



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 1, 2011

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

OR2011-01671

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# 407825.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for fifteen categories of information pertaining to a specified location and a specified traffic accident. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code and section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note that the submitted traffic control devices inspection report, which you have labeled Exhibit B, is 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." 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

¹We 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.

information if it is confidential under other law. Although you raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.111 is a discretionary exception and therefore not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. See Open Records Decision No. 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 may be waived).

However, you also contend the report is excepted from disclosure under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code, which 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.*, 965 F.2d 155, 160 (7th Cir. 1992); *Robertson v. Union Pac. R.R.*, 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 information at issue was "created for the purpose of identifying and evaluating hazards on public roads." You also inform us that the roadway at issue 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 states that section 409 of title 23 would protect the information at issue from discovery in civil litigation. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude that the department may withhold Exhibit B pursuant to section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or

documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the memorandum submitted as Exhibit C was prepared by a department employee and communicated to her supervisor for transmission to the department’s attorney in connection with litigation to which the department is a party. You state the communication was confidential and that the department has not waived confidentiality. Accordingly, we conclude the department may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold Exhibit B pursuant to section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. The department may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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.

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, 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,



Kate Hartfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/em

Ref: ID# 407825

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)