



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 23, 2004

Ms. Patrice Fogarty
City Secretary
City of Missouri City
1522 Texas Parkway
Missouri City, Texas 77489-2170

OR2004-9973

Dear Ms. Fogarty:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 213829.

The City of Missouri City (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information made confidential by statute. You claim that the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8, excepts the submitted information from disclosure. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 ("Privacy Rule"); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office recently addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted that section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides that a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent that such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted that the Act "is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public." *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 at 8 (2004); *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held that disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a) of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 681 at 9 (2004); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may withhold requested protected health information from the public only if an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

We note that the submitted information consists of an emergency medical services ("EMS") report that is subject to the Emergency Medical Services Act, sections 773.091 through 773.173 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 773.091 provides in relevant part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

....

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services[.]

Health & Safety Code §§ 773.091(b), (g). Thus, except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), EMS records are deemed confidential under section 773.091 and may only be released in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Health & Safety Code §§ 773.091-.094.

Confidential EMS records may be released to "any person who bears a written consent of the patient or other persons authorized to act on the patient's behalf." Health & Safety Code § 773.092(e)(4). When a patient is deceased, as is the case in this instance, his personal

representative may consent to the release of his records. *Id.* § 773.093(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 632 (1995) (defining “personal representative” for purposes of EMS Act). This consent must be written and signed by the patient, authorized representative, or personal representative and must specify (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *Id.* § 773.093(a). Section 773.093(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. However, we have no information before us from which to conclude that release to the requestor of the records at issue is authorized pursuant to section 773.092(e)(4) in this instance. Therefore, we conclude that the submitted information is subject to section 773.091 and must be withheld under section 552.101. However, as noted above, information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of the patient receiving emergency medical services is not confidential under section 773.091 and may not be withheld on that basis. Because you claim no other exception for such information and it is not otherwise confidential by law, the city must release to the requestor the listed information from the submitted EMS report.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,



Caroline E. Cho
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 213829

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Gerda Knappick
2310 Maple Crest Drive
Missouri City, Texas 77459
(w/o enclosures)