ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 12, 2004

Ms. Sharon Alexander
Associate General Counsel
Texas Department of Transoportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2004-8638

Dear Ms. Alexander:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 210947.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for the following: 1) any lane closure permits issued by WW Webber for closing lanes on IH45 South, south of FM 739 near Angus, Texas for July 16, 2004 and 2) barricade summary sheets for the IH 45 project in Navarro County. You claim that the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[1]

Initially, we note that you have only submitted Traffic Control Devices Inspection Reports, which you indicate are responsive to the second portion of the request, for our review. However, you have not submitted information responsive to the first portion of the request. To the extent such information existed when the department received this request, we presume you have released it. If you have not, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (concluding that

[1] We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This ruling does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

section 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be released as soon as possible under the circumstances).

Next, we note that the submitted information is made expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

> the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:
>
> > (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of completed reports. Therefore, the department may only withhold this information if it is confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Although you argue that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code, section 552.111 is a discretionary exception and, therefore, not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.[2] However, you also contend that the submitted information is confidential under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code, which is "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also Pierce County v. Guillen*, 123 S.Ct. 720 (2003) (upholding constitutionality of section 409, relied upon by county in denying request under state's Public Disclosure Act).

Section 409 provides as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential accident sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings, pursuant to sections 130, 144, and 152 of this title or for the purpose of developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented utilizing Federal-aid highway funds shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other

---

[2] Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.111); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Discretionary exceptions therefore do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

> purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.

23 U.S.C. § 409. Federal courts have determined that section 409 excludes from evidence data compiled for purposes of highway and railroad crossing safety enhancement and construction for which a state receives federal funding, in order to facilitate candor in administrative evaluations of highway safety hazards and to prevent federally-required record-keeping from being used for purposes of private litigation. *See Harrison v. Burlington N. R.R.*, 965 F.2d 155, 160 (7th Cir. 1992); *Robertson v. Union Pac. R.R.*, 954 F.2d 1433, 1435 (8th Cir. 1992).

You state that "Interstate 45 is part of the National Highway System under 23 U.S.C. § 103 and therefore is a federal-aid highway within the meaning of 23 U.S.C. § 409." You assert that section 409 of title 23 would protect the submitted information from discovery in civil litigation. Upon review, we conclude that the department must withhold the submitted information under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 210947

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Linda Garner
Robert M. Hagy, Legal Investigations
P.O. Box 790272
San Antonio, Texas 78279-0272
(w/o enclosures)