



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 28, 2017

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

OR2017-04298

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# 647400.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for all safety analyses and safety improvements made on a specified highway in specified locations.¹ You state you have no information responsive to a portion of the request.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under section 409 of title 23 of the

¹You state the department sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²The 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), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

United States Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we note the submitted fatal crash review form and fatality report are completed reports 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 you seek 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 Gov’t Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the department may not withhold the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.103 or section 552.111. However, you also contend 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 information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code 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 for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at

³We 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.

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 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.

You state the roadway to which the information at issue pertains is eligible for federal aid under section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code, and, thus, is a federal-aid highway for the purposes of section 409 of title 23. You also state the information at issue was compiled for highway safety purposes. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the department may withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. You claim the information at issue 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. Upon review, we find section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code would protect the information at issue from discovery in civil litigation. Thus, based on your representations and our review, we find with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. See *id.* § 552.107(1). 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. 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 “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. 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. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a 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. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). 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 remaining information consists of communications involving attorneys for the department and department employees. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information. Accordingly, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. With the exception of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) 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.

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, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MJC', written over a light blue horizontal line.

Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/sb

Ref: ID# 647400

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)