August 1, 2018

To Whom This May Concern:

In response to public records requests received by the Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ), a copy of DOJ’s Division of Criminal Investigation (DCI) investigative case file for DCI’s investigation into the May 23, 2018, shooting by Fox Crossing Police Officer Seely Moe, which resulted in the death of Joshua M. Gomoll, has been prepared for release. The Winnebago County District Attorney determined there is no basis to prosecute the law enforcement officers involved, and DCI is releasing its case file pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 175.47(5)(b).

The DCI case in question is 18-3713: Fox Crossing OID – Joshua M. Gomoll. That investigative case file has been reviewed in preparation for public release, and a copy of the case file reports has been made available online on the Wisconsin Department of Justice’s website at www.doj.state.wi.us/dci/officer-involved-critical-incident. Access to copies of related photographs, audio recordings, and video recordings may be obtained by contacting DOJ Communications Director John Koremenos at koremenosj@doj.state.wi.us.

Certain information has been redacted from the records, either because specifically required by law or pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. These redactions are described below. In addition, I have been mindful in preparing these records for release that the purpose of the Wisconsin public records law is to shed light on the workings of government and the official acts of public officers and employees. Building and Constr. Trades Council v. Wauunakee Comm. Sch. Dist., 221 Wis. 2d 575, 582, 585 N.W.2d 726 (Ct. App. 1998).

Well-established public policy recognizes the privacy rights of a deceased person’s surviving loved ones. Cf. National Archives and Records Admin. v. Favish, 541 U.S. 157, 168, 171-72 (2004). In preparing these records for release, I applied the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) public records balancing test and determined that the public interest in treating surviving loved ones of the deceased with respect for their privacy and dignity outweighed any public interest in disclosure of the following records:

- Graphic photographs/video of Joshua Gomoll at the scene and during his subsequent autopsy.
- Graphic descriptions of Mr. Gomoll’s injuries and of the scene.
In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in protecting the privacy of this family, and in facilitating cooperation with law enforcement in sensitive investigations, also outweighs any public interest in disclosure of the described records. *Cf. Linzmeyer v. Forcey*, 2002 WI 84, ¶ 38, 254 Wis. 2d 306, 646 N.W.2d 811.

Wisconsin Const. art. I, § 9m requires that crime victims be treated with “fairness, dignity and respect for their privacy.” Related Wisconsin statutes recognize that this state constitutional right must be vigorously honored by law enforcement agencies. Wis. Stat. §§ 950.01 and 950.02(4)(a). The Wisconsin Supreme Court, speaking about both Wis. Const. art. I, § 9m, and related victim rights statutes, has instructed that “justice requires that all who are engaged in the prosecution of crimes make every effort to minimize further suffering by crime victims.” *Schilling v. Crime Victim Rights Bd.*, 2005 WI 17, ¶ 26, 278 Wis. 2d 216, 692 N.W.2d 623.

In preparing these records for release, I determined by application of the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test that these public policies requiring that crime victims be treated with respect for their privacy and dignity outweighed any public interest in disclosure of the names or other personally identifying information of these individuals where present within DCI case file records. Accordingly, the names, dates of birth, addresses, driver's license numbers, and license plate numbers for these individuals have been fully redacted from the reports prior to release.

I also determined by application of the public records balancing test that the public interest in protecting the ability of law enforcement to gather information when conducting sensitive investigations and in protecting the privacy of citizens involved in those investigations outweighs any public interest in disclosure of information that could identify witnesses and other individuals referenced by witnesses. *Cf.* Wis. Stat. § 19.31; *Linzmeyer*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41. Due to the sensitive and sometimes controversial nature of officer-involved shooting incidents, public disclosure of the full names and other identifying information for individuals interviewed or mentioned during interviews could expose these individuals to unwanted public scrutiny, criticism, or pressure from outside sources, which could have a chilling effect on future witnesses' willingness to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement in investigations of similar incidents. Accordingly, the following information has been redacted from the records prepared for release:

- The names of adult witnesses/victims, Mr. Gomoll's family members, Mr. Gomoll's girlfriend, and others mentioned by interviewed individuals were redacted to initials. In instances where a family member shared the last name of Mr. Gomoll, only the first names were redacted to initials. The name of Mr. Gomoll's juvenile child has been redacted in full.

- The names of juvenile witnesses have also been redacted in full.

- The name of Mr. Gomoll's mother has not been redacted, as she has been widely reported in the media.
• Other information that would identify the above individuals, including dates of birth, home addresses, home and personal cellular telephone numbers, vehicle information, and employment information for these individuals have been redacted.

• Audio/video recordings of witness interviews.

• Mr. Gomoll's current and previous address and current employer.

In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in avoiding unnecessary intrusion into the personal lives of persons collaterally mentioned in a law enforcement report outweighs any public interest in information about the conduct of governmental affairs. Furthermore, I determined that the public interest in protecting the privacy of these individuals, and in facilitating cooperation with law enforcement in sensitive investigations, also outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this described information. Cf. Linzmeyer, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶ 38.

In addition to the overall redactions set forth thus far, certain other specific types of redactions have been made from the records prior to public release, for the reasons explained below.

Birthdates and social security numbers of individual persons have been redacted to protect against identity theft or other unauthorized use following any subsequent disclosure. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I concluded that the public policy in favor of protecting the confidentiality of this economically valuable individually identifiable information and preventing its misuse upon any subsequent disclosure, as well as the public policies outlined in Wis. Stat. §§ 801.19, 801.20, and 801.21, outweigh any public interest in disclosure of the dates of birth and social security numbers of individual persons.

Home addresses, home telephone numbers, and personal cellular telephone numbers have been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in disclosure of this information is outweighed by the public interest in the expectation of privacy on the part of individuals in their personal lives, the public policies expressed in Wis. Stat. § 19.36(10)(a) recognizing the confidentiality and privacy of the personal contact information of an employer's employees, and the public interest in protecting the sources of law enforcement information and in encouraging citizens to cooperate with law enforcement investigators without undue concern that their private lives will become public matters. Cf. Wis. Stat. § 19.31; Linzmeyer, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41.

Pursuant to the federal Driver's Privacy Protection Act (DPPA), which prohibits release of personal information and highly restricted personal information in response to a public records request, personal information, as defined in DPPA, contained within the DCI records that was obtained from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (DOT) Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) database has been redacted. See 18 U.S.C. § 2721 et seq.; New Richmond News v. City of New Richmond, 2016 WI App 43, 370 Wis. 2d 75, 881 N.W.2d 339.
Wisconsin Department of Transportation (DOT) files, accessed through the Wisconsin Department of Justice TIME System, which are provided to law enforcement personnel only and require training and certification to access, have been redacted when contained in the investigative file in their original format, and where the information contained within those records is provided within the investigative report. I concluded that disclosure of such information by DOJ would significantly impair future information sharing and other cooperative law enforcement efforts between DOJ and other government agencies. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I concluded the public interest in ensuring law enforcement access to DOT records and in cooperating with other government and law enforcement agencies outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this information. Cf. Linzmeyer, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39; see also 18 U.S.C. § 2721 et seq.; New Richmond News, 370 Wis. 2d 75.

The name of the officer who piloted the Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (drone) has been redacted to protect against identity theft or other unauthorized use following any subsequent disclosure. Disclosure of the name would permit access to personally identifiable information about this officer. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I concluded that the public interest in protecting the confidentiality of this officer's personally identifiable information and preventing its misuse upon any subsequent disclosure and in the expectation of privacy on the part of individuals in their personal lives outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this information. Additionally, well-established public policy recognizing the confidentiality and privacy of the personal contact information of an employer's employees is expressed in Wis. Stat. § 19.36(10)(a). Because disclosure of the officer's name would permit access to the officer's personal contact information, I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of personal contact information outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this information.

Specific details regarding SWAT and tactical team assignments for officers involved in this incident have been redacted to preserve the security and effectiveness of these law enforcement techniques. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I determined that the public interest in effective investigation of crime and protection of public safety, including protecting the ability of law enforcement to respond in emergency situations without jeopardizing officer safety or undermining officer effectiveness by revealing their equipment and techniques, outweighs any public interest in disclosure. Cf. Wis. Stat. § 19.31; Linzmeyer, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41.

Information containing specific details regarding weapons assigned to law enforcement personnel has been redacted to preserve the safety, security, and effectiveness of the law enforcement officers. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I determined that the public interest in effective investigation of crime and protection of public safety, including protecting the ability of law enforcement to respond in emergency situations without jeopardizing officer safety or undermining officer effectiveness by revealing their equipment and techniques, outweighs any public interest in disclosure. Cf. Wis. Stat. § 19.31; Linzmeyer, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41.

Crime Laboratory records have been redacted pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.79(1). In accordance with Wis. Stat. § 165.79(1), information present within DCI case reports that
discloses what analyses were performed by the Crime Laboratory and the results of those analyses also has been redacted from the records prior to release.

Fox Crossing police officers and firefighters provided initial medical assessment and treatment of Mr. Gomoll at the scene. Emergency medical personnel from Gold Cross Ambulance subsequently responded to the shooting scene to provide medical care for Mr. Gomoll. Specific information regarding the medical assessment of Mr. Gomoll, as observed or reported by law enforcement, the EMT personnel, or other witnesses, has been redacted from the records in accordance with Wis. Stat. §§ 256.15(12) and 146.82(5)(c). To the extent the information is not directly governed by Wis. Stat. §§ 256.15(12) and 146.82(5)(c), in applying the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test, I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of personal medical information, as well as the analogous restrictions on release of patient treatment information described under Wis. Stat. § 256.15(12), outweigh any public interest in disclosure of this information.

Specific information identifying routine shifts worked by law enforcement officers and first responders has been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test in the interest of preserving the safety of the officers, the officers' families, and the officers' homes. In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in protecting the security of the officers, the officers' families, and the officers' homes outweighs any public interest in information regarding their routine shifts. Details regarding the specific shifts worked by the officers involved in the May 23, 2018 shooting incident have not been redacted from the records.

Descriptions of emotional distress exhibited by Officer Moe at the scene have been redacted in part to protect his privacy, pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. Release of the descriptions would revictimize him and adversely impact his preparation to return to his law enforcement duties. In applying the balancing test, I concluded the public interest in respect for crime victims and in effective law enforcement outweighs any public interest in disclosure. Cf. Wis. Stat. § 19.31; Lenzmeyer, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41.

As documented in the DCI case file, squad video recordings from the officers responding to the scene of the officer-involved shooting were collected by DCI for review. Due to space constraints, the very large investigatory file, and the time necessary to review and redact this material, squad video that does not depict scenes of investigatory interest are not included in this release. DCI's review of these recordings is documented in individual reports within the DCI case file.

Specific information that reveals the location and type of residential security equipment maintained by Mr. Gomoll's family has been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. I determined that the public interest in protecting the security of these residences and the people who live there outweighs any public interest in detailed information regarding these residences' security systems.

DCI report number 18-3713/21 documents DOJ's receipt of the provisional autopsy findings for Mr. Gomoll. Mr. Gomoll's autopsy was conducted for Winnebago County by the Milwaukee County Medical Examiner's Office. The DCI report documenting receipt of these records is included with the release; however, the records attached to these reports, which
were provided by the medical examiner's office, have been wholly redacted from the release. Those records were provided to DOJ on the condition that the reports would not be shared with any person outside the criminal investigation, and the medical examiner's offices would not provide the reports to DOJ without DOJ's agreement to those conditions. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I determined there is a public interest in honoring the conditions under which the medical examiner's records were provided to DOJ and in cooperating with the medical examiner's offices so as to encourage the current and future joint law enforcement efforts of our agencies. To not honor the conditions by disclosing the records would preclude future record-sharing and significantly impair cooperative law enforcement efforts between DOJ and the Milwaukee County Medical Examiner's Office. I concluded that the public interest in effective investigation of crime and effective law enforcement, which is furthered by honoring the conditions under which the medical examiner's office provided their records to DOJ, outweighs any public interest in disclosure of the autopsy records. Cf. Linzmeyer, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶ 30, 32, 39. If desired, medical examiner's records may be requested directly from the records custodian at the medical examiner's office.

I redacted medical information pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. Well-established public policy recognizing the confidentiality and privacy of personal medical information is expressed in Wis. Stat. § 146.82. Although Wis. Stat. § 146.82 does not directly govern the medical information included in these records, I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of personal medical information outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this information. See also John K. MacIver Inst. for Pub. Policy, Inc. v. Erpenbach, 2014 WI App 49, ¶ 19 & n.4, 354 Wis. 2d 591, 849 N.W.2d 888 (observing that “[p]ersonal finance or health information” may be subject to redaction as “purely personal” in an email that otherwise is subject to disclosure).

Only one copy of records for which duplicate copies exist has been included with the records prepared for release. Stone v. Bd. of Regents, 2007 WI App 223, ¶ 20, 305 Wis. 2d 679, 741 N.W.2d 774.

The law permits DOJ to impose fees for certain “actual, necessary and direct” costs associated with responding to public records requests. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3). Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(f), DOJ may require prepayment for the costs of locating (if applicable), copying, and mailing the requested records if the total amount exceeds $5.00. Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(e), in this instance, DOJ is waiving its fees, and therefore, the records are being made available online at this time without any payment required.

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b), this determination is subject to review by mandamus under Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1) or upon application to a district attorney or the Attorney General.

Sincerely,

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government
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