



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 18, 2008

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2008-08379

Dear Ms. Alexander:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 313045.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for all documents concerning a road construction project on U.S. 380 in Wise County, Texas. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, you state that some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-00671 (2008). Accordingly, to the extent information responsive to the current request is identical to information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude that, as we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed, the department must continue to rely on that ruling as a previous determination. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

---

<sup>1</sup>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 open records letter 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.

Next, we note that the submitted information includes a Traffic Control Devices Inspection Checklist that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from required public disclosure unless they "are expressly confidential under other law." Under section 552.022(a)(1), a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body is expressly public unless it either is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly confidential under other law. Thus, the department may only withhold this information if it is confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. Although you argue that this information is excepted under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions and, as such, are not other law for purposes of section 552.022. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 subject to waiver), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 may be waived).

However, the department also contends that this information is excepted from disclosure under section 409 of title 23 of the United State Code. 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 148 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 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 determined that section 409 excludes from evidence data compiled for purposes of highway 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. Co.*, 965 F.2d 155, 160 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992); *Robertson v. Union Pac. R.R. Co.*, 954 F.2d 1433, 1435 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). We agree that this section constitutes other law for the purposes of section 552.022(a). *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001).

You inform us that the information at issue was created for the purpose of identifying and evaluating hazards on public roads. You also assert that U.S. 380 is part of the National Highway System under section 409 of title 23 of the United State Code and therefore is a federal-aid highway. Finally, you state that this section would protect the information at

issue from discovery in civil litigation. Therefore, we conclude that section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code requires the department to withhold the information that is subject to section 552.022.

Next, we address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information at issue that is not subject to section 552.022. This exception provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information *and* (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1<sup>st</sup> Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture."<sup>2</sup> *Id.* This office has concluded that a governmental body's receipt of a claim letter that it

---

<sup>2</sup>Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982)*; (2) hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982)*; and (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981)*.

represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the "TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, is sufficient to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated.

You inform us, and provide documentation showing, the department received a notice of claim concerning an incident that occurred on the roadway at issue, alleging negligence by the department with regard to traffic control devices on the Site Concrete job site. You represent that the notice of claim is in compliance with the notice requirements of the TTCA. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find that you have demonstrated that the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date of its receipt of this request for information. Furthermore, we find that the remaining information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, the department may withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the department must withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. The department may withhold the rest of the requested information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining claimed exception to disclosure.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 challenge 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Nancy E. Griffiths  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NEG/jb

Ref: ID# 313045

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Dora A. Kline  
Plaza of the Americas  
700 North Pearl Street, 25<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2832  
(w/o enclosures)