



March 13, 2002

Ms. Janice Mullenix  
Texas Department of Transportation  
Dewitt C. Greer State Highway Building  
125 East 11th Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2002-1218

Dear Ms. Mullenix:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 159816.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received two requests for information regarding a railroad crossing at FM 516 and Business Interstate 20. The first requestor seeks "complete information, including any pictures or reports, on any work that has been done concerning" the railroad crossing from November 1, 2000 to May 11, 2001. The second requestor seeks "all documents, agreements, letters, notes, or plans relating to any agreement entered into between [the department] and the city of Barstow or Union Pacific Railroad regarding the installation of any railroad signal warning lights/gates at" the railroad crossing. You contend that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code.

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information is made expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant 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:

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body;

...

(5) all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]

The submitted information contains estimates and a contract relating to the expenditure of public funds which are expressly public under section 552.022(a). Therefore, you may only withhold this information if the information is confidential under other law. Although you argue that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code, section 552.111 is a discretionary exception and therefore is not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.<sup>1</sup> However, you also contend that the submitted information is confidential 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 [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. 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, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we conclude that the department must withhold the estimates and the contract under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code.

As to the remaining information, you claim that the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 because it would be privileged from discovery under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." Federal courts have stated that section 409 excludes from

---

<sup>1</sup>Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (governmental body may waive litigation exception, section 552.103), 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)), 592 at 8 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104, information relating to competition or bidding), 549 at 6 (1990) (governmental body may waive informer's privilege), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Discretionary exceptions therefore do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

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 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992); *Robertson v. Union Pac. R.R. Co.*, 954 F.2d 1433, 1435 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992).

You characterize the information that the department seeks to withhold as "intraagency memoranda." You further assert that section 409 of title 23 would protect this information from discovery in civil litigation. You therefore contend that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. The records you submitted to this office include communications with third parties, including other governmental bodies, affected by the railroad crossing to which the information pertains. We note that section 552.111 protects communications with third parties with which the department shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Open Records Decision Nos. 464 (1987), 429 (1985); *see also Wu v. National Endowment of the Humanities*, 460 F.2d 1030 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.), *cert. denied*, 410 U.S. 926 (1972). Based on your representations and our review of the submitted documents, we conclude that the information at issue would be protected from discovery in litigation under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. Therefore, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government 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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body

fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 Department of Public 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Karen A. Eckerle  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KAE/RWP/sdk

Ref: ID# 159491

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Roddy L. Harrison  
P.O. Box 1908  
Pecos, Texas 79772-1908  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kathleen McCulloch  
Shafer, Davis, Ashley, O'Leary & Stoker  
P.O. Box 1552  
Odessa, Texas 79760-1552  
(w/o enclosures)