ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 31, 2006

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

OR2006-01014

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# 241261.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information related to a specified contract and related records and inspection reports. You claim that the requested 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]

To the extent any additional information existed on the date the department received this request, we assume it has been released. If the department has not released any such records, it must release them to the requestor at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes

[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 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.

that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances).

We note that the submitted Traffic Control Devices Inspection Reports are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from required disclosure unless they "are expressly confidential under other law." This section provides in pertinent part:

> (a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, 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, excepted as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Therefore, the department may only withhold this information if it is confidential under other law. Although you argue that the information is excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception and, as such, is not other law for purposes of section 552.022. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 may be waived). Thus, this information may not be withheld under section 552.111.

However, the department also contends the information is excepted from disclosure under section 409 of title 23 of the United States 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 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. Co.*, 965 F.2d 155, 160 (7th Cir. 1992); *Robertson v. Union Pac. R.R. Co.*, 954 F.2d 1433, 1435 (8th Cir. 1992). We agree that section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code is other law for purposes of section 552.022(a) of the Government Code. *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).

You state that the submitted information was created or is maintained by the department for highway safety purposes. Furthermore, you inform us that the FM 44 is part of the National Highway System under section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code and is therefore a federal-aid highway within the meaning of section 409. Furthermore, the department indicates that section 409 of title 23 would protect the submitted information from discovery in civil litigation. Based on your representations and upon review, we conclude that the department may withhold the information at issue in its entirety pursuant to 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, 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 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 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,

Candice M. De La Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CMD/krl

Ref: ID# 241261

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sherri L. Davis
Chamberlain & McHaney
P. O. Box 684158
Austin, Texas 78768-4158
(w/o enclosures)