



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 5, 2009

Ms. Pauline E. Higgins  
Senior Vice President  
General Counsel  
Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County  
P.O. Box 61429  
Houston, Texas 77208-1429

OR2009-13938

Dear Ms. Higgins:

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# 357371.

The Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County ("METRO") received a request for twenty-seven categories of information pertaining to a specified request for proposal, the project relating to the request for proposal, and negotiations between METRO and Parsons Transportation Group, Inc. ("Parsons"). You state METRO has no information responsive to categories fourteen, sixteen, twenty, twenty-five, and twenty-six of the request.<sup>1</sup> You also state METRO will release most of the responsive information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.110, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you indicate release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Parsons, Washington Group Management ("Washington Group"), and Fluor Corporation d/b/a Bayou City Transit Team ("Bayou City"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified these companies of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from Parsons. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, part of which is a representative sample.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.103 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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office are 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.

claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>3</sup> Open Records Decision No. 555; *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state Manhattan Construction Company ("Manhattan"), through its attorney, has threatened litigation relating to the project at issue in the request. You also state Manhattan's attorney, in correspondence addressed to METRO, alleged Parsons had breached an agreement between Manhattan and Parsons and questioned METRO's award of the contract to Parsons. Further, you inform us Manhattan and Parsons are involved in pending arbitration pertaining to METRO's award of the contract to Parsons. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree that based on the totality of the circumstances, METRO reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. Furthermore, we find the submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Thus, METRO may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the 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 must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

---

<sup>3</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); 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 threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Ana Carolina Vieira  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACV/eeg

Ref: ID# 357371

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Guyer  
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.  
100 M. Street SE, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20003  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Stoppenhagen  
Fluor Corporation/Bayou City Transit Team  
One Floor Daniel Drive  
Sugarland, Texas 77478  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregory Therrien  
Washington Group Management Co.  
P.O. Box 73  
Boise, Idaho 89729  
(w/o enclosures)