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July 18, 2022

Alicia Gralewicz
agralewicz9@gmail.com

Dear Alicia Gralewicz:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated May 27, 2022, in which you wrote, “How can I obtain 911 call recording[s]? . . . Can you provide [a] form to request record[s] of the call?” In your follow-up correspondence, dated July 17, 2022, you wrote, “How can I obtain a 911 audio recording from past year[s]? . . . I was told it’s open records plus 911 calls are saved but I have not been helped in this area.”

DOJ construed your correspondence as seeking information about how to obtain 911 dispatch audio recordings in general, and DOJ is providing you with general public records law information below. DOJ did not construe your correspondence as seeking records from DOJ. If DOJ misunderstood your correspondence, please contact DOJ’s Office of Open Government at opengov@widoj.gov.


The Wisconsin 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. This definition includes 911 dispatch audio recordings.

Records are presumed to be open to public inspection and copying, but there are exceptions. Wis. Stat. § 19.31. Statutes, case law, and the public records law balancing test, which weighs the public interest in disclosure of a record against the public interest in nondisclosure, provide such exceptions. Exceptions to disclosure should be narrowly construed to effectuate the law’s purpose of ensuring government openness and transparency.

If you seek 911 dispatch audio recordings, you may submit a public records request by contacting the law enforcement agency involved in your matter. Each law enforcement agency is a separate authority under the public records law. In order to submit a public records request, there are no “magic words” that are required, and an authority may not require that you fill out a specific form in order to submit a request. You may submit a request verbally or in writing. 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). Under the public records law, a request need not be made in person, and generally, a requester is not required to identify themselves or to state the purpose of the request. 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”).

We hope you find this information helpful. 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 would like to learn more about the public records law, DOJ’s Office of Open Government offers several open government resources on DOJ’s 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. If you have additional questions, you may also 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. § 19.39 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
September 9, 2022

Carol Albers
pinerivergp6@gmail.com

Dear Carol Albers:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated December 3, 2021, in which you asked for clarification of Wis. Stat. § 19.84. You specifically asked, “[I]f there is any time (other than for an emergency meeting) when the required 24 hours notice is waived for holding a Town Board meeting.” Your Town Board “recently had a Monday town meeting that the was [sic] agenda was posted the Sunday before the meeting.”

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 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 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.

The open meetings law provides for the level of specificity required in agenda items for open meetings as well as the timing for releasing agendas in order to provide proper notice. Wis. Stat. § 19.84(2). 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. Id. 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).
No Wisconsin court decisions or Attorney General opinions discuss what constitutes “good cause” to provide less than twenty-four-hour notice of a meeting. This provision, like all other provisions of the open meetings law, must be construed in favor of providing the public with the fullest and most complete information about governmental affairs as is compatible with the conduct of governmental business. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1), (4). If there is any doubt whether “good cause” exists, the governmental body should provide the full twenty-four-hour notice.

When calculating the twenty-four hour notice period, Wis. Stat. § 990.001(4)(a) requires that Sundays and legal holidays shall be excluded. Posting notice of a Monday meeting on the preceding Sunday is, therefore, inadequate, but posting such notice on the preceding Saturday would suffice, as long as the posting location is open to the public on Saturdays. Caylor Correspondence (Dec. 6, 2007).

Every public notice of a meeting must give the time, date, place and subject matter of the meeting, and the notice must be in such a form as to reasonably apprise the public of this information. Wis. Stat. § 19.84(2). The notice requirement gives the public information about the business to be conducted that will alert them to the importance of the meeting, so that they can make an informed decision whether to attend. State ex rel. Badke v. Vill. Bd. of Vill. of Greendale, 173 Wis. 2d 553, 573–78, 494 N.W.2d 408 (1993).

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, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 9, 2022

Scott Gregory
stgregory01@gmail.com

Dear Scott Gregory:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated August 17, 2021, in which you wrote that you “called the Sheboygan County Courthouse to ask the process to obtain a Criminal Complaint . . . . The person who answered the phone told me that the criminal complaint was a public record, but they don’t release the record to just anyone who wants a copy, I must have some type of involvement in the case or be media.” You are “looking for clarification as to whether [you] have a right to obtain the record or not.”


Records, including criminal complaints, 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).

We hope you find this information helpful. 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 would like to learn more about the public records law, DOJ’s Office of
Open Government offers several open government resources on DOJ’s 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. If you have additional questions, you may also 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. § 19.39 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
September 28, 2022

Chris Mehling
chris.mehling@icloud.com

Dear Chris Mehling:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated August 16, 2021, in which you wrote, “I’m writing to report numerous open meeting violations that occurred during the August 11, 2021 school board meeting at Arrowhead High School.” You provided a video link to the meeting and a timeline summary of events, however the video was marked private.

The DOJ 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, it appears the concerns expressed in your correspondence are outside the OOG’s scope. Therefore, the OOG cannot provide assistance regarding the school board’s procedure to fill a vacant school board seat, including the application deadline, the related actions of the board president, and the school board policy referenced in your correspondence.

The open meetings law ensures the public’s right to access the meetings of governmental bodies. It 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).

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, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 28, 2022

Monica Weitkuhn
meweitkuhn@yahoo.com

Dear Monica Weitkuhn:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated September 9, 2022, regarding the federal Drivers Privacy Protection Act (DPPA). You asked “if it is a violation of the DPPA for a Law Enforcement Officer to access a citizen’s driving record and photo because the LEO did not like something the citizen said on social media?”

The DOJ Office of Open Government (OOG) works to increase government openness and transparency with a focus on the Wisconsin Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39, and the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98. Your correspondence largely pertains to a matter outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities. As a result, we are unable to offer you assistance or insight regarding law enforcement’s use of the TIME System. We can, however, provide you with some general information about the federal Driver’s Privacy Protection Act (DPPA), 18 U.S.C. § 2721 et. seq., as it relates to Wisconsin’s public records law that we hope you will find helpful.

The DPPA limits the release of certain information obtained from state motor vehicle records. Under the DPPA, “personal information” or “highly restricted personal information” obtained from DMV records may not be disclosed, except when permissible by state law (the “state law exception”), or when permissible “[f]or use by any government agency, including any court or law enforcement agency, in carrying out its functions” (the “agency functions” exception), among other DPPA exceptions. 18 U.S.C. § 2721(b)(14) (the “state law” exception); 18 U.S.C. § 2721(b)(1) (the “agency functions” exception).

In New Richmond News v. City of New Richmond, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals ruled that the “state law exception” permits authorities to release traffic accident reports unredacted, because Wisconsin law specifically mandates that authorities provide the public with access to accident reports. New Richmond News v. City of New Richmond, 2016 WI App 43, ¶¶ 34–36, 370 Wis. 2d 75, 881 N.W.2d 339 (citing Wis. Stat. § 346.70(4)(f)). In contrast, the court ruled that responding to public records requests was not an “agency function” for purposes of the DPPA, such that authorities may not release unredacted incident reports containing personal information unless a different DPPA exception applies. Id. ¶¶ 43–49.
Finally, the court ruled that information obtained from another source, but verified using state motor vehicle records, is not subject to the DPPA. *Id.* ¶ 51. Depending on the totality of circumstances related to a particular public records request, non-DPPA statutory, common law, or balancing test considerations may also warrant redaction of certain personal information pursuant to the usual public records law analysis.

If you would like to learn more about the public records 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 Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39, 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 28, 2022

Thomas Willan
tom@ironmanbuildings.com

Dear Thomas Willan:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated August 27, 2021, in which you wrote, “Dane County is refusing to disclose what options it is considering for a major redevelopment project . . . before deciding which proposal to pursue. . . . citing a need to protect negotiations.” You requested assistance “forcing Dane county to be transparent.”

DOJ is also in receipt of your correspondence, dated October 14, 2021, regarding your public records request to the town of Cottage Grove. You wrote, “They are claiming privilege to closed door meeting minutes regarding an intergovernmental agreement they are proposing with the city of Madison.” You asked, “the Attorney General to investigate both the meeting behind closed doors” and requested ”an opinion from the Attorney General on the lawful trading of one person’s property rights for the advancement of another when everyone is similarly situated?”

The DOJ 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. While a portion of your correspondence pertained to the public records law and open meetings law, it also discussed a matter outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities. As a result, we are unable to offer you assistance or insight regarding the portions of your correspondence that fall outside this scope. We can, however, provide you with some general information about the public records law and open meetings law that we hope you will find helpful.

The Attorney General and OOG 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.
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).

Wisconsin 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).

Under the open meetings law, a closed session is authorized for “[d]eliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session.” Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(e). Thus, the Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(e) exemption is not limited to deliberating or negotiating the purchase of public property or the investing of public funds, because the exemption also authorizes a closed session for “conducting other specified public business.” For example, the Attorney General has determined that the exemption authorized a school board to convene in closed session to develop negotiating strategies for collective bargaining. 66 Op. Att’y Gen. 93, 96-97 (1977).

However, it is important to note two things. First, exemptions authorizing a governmental body to meet in closed session should be construed narrowly. Governmental officials must keep in mind that this exemption is restrictive, not expansive. 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. Second, a closed session under this exemption is only permissible “whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session.” The use of the word “require” in Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(e) limits that exemption to situations in which competitive or bargaining reasons leave a governmental body with no option other than to close the meeting. State ex rel. Citizens for Responsible Dev. v. City of Milton, 2007 WI App 114, ¶ 14, 300 Wis. 2d 649, 731 N.W.2d 640. When a governmental body seeks to convene in closed session under Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(e), the burden is on the body to show that competitive or bargaining interests require closure. Id. ¶¶ 6–8.

The 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 employees. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Waunakee Cmty. 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).

Public policies that may be weighed in the balancing test can be identified through their expression in other areas of the law. Exemptions to the open meetings law that allow an authority to meet in closed session, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.85, “are indicative of public policy,” and a records custodian may consider them as balancing factors favoring non-disclosure. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a); State v. Beaver Dam Area Dev. Corp., 2008 WI 90, ¶ 82, 312 Wis. 2d 84, 752 N.W.2d 295. However, if a records custodian relies upon the public policy expressed in an open meetings exemption to withhold a record, the custodian must make “a specific demonstration that there was a need to restrict public access at the time that the request to inspect or copy the record was made.” Id.; see Journal Times v. City of Racine Bd. of Police & Fire Comm’rs, 2014 WI App 67, ¶ 9, 354 Wis. 2d 591, 849 N.W.2d 888 (records of a closed meeting, such as motions and votes, may be withheld from disclosure in response to a public records request only if the authority makes a specific demonstration of need to restrict access at the time of the request), rev’d on other grounds, 2015 WI 56, 362 Wis. 2d 577, 866 N.W.2d 563.)

The proper closing of a meeting under one of the exemptions is not in and of itself sufficient reason to deny access to records considered or distributed during the closed session, or to minutes of the closed session. See Oshkosh Nw. Co. v. Oshkosh Library Bd., 125 Wis. 2d 480, 485, 373 N.W.2d 459 (Ct. App. 1985). A records custodian denying access to records on the basis of public policy expressed by one of the open meetings exemptions must do more than identify the exemption under which the meeting was closed and assert that the reasons for closing the meeting still exist and therefore justify denying access to the requested records. Id. The records custodian instead must state specific public policy reasons for the denial, as evidenced by existence of the related open meetings exemption. Id.

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).

Regarding enforcement of 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).

Regarding enforcement of the public records law, 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, the Attorney General normally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Again, although you did not specifically request the Attorney General to file an action for mandamus, nonetheless, we respectfully decline to do so at this time.

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 and Public Records Law and maintains an Open Meetings Law Compliance Guide and 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 28, 2022

Cheryl Wirtz
cheryl.wirtz@oshkosh.k12.wi.us

Dear Cheryl Wirtz:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated November 11, 2021, in which you asked, “Is there a state statute that addresses how to handle a meeting when it is moved due to an emergency?”

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 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 your correspondence, you did not provide any details or context regarding your question. If your question was in reference to the notice requirements under the open meetings law, 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. Id. 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).

No Wisconsin court decisions or Attorney General opinions discuss what constitutes “good cause” to provide less than 24-hours’ notice of a meeting. This provision, like all other provisions of the open meetings law, must be construed in favor of providing the public with
the fullest and most complete information about governmental affairs as is compatible with
the conduct of governmental business. Wis. Stat. § 19.81(1), (4). If there is any doubt whether
“good cause” exists, the governmental body should provide the full 24-hour notice.

Every public notice of a meeting must give the time, date, place and subject matter of
the meeting, and the notice must be in such a form so as to reasonably apprise the public of
this information. Wis. Stat. § 19.84(2). The notice requirement gives the public information
about the business to be conducted that will alert them to the importance of the meeting, so
that they can make an informed decision whether to attend. State ex rel. Badke v. Vill. Bd. of
Vill. of Greendale, 173 Wis. 2d 553, 573–78, 494 N.W.2d 408 (1993).

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, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, and maintains an Open
Meetings Law Compliance Guide on its website.

Thank you for your correspondence. We are dedicated to the work necessary to
preserve Wisconsin’s proud tradition of open government. If you have additional questions or
concerns, or if you wish to provide additional context to your question, DOJ maintains a
Public Records Open Meetings (PROM) help line to respond to individuals’ open government
questions. The PROM telephone number is (608) 267-2220.

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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 29, 2022

Tina Bradle
MTBRADLE1@gmail.com

Dear Tina Bradle:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated February 2, 2022, regarding your January 6, 2022 public records request to the Town of Freedom’s clerk for “information on any $$ given to the Town chair for anything above and beyond his normal town board duties, any/all information (bids, purchase agreement) on a tractor the town purchased.” You wrote, “To date, I have not received any acknowledgement.”


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”).

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); 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.

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, the Attorney General normally 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.

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:
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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 29, 2022

Steven Foster
sfoster354@gmail.com

Dear Steven Foster:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated January 10, 2022, regarding your public records request to the Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) for “competitive bidding records for Control Works Inc.” You wrote, “I’ve made multiple requests for this information, but so far Madison Metropolitan School District has ignored my request.” You asked if DOJ “can obtain the information” for you.


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).

In your correspondence you wrote, “MMSD sent me 2 files showing that Control Works Inc. made $940,828 so far this year. They haven’t sent me the information showing how much of the $940,828 was awarded as a result of winning competitive bids.” 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). 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.

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 & 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 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, the Attorney General normally 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 29, 2022

Cynthia Mathews
iamcynthiamathews@gmail.com

Dear Cynthia Mathews:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated September 28, 2021, regarding your public records request to the Monroe County Clerk of Courts. You wrote, “They charged me $1.25 a page for a total of $12.50 for emailing me two criminal complaints. . . . I am unsure why I have to pay for copy fees when there was no ink or paper used.” You asked DOJ to “[p]lease investigate this.”


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, 341 Wis. 2d 607, 815 N.W.2d 367 (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 choose to provide copies of a requested record without charging fees or by reducing fees where an authority determines that waiver or reduction of the fee is in the public interest. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(e).

The law permits an authority to impose a fee for locating records if the cost is $50.00 or more. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(c). An authority may require a requester prepay any such fees 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 should be based on the pay rate (including fringe benefits) 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/news-releases/office-open-government-advisory-charging-fees-under-wisconsin-public-records-law).

There may be other laws outside of the public records law establishing fees for the records in question, potentially rendering those fees permissible under the public records law. See Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3) (allowing fees outside the public records law if those fees are established by another law). Examples include Wis. Stat. § 814.61(10)(a) (court records), Wis. Stat. § 59.43(2)(b) (land records recorded by registers of deeds), and Wis. Stat. § 6.36(6) (authorizing fees for copies of the official statewide voter registration list).

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.

If you would like to learn more about the public records 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 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government
Brandon Moore
brandonmoore.pare@gmail.com

Dear Brandon Moore:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated January 25, 2022, regarding “access to Wisconsin counties GIS data.” You wrote, “While some counties freely provide this data, others require a $50 fee. . . . I can understand the need for a fee to cover computation and employee time costs if the data needed to be manipulated prior to shipment, however the data I am requesting is in the original raw format which doesn’t need manipulation. Any guidance you can provide would be greatly appreciated.”


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, 341 Wis. 2d 607, 815 N.W.2d 367 (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 choose to provide copies of a requested record without charging fees or by reducing fees where an authority determines that waiver or reduction of the fee is in the public interest. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(e).

The law permits an authority to impose a fee for locating records if the cost is $50.00 or more. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(c). An authority may require a requester prepay any such fees 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 should be based on the pay rate (including fringe benefits) 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/news-releases/office-open-government-advisory-charging-fees-under-wisconsin-public-records-law).

There may be other laws outside of the public records law establishing fees for the records in question, potentially rendering those fees permissible under the public records law. See Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3) (allowing fees outside the public records law if those fees are established by another law). However, the Office of Open Government (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.

If you would like to learn more about the public records 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 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 29, 2022

Karen Stollenwerk
ksranch@tds.net

Dear Karen Stollenwerk:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated October 18, 2021, in which you asked, “Are township employee applications, resumes and references for town clerk/treasure available through open records request?”


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).

Generally, personnel-related records, such as employee applications, resumes, and references, are subject to disclosure under the public records law. Wisconsin Stat. § 19.36(7) pertains to identities of applicants for public positions. Wisconsin Stat. § 19.36(10) addresses the treatment of certain employee personnel records and provides that certain records and information cannot be disclosed. 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. It is important to note that all exceptions to disclosure under the public records law must be construed narrowly.

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 & 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).

If you would like to learn more about the public records 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 Public Records Law, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.31 to 19.39, and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide on its website.

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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 30, 2022

Ross Corbett
rosswcorbett@gmail.com

Dear Ross Corbett:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated March 16, 2022, regarding your wife’s request to the Hammond Police Department for a copy of “the police report from [your brother-in-law’s] injury. You wrote, “The chief of police Rick Coletrain has denied her request for this document stating he doesn’t know her and there isn’t much in the report.” You “would like to get a copy of this report.”

The DOJ 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. While a portion of your correspondence pertained to the public records law, it also discussed a matter outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities. As a result, we are unable to offer you assistance or insight regarding matters outside this scope. We can, however, provide you with some general information about the public records law that we hope you will find helpful.

The 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 employees. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Waunakee Cmty. 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).
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).

If your wife has not already done so, I suggest that she submit her public records request in writing to the police department. If the police department denies the written request, in whole or part, the police department is required to provide your wife, as the requester, with a written statement of the reasons for denying the written request. The public records law’s enforcement provisions are also available to a requester if the request is in writing.

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, the Attorney General normally 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,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 30, 2022

Tanya Jacobson
tweisser1973@gmail.com

Dear Tanya Jacobson:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated January 4, 2022, in which you wrote, “[T]he Village of Dallas is currently running meetings without enough board members and changing the scheduled meeting time without notifying the public.”

The DOJ 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. While a portion of your correspondence pertained to the open meetings law, it also discussed a matter outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities. As a result, we are unable to offer you assistance or insight regarding matters outside this scope. We can, however, provide you with some general information about the open meetings law that we hope you will 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).

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. *Id.* 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).

Every public notice of a meeting must give the time, date, place and subject matter of the meeting, and the notice must be in such a form so as to reasonably apprise the public of this information. Wis. Stat. § 19.84(2). The notice requirement gives the public information about the business to be conducted that will alert them to the importance of the meeting, so that they can make an informed decision whether to attend. *State ex rel. Badke v. Vill. Bd. of Vill. of Greendale*, 173 Wis. 2d 553, 573–78, 494 N.W.2d 408 (1993).

Whether the notice is specific enough is determined on a case-specific basis, based on a reasonableness standard. *State ex rel. Buswell v. Tomah Area Sch. Dist.*, 2007 WI 71, ¶¶ 27–29, 301 Wis. 2d 178, 732 N.W.2d 804. This includes analyzing such factors as the burden of providing more detailed notice, whether the subject is of particular public interest, and whether it involves non-routine action that the public would be unlikely to anticipate. *Id.* ¶ 28. There may be less need for specificity where a meeting subject occurs frequently, because members of the public are more likely to anticipate that the meeting subject will be addressed, but novel issues may require more specific notice. *Id.* ¶ 31.

A governmental body, when conducting a meeting, is free to discuss any aspect of any subject identified in the public notice of that meeting, as well as issues reasonably related to that subject, but may not address any topics that are not reasonably related to the information in the notice. *Buswell*, 2007 WI 71, ¶ 34. There is no requirement, however, that a governmental body must follow the agenda in the order listed on the meeting notice, unless a particular agenda item has been noticed for a specific time. Stencil Correspondence (Mar. 6, 2008). Nor is a governmental body required to actually discuss every item contained in the public notice. It is reasonable, in appropriate circumstances, for a body to cancel a previously planned discussion or postpone it to a later date. Black Correspondence (Apr. 22, 2009); Krueger Correspondence (Feb. 13, 2019).

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, Wis. Stat. §§ 19.81 to 19.98, 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,

[Signature]

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:lah
September 30, 2022

Kelly Rauch
krauch70@gmail.com

Dear Kelly Rauch:

The Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ) is in receipt of your correspondence, dated January 25, 2022, in which you wrote that you are “looking for assistance regarding a Town Chairman and Town Board Violating Town Ordinances and State Statutes.” You wrote, the Chairman held “a closed session meeting with the board under statute 19.85 (1)(b) without giving me notice. . . . He and his staff have violated ‘Open Records Request Law’ by refusing me copies of the Town budget for 2021 and 2022, Summary of expenses and revenues for the budget of 2021 (12/20/21), and has refused me copies of my personnel file (12/16/21).”

The DOJ 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. While a portion of your correspondence pertained to the open meetings law and public records law, it also discussed a matter outside the scope of the OOG’s responsibilities. As a result, we are unable to offer you assistance or insight regarding Wis. Stat. §§ 60.30(1e)(f) and 17.001, the Town of Cable Ordinance #45-22, and the Town’s grievance policy and process. We can, however, provide you with some general information about the open meetings law and public records law that we hope you will 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).

Wisconsin 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).

Under Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(b), a closed session is authorized for “[c]onsidering dismissal, demotion, licensing or discipline of any public employee or person licensed by a board or commission or the investigation of charges against such person, ... and the taking of formal action on any such matter.” If a closed session for such a purpose will include an evidentiary hearing or final action, then the governmental body must give the public employee actual notice of that closed hearing and/or closed final action. Evidentiary hearings are characterized by the formal examination of charges and by taking testimony and receiving evidence in support or defense of specific charges that may have been made. See 66 Op. Att’y Gen. 211, 214 (1977). Where actual notice is required, the notice must state that the person has a right to request that any such evidentiary hearing or final action be conducted in open session. If the person makes such a request, the governmental body may not conduct an evidentiary hearing or take final action in closed session.

However, those provisions on actual notice to the employee would not apply unless the governmental body goes into closed session under Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(b). See Johnson Correspondence (February 27, 2009). In other words, Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(b) requires actual notice to the public employee in question only if the contemplated closed session will include an evidentiary hearing or final action. Id. In other circumstances, no actual notice would be required under Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(b). Id.

The 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 employees. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Waunakee Cmty. 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).

Generally, personnel-related records, including disciplinary records, are subject to disclosure under the public records law. Wisconsin Stat. § 19.36(10) addresses the treatment of certain employee personnel records and provides that certain such records cannot be disclosed. However, like all exceptions to disclosure under the public records law, these must be construed narrowly.
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).

Regarding enforcement of the open meetings law, the Attorney General and the district attorneys have authority to enforce the law. Wis. Stat. § 19.97(1). The Attorney General is authorized to enforce the open meetings law; however, the Attorney General normally exercises this authority in cases 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 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).

Regarding enforcement of the public records law, 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, the Attorney General normally exercises this authority in cases presenting novel issues of law that coincide with matters of statewide concern. Again, 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.
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 public records law and open meetings law and maintains a Public Records Law Compliance Guide and 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. § 19.39 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