



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 15, 2015

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

OR2015-07330

Dear Ms. Parker:

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# 564474.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for eight categories of information relating to a specified fatal motor vehicle crash. The department states it does not have information responsive to some categories of the request.<sup>1</sup> The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. Additionally, the department states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of NTE Mobility Partners Segments 3, LLC ("NTE"). Accordingly, the department states, and provides documentation showing, it notified NTE of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

comments from NTE and North Tarrant Infrastructure, LLC. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, we note the submitted information contains Traffic Control Inspection Checklists. This information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for 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 the Act or other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). Although the department seeks to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, sections 552.103 and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *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 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 or section 552.111. However, the department also contends the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. We note section 409 is “other law” that makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also Pierce County v. Guillen*, 537 U.S. 129 (2003) (upholding constitutionality of section 409, relied on by county in denying request under state’s Public Disclosure Act). Accordingly, we will consider the department’s argument under section 409 for the information at issue. Further, we will consider the department’s arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.111 for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

The department contends the Traffic Control Inspection Checklists are excepted from disclosure under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. Section 409 provides:

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

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 stated 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); *see also Pierce*, 537 U.S. at 129.

The department states the information at issue was created for highway safety purposes. The department also states the subject roadway 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 for the purposes of section 409 of title 23. Based upon the department's representations and our review, we conclude the department may withhold the Traffic Control Inspection Checklists pursuant to section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(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 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 is 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, orig. proceeding); *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). The governmental body must

meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

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 demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

The department states, prior to its receipt of the instant request, it reasonably anticipated litigation when it was made aware of a notice of representation and notice to preserve evidence received by the department's contractor on the highway where the fatal motor vehicle crash occurred. Thus, we find the department reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We also find the department has established the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, we agree the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded or is no longer anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

In summary, the department may withhold the Traffic Control Inspection Checklists pursuant to section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. The department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining submitted argument against disclosure of this information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 564474

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

NTE Mobility Partners Segments 3  
North Tarrant Infrastructure  
c/o Ms. Marilyn Montano  
Jackson Walker, LLP  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)