Ct. App. 1992). However, we recommend communicating with an authority if you are unable to access the records as provided, and we would encourage an authority to accommodate a requester's request for a different format if possible.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority's response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for
mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding your matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:lah
December 10, 2019

Julie Russell
Diversified Investigations, LLC
Post Office Box 0562
Appleton, WI 54912-0562

Dear Ms. Russell:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated April 23, 2019, regarding your public records requests to the Oneida County Sheriff’s Department and Waukesha County Sheriff’s Department. You requested DOJ “review [the] Oneida County SO” and “Waukesha Co SO fee schedule for Open Records.” You also requested that DOJ review your letter “addressed to Waukesha District Attorney Opper regarding their definition of ‘Background Check’ vs. Open Records Request and corresponding flat rate fee of $5.”

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39.

To the extent that your concerns may relate to the DA’s handling of your complaint, DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel, as DOJ may be called upon to represent the DA. As a courtesy to you, I contacted the DA and made her aware of your concerns, and she is also being copied on this letter. Further, pursuant to the Attorney General’s independent statutory authority to enforce and interpret the public records law, see Wis. Stat. §§ 19.97 to 19.98, I also contacted the Waukesha County Corporation Counsel and the Oneida County Corporation Counsel to make them aware of your concerns regarding the Waukesha County Sheriff’s Department and the Oneida County Sheriff’s Department, respectively, and both corporation counsel are also being copied on this letter. It is my understanding that your concerns have now been resolved, but DOJ can provide you with some general information about the public records law that you might find helpful.

The Wisconsin Public Records Law authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.” The purpose of the public records law is to shed light on the workings of government and the official acts of public officers and

With respect to fees under the public records law, "[A]n authority may charge a fee not exceeding the actual, necessary, and direct costs of four specific tasks: (1) 'reproduction and transcription'; (2) 'photographing and photographic processing'; (3) 'locating'; and (4) 'mailing or shipping.'" Milwaukee Journal Sentinel v. City of Milwaukee, 2012 WI 65, ¶ 54 (citation omitted) (emphasis in original).

The amount of such fees may vary depending on the authority. However, an authority may not profit from complying with public records requests. WIREData, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex, 2008 WI 69, ¶¶ 103, 107, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736 (an authority may not profit from its response to a public records request, but may recoup all of its actual costs). An authority may not charge for the time it takes to redact records. Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, 2012 WI 65, ¶¶ 1 & n.4, 6, 58 (Abrahamson, C.J., lead opinion); id. ¶ 76 (Roggensack, J., concurring).

The law also permits an authority to impose a fee for locating records if the cost is $50.00 or more. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(c). Additionally, an authority may require prepayment for the costs associated with responding to a public records request if the total amount exceeds $5.00. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(f). Generally, the rate for an actual, necessary, and direct charge for staff time (such as for locating a record) should be based on the pay rate of the lowest paid employee capable of performing the task. For more information on permissible fees, please see the Office of Open Government Advisory: Charging Fees under the Wisconsin Public Records Law, which was issued on August 8, 2018 and can be found on DOJ’s website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/oog-advisories-and-attorney-general-opinions).

There may be other laws that authorize an authority to charge other fees outside of the public records law. However, the OOG is unable to offer you assistance regarding other laws that are outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities and authority under the public records law.

The OOG also encourages authorities and requesters to maintain an open line of communication. This helps to avoid misunderstandings between an authority and a requester. It is also helpful in resolving issues such as those related to fees. If a requester is concerned about potential fees, it may be helpful that he or she express such concerns in the request.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern.
Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf at this time.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

**Lawyer Referral and Information Service**
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:amh:lah

Cc: Waukesha County District Attorney
    Waukesha County Corporation Counsel
    Oneida County Corporation Counsel
December 30, 2019

Mary Gorske
Fond du Lac, WI 54937

Dear Ms. Gorske:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated July 15, 2019, regarding your concerns "about the lack of adherence to the Wisconsin State Statutes by elected officials in the Town of Fond du Lac." Regarding the annual town meeting, you expressed concern that the "minutes will not be approved until April 2020 so the Clerk can change them," the motion that passed "was never published as required by State Statute 60.80," and the "results of the votes for the motions were never announced at the meeting." You wrote, "I am appealing to your office to see if you could encourage and educate the elected officials of the Town of Fond du Lac as to their duty to comply with and enforce Wisconsin State Statutes and Town ordinances."

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) are committed to increasing government openness and transparency. The OOG works in furtherance of this with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.39. The OOG is only authorized to provide assistance within this scope. Based on the information you provided, it appears that some of the subject matter of your correspondence is outside the OOG’s scope. Therefore, the OOG cannot provide you with assistance regarding such subject matter. Additionally, the information you provided in your correspondence is insufficient to properly evaluate the issues you raised. However, we can provide you with some general information about the open meetings law that you may find helpful.

The open meetings law acknowledges that the public is entitled to the fullest and most complete information regarding government affairs as is compatible with the conduct of governmental business. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1). All meetings of governmental bodies shall be held publicly and be open to all citizens at all times unless otherwise expressly provided by law. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(2). The provisions of the open meetings law are to be construed liberally to achieve that purpose. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(4).

In an effort to increase transparency, DOJ recommends that governmental bodies keep minutes of all meetings. However, there is no requirement under the open meetings law
for a governmental body to do so. The open meetings law only requires a governmental body to create and preserve a record of all motions and roll-call votes at its meetings. Wis. Stat. § 19.88(3). This requirement applies to both open and closed sessions. See De Moya Correspondence (June 17, 2009). Written minutes are the most common method used to comply with the requirement, but they are not the only permissible method. It can also be satisfied if the motions and roll-call votes are recorded and preserved in some other way, such as on a tape recording. See I-95-89 (Nov. 13, 1989).

Thus, as long as the body creates and preserves a record of all motions and roll-call votes, the Wis. Stat. § 19.88(3) requirement is satisfied, and the open meetings law does not require the body to take more formal or detailed minutes of other aspects of the meeting. Other statutes outside the open meetings law, however, may prescribe particular minute-taking requirements for certain governmental bodies and officials that go beyond what is required by the open meetings law. I-20-89 (Mar. 8, 1989). See, e.g., Wis. Stat. §§ 59.23(2)(a) (county clerk); 60.33(2)(a) (town clerk); 61.26(3) (village clerk); 62.09(11)(b) (city clerk); 62.13(5)(i) (police and fire commission); 66.1001(4)(b) (plan commission); 70.47(7)(bb) (board of review).

Although Wis. Stat. § 19.88(3) does not indicate how detailed the record of motions and roll-call votes should be, the general legislative policy of the open meetings law is that "the public is entitled to the fullest and most complete information regarding the affairs of government as is compatible with the conduct of governmental business." See Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1). In light of that policy, it seems clear that a governmental body's records should provide the public with a reasonably intelligible description of the essential substantive elements of every motion made, who initiated and seconded the motion, the outcome of any vote on the motion, and, if a roll-call vote, how each member voted. See De Moya Correspondence (June 17, 2009).

Under the open meetings law, the Attorney General and the district attorneys have authority to enforce the law. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(1). Generally, the Attorney General may elect to prosecute complaints presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. While you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an enforcement action, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an enforcement action at this time.

More frequently, the district attorney of the county where the alleged violation occurred may enforce the law. However, in order to have this authority, an individual must file a verified complaint with the district attorney. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(1). If the district attorney refuses or otherwise fails to commence an action to enforce the open meetings law within 20 days after receiving the verified complaint, the individual may bring an action in the name of the state. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(4). (Please note a district attorney may still commence an enforcement action even after 20 days have passed.) Such actions by an individual must be commenced within two years after the cause of action accrues. Wis. Stat. § 893.93(2)(a).

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney fees. You may reach it using this contact information:
The Attorney General and DOJ's Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin open meetings law and maintains an Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin's proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.98 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:ah
December 30, 2019

Dr. Shaun McCrystal
Yeronga, QLD 4104
Australia
shaun.mccrystal@uq.net.au

Dear Mr. McCrystal:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated July 22, 2019, regarding your public records request to the Manitowoc County Sheriff’s Office. As of that date, you had not received a response to your request or to your follow up correspondence regarding your request. You asked DOJ for “a review of the MTSO’s handling of [your] FOIA request and the immediate release of the information sought by the request.”

Your correspondence references the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552. FOIA applies to federal agencies and helps ensure public access to records of federal agencies. In Wisconsin, the state counterpart to FOIA is the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. The purpose of the public records law is to shed light on the workings of government and the official acts of public officers and employees. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Waukeake Cnty. Sch. Dist., 221 Wis. 2d 575, 582, 585 N.W.2d 726 (Ct. App. 1998). The public records law authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.”

Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test, determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

Whether an investigation or litigation is ongoing and whether the confidentiality of the requested records is material to that ongoing investigation or litigation are factors that an authority may consider in applying the balancing test. Cf. Linzmeyer v. Forcey, 2002 WI...
84, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41, 254 Wis. 2d 306, 646 N.W.2d 811; Journal/Sentinel, Inc. v. Aagerup, 145 Wis. 2d 818, 824-27, 429 N.W.2d 772 (Ct. App. 1988); Democratic Party of Wisconsin v. Wisconsin Dept' of Justice, 2016 WI 100, ¶ 12, 372 Wis. 2d 460, 888 N.W.2d 584. An authority could determine that release of records while an investigation or litigation is in progress could compromise the investigation or litigation. Therefore, when performing the public records balancing test, an authority could conclude that the public interest in effectively investigating and litigating a case and in protecting the integrity of the current investigation or litigation outweighs the public interest in disclosing the requested records at that time. Id.; Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a).

The public records law does not require a response to a public records request within a specific timeframe. In other words, after a request is received, there is no set deadline by which the authority must respond. However, the law states that upon receipt of a public records request, the authority “shall, as soon as practicable and without delay, either fill the request or notify the requester of the authority’s determination to deny the request in whole or in part and the reasons therefor.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(a). A reasonable amount of time for a response “depends on the nature of the request, the staff and other resources available to the authority to process the request, the extent of the request, and other related considerations.” WIREdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex, 2008 WI 69, ¶ 56, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736; see Journal Times v. Police & Fire Comm’rs Bd., 2015 WI 56, ¶ 85, 362 Wis. 2d 577, 866 N.W.2d 563 (an authority “can be swamped with public records requests and may need a substantial period of time to respond to any given request”).

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b), “If an authority denies a written request in whole or in part, the requester shall receive from the authority a written statement of the reasons for denying the written request.” Specific policy reasons, rather than mere statements of legal conclusion or recitation of exemptions, must be given. Pangman & Assocs. v. Zellmer, 163 Wis. 2d 1070, 1084, 473 N.W.2d 538 (Ct. App. 1991); Vill. of Butler v. Cohen, 163 Wis. 2d 819, 824-25, 472 N.W.2d 579 (Ct. App. 1991). In every written denial, the authority must also inform the requester that “if the request for the record was made in writing, then the determination is subject to review by mandamus under s. 19.37(1) or upon application to the attorney general or a district attorney.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b).

While the law requires an authority to fill a request or notify the requester of a determination to deny a request, the law does not require an authority to respond to a requester if the authority has no records responsive to a request. However, DOJ advises that an authority notify a requester if they have no responsive records. Journal Times v. City of Racine Bd. of Police & Fire Comm’rs, 2015 WI 56, ¶ 85, 362 Wis. 2d 577, ¶ 102, 866 N.W.2d 563.

The Office of Open Government encourages authorities and requesters to maintain an open line of communication. This helps to avoid misunderstandings between an authority and a requester. If it becomes apparent to an authority that a public records request may require a longer response time, it may be prudent that the authority provide the requester with a letter providing an update on the status of the response and, if possible, indicating when a response might be anticipated. Similarly, if an authority receives an inquiry from a requester seeking an update on the status of the request, it is advisable for the authority to respond to the requester with an update. As a courtesy to you, I am sending a copy of this letter to the Manitowoc County Sheriff’s Office to make them aware of your concerns.
The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority's response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding your matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney's fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin's proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

cc: Sheriff Daniel Hartwig, Manitowoc County Sheriff's Office
December 30, 2019

Samuel Polhamus
Sparta, WI 54656

Dear Mr. Polhamus:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated June 25, 2019, regarding your public records request “for a copy of a pre-trial offer” in “Monroe County Case Number 2019-CF-000037.” You “contacted the Monroe County District Attorney directly, via email, and have heard nothing back regarding this request.” You now request an action for mandamus.

The Attorney General and DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) appreciate your concern about your public records request to the Monroe County District Attorney (DA). However, DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel concerning your public records request, as DOJ may be called upon to represent the DA. However, as a courtesy to you, I am sending a copy of this letter to the DA and to make him aware of your concerns.

Although DOJ cannot offer you legal advice or counsel regarding this matter, we can provide you with the following information regarding the public records law that you may find helpful. The Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39, authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.” The purpose of the public records law is to shed light on the workings of government and the official acts of public officers and employees. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Waunakee Cnty. Sch. Dist., 221 Wis. 2d 575, 582, 585 N.W.2d 726 (Ct. App. 1998).

Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of
a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

The public records law does not require a response to a public records request within a specific timeframe. In other words, after a request is received, there is no set deadline by which the authority must respond. However, the law states that upon receipt of a public records request, the authority “shall, as soon as practicable and without delay, either fill the request or notify the requester of the authority’s determination to deny the request in whole or in part and the reasons therefor.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(a). A reasonable amount of time for a response “depends on the nature of the request, the staff and other resources available to the authority to process the request, the extent of the request, and other related considerations.” WIREdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex, 2008 WI 69, ¶ 56, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736; see Journal Times v. Police & Fire Comm’rs Bd., 2015 WI 56, ¶ 85, 362 Wis. 2d 577, 866 N.W.2d 563 (an authority “can be swamped with public records requests and may need a substantial period of time to respond to any given request”).

Whether an investigation or litigation is ongoing and whether the confidentiality of the requested records is material to that ongoing investigation or litigation are factors that an authority may consider in applying the balancing test. Cf. Linzmeyer v. Forcey, 2002 WI 84, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41, 254 Wis. 2d 306, 646 N.W.2d 811; Journal/Sentinel, Inc. v. Aagerup, 145 Wis. 2d 818, 824-27, 429 N.W.2d 772 (Ct. App. 1988); Democratic Party of Wisconsin v. Wisconsin Dep’t of Justice, 2016 WI 100, ¶ 12, 372 Wis. 2d 460, 888 N.W.2d 584. An authority could determine that release of records while an investigation or litigation is in progress could compromise the investigation or litigation. Therefore, when performing the public records balancing test, an authority could conclude that the public interest in effectively investigating and litigating a case and in protecting the integrity of the current investigation or litigation outweighs the public interest in disclosing the requested records at that time. Id.; Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a).

Additionally, prosecutors’ case files, whether open or closed, are not subject to disclosure under the public records law. State ex rel. Richards v. Foust, 165 Wis. 2d 429, 436, 477 N.W.2d 608 (1991); see also Democratic Party of Wisconsin v. Wisconsin Dep’t of Justice, 2016 WI 100, ¶ 12, 372 Wis. 2d 460, 888 N.W.2d 584.

The public records law “does not require an authority to provide requested information if no record exists, or to simply answer questions about a topic of interest to the requester.” Journal Times v. City of Racine Board of Police and Fire Commissioners, 2015 WI 56, ¶ 55 (citation omitted) (“While a record will always contain information, information may not always be in the form of a record.”); see also State ex rel. Zinngrabe v. Sch. Dist. of Sevastopol, 146 Wis. 2d 629, 431 N.W.2d 734 (Ct. App. 1988). An authority cannot fulfill a request for a record if the authority has no such record. While the public records law does not require an authority to notify a requester that the requested record does not exist, it is advisable that an authority do so.

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b), “If an authority denies a written request in whole or in part, the requester shall receive from the authority a written statement of the reasons for denying the written request.” Specific policy reasons, rather than mere statements of legal
conclusion or recitation of exemptions, must be given. Pangman & Assoc. v. Zellmer, 163 Wis. 2d 1070, 1084, 473 N.W.2d 538 (Ct. App. 1991); Vill. of Butler v. Cohen, 163 Wis. 2d 819, 824-25, 472 N.W.2d 579 (Ct. App. 1991). In every written denial, the authority must also inform the requester that “if the request for the record was made in writing, then the determination is subject to review by mandamus under s. 19.37(1) or upon application to the attorney general or a district attorney.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b).

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, as explained above, DOJ may be called upon to represent the DA. Therefore, we respectfully decline your request for DOJ to pursue an action for mandamus.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.
The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:lah

Cc: Monroe County District Attorney
December 30, 2019

Madison, WI 53705

Dear [Redacted]

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated July 1, 2019, in which you wrote, “The Madison police department has redacted information in the report of my child’s assault [sic] that I need to protect him and ought to have been provided. Can your office help?”

DOJ has insufficient information to evaluate whether the redactions in the records you received are permitted under the public records law. However, we can provide you with some general information regarding the public records law that we hope you will find helpful.


Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W.2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test, determines whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. Hempel v. City of Baraboo, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).
Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue an action for mandamus on your behalf.

You may wish to contact a private attorney regarding your matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a private attorney may charge attorney's fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4666

The Attorney General and the Office of Open Government are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin's proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKL:iah
December 30, 2019

Michael Schuetz
Hawkins, WI 54530

Dear Mr. Schuetz:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated June 17, 2019 and June 25, 2019, regarding your public records requests to the School District of Flambeau for an employee’s “pay status and disbursements [sic] made to him over the last 12 months.” You have not received a response to your requests and wrote, “I would like to file a complaint of non compliance of open records.”

DOJ’s Office of Open Government (OOG) works to increase government openness and transparency with a focus on the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. Based on the information you provided in your correspondence, it appears that some of the subject matter of your correspondence is outside this scope. Therefore, we are unable to offer you assistance regarding your concerns that are outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities.

Your correspondence references the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552. FOIA applies to federal agencies and helps ensure public access to records of federal agencies. In Wisconsin, the state counterpart to FOIA is the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39. The purpose of the public records law is to shed light on the workings of government and the official acts of public officers and employees. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Waunakee Cmty. Sch. Dist., 221 Wis. 2d 575, 582, 585 N.W. 2d 726 (Ct. App. 1998). The public records law authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.”

The public records law authorizes requesters to inspect or obtain copies of “records” created or maintained by an “authority.” Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Requested records fall into one of three categories: (1) absolute right of access; (2) absolute denial of access; and (3) right of access determined by the balancing test. Hathaway v. Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 of Green Bay, 116 Wis. 2d 388, 397, 342 N.W. 2d 682 (1984). If neither a statute nor the common law requires disclosure or creates a general exception to disclosure, the records custodian must decide whether the strong public policy favoring disclosure is overcome by some even stronger public policy favoring limited access or nondisclosure. This balancing test determines
whether the presumption of openness is overcome by another public policy concern. *Hempel v. City of Baraboo*, 2005 WI 120, ¶ 4, 284 Wis. 2d 162, 699 N.W.2d 551. If a records custodian determines that a record or part of a record cannot be disclosed, the custodian must redact that record or part of that record. See Wis. Stat. § 19.36(6).

If an authority denies a written request, in whole or in part, the authority must provide a written statement of the reasons for such a denial and inform the requester that the determination is subject to review by mandamus under Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1) or upon application to the attorney general or a district attorney. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b).

The public records law does not require a response to a public records request within a specific timeframe. In other words, after a request is received, there is no set deadline by which the authority must respond. However, the law states that upon receipt of a public records request, the authority “shall, as soon as practicable and without delay, either fill the request or notify the requester of the authority’s determination to deny the request in whole or in part and the reasons therefor.” Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(a). A reasonable amount of time for a response “depends on the nature of the request, the staff and other resources available to the authority to process the request, the extent of the request, and other related considerations.” *WIREdata, Inc. v. Vill. of Sussex*, 2008 WI 69, ¶ 56, 310 Wis. 2d 397, 751 N.W.2d 736; *see Journal Times v. Police & Fire Comm’s Bd.*, 2015 WI 56, ¶ 85, 362 Wis. 2d 577, 866 N.W.2d 563 (an authority “can be swamped with public records requests and may need a substantial period of time to respond to any given request”).

The OOG encourages authorities and requesters to maintain an open line of communication. This helps to avoid misunderstandings between an authority and a requester. For example, if it becomes apparent to an authority that a public records request may require a longer response time, it may be prudent for the authority to send the requester a letter providing an update on the status of the response and, if possible, indicating when a response might be anticipated. Similarly, if an authority receives an inquiry from a requester seeking an update on the status of the request, it is advisable for the authority to respond to the requester with an update. I have also sent a copy of this letter to the school district to make them aware of your concerns.

The public records law provides several remedies for a requester dissatisfied with an authority’s response, or lack of response, to a public records request. A requester may file an action for mandamus, with or without an attorney, asking a court to order release of the records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(a).

Alternatively, the requester may submit a written request for the district attorney of the county where the record is found, or the Attorney General, to file an action for mandamus seeking release of the requested records. Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1)(b). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the public records law; however, he generally exercises this authority only in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to pursue a mandamus action at this time.

You may also wish to contact a private attorney regarding this matter. The State Bar of Wisconsin operates an attorney referral service. The referral service is free; however, a
private attorney may charge attorney’s fees. You may reach the service using the contact information below:

Lawyer Referral and Information Service
State Bar of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7158
Madison, WI 53707-7158
(800) 362-9082
(608) 257-4600

The Attorney General and DOJ’s OOG are committed to increasing government openness and transparency, and DOJ endeavors to offer guidance in these areas. DOJ offers several open government resources through its website (https://www.doj.state.wi.us/office-open-government/office-open-government). DOJ provides the full Wisconsin public records law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide on its website.

DOJ appreciates your concern. We are dedicated to the work necessary to preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. Thank you for your correspondence.

The information provided in this letter is provided pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.39 and does not constitute an informal or formal opinion of the Attorney General pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.015(1).

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Sarah K. Larson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

SKLlah

cc:    Erica Schley, District Administrator, School District of Flambeau