



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 27, 2006

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

OR2006-01895

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# 243137.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received two requests for information relating to an accident that occurred on Highway 90 in San Antonio and a contract involving the highway. You have submitted information that the department seeks to withhold under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code and section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. We have considered your arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.¹

We note that one of the of the submitted documents is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," unless the information is expressly confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may

¹This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative samples of information are truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling neither reaches nor authorizes the department to withhold any information that is substantially different from the submitted information. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.111 subject to waiver). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.111 are not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the department may not withhold any information contained in the document that is subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.111.

You also contend, however, that the information in question is confidential under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. Section 409 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 23 U.S.C. § 409, relied on by county in denying request under state’s Public Disclosure Act). Section 409 provides that

[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying [sic] 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 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. You state that Highway 90 is part of the National Highway System under section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code and thus is a federal-aid highway for purposes of section 409 of title 23. You also state that the information that is subject to section 552.022 was created for highway safety purposes. Based on your representations, we conclude that the information in question is confidential by law under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. Therefore, the department must withhold that information under the federal law.

With respect to the rest of the submitted information, we address your claim under section 552.103. 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). A governmental body that seeks to withhold information under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information at issue. 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 [1st 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."² *Id.* This office has concluded that a governmental body's receipt of a claim letter that it 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. If this representation is not made, then the receipt of the claim letter is a factor that we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996).*

You have enclosed a copy of a notice of claim that was submitted to the department. You inform us that the department received the notice prior to its receipt of these requests for information and that the notice meets the requirements of the TTCA. You state that the submitted information relates to the incident and the location that are the subject of the notice. Based on your representations, the notice of claim, and our review of the remaining

²Among 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 ("EEOC"), *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)*.

information, we conclude that the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

In reaching this conclusion, we assume that the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation have not seen or had access to any of the remaining information. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that relates to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). If the opposing parties have seen or had access to information that relates to anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We further note that the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary: (1) the department must withhold the information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code; and (2) the department may withhold the rest of the submitted information under section 552.103.

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,

³As we are able to make this determination, we do not address your claim under section 552.111.


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,



James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/sdk

Ref: ID# 243137

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rafael Mogollan
Frontier Adjustors
P.O. Box 681293
San Antonio, Texas 78268-1293
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gerald R. Zwernemann
Thornton, Biechlin, Segrato, Reynolds & Guerra, L.C.
100 N.E. Loop 410, 5th Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78216-4741
(w/o enclosures)