



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2015

Ms. Amy L. Sims  
Deputy City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Lubbock  
P.O. Box 2000  
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2015-06197

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 558356 (Lubbock File No. 1080).

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for six categories of information related to a specified accident, including 1) all personnel files related to individuals who service a specified vehicle; 2) all maintenance and repair orders for a specified vehicle; 3) all payments made for parts and services related to the repair and maintenance of a specified vehicle; and 4) all records related to the types of repairs, parts ordered, maintenance performed, or identities of personnel who worked on specified vehicles. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you did not submit any information responsive to category two, three, or four described above. Further, you have not indicated that such information does not exist or that you wish to withhold any such information from disclosure. Therefore, to the extent information responsive to this aspect of the request exists, we assume the city has released it to the requestor. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that

if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) for the submitted information. 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, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent 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 the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *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 not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Family and Medical Leave Act (the “FMLA”). *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 *et seq.* Section 825.500 of chapter V of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Subsection (g) of section 825.500 states:

[r]ecords and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees’ family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files. . . . If the [Americans

with Disabilities Act (the “ADA”), as amended, is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements . . . , except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee’s physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is confidential under section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Further, we find none of the release provisions of the FMLA apply to this information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, which states, in part, “for a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual’s protected health information . . . is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].” Health & Safety Code § 181.006(2). Section 181.001(a) states, “[u]nless otherwise defined in this chapter, each term that is used in this chapter has the meaning assigned by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and Privacy Standards [(“HIPAA”).” *Id.* § 181.001(a). Accordingly, as chapter 181 does not define “protected health information,” we turn to HIPAA’s definition of the term. HIPAA defines “protected health information” as individually identifiable health information that is transmitted or maintained in electronic media or any other form or medium. 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. But “protected health information” excludes individually identifiable health information in employment records held by a covered entity in its role as employer. *See id.* You state the city is a covered entity and the remaining information “may be protected health information.” We note the remaining information is contained in employment records and the city holds it in its role as an employer. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of protected health information that is confidential under section 181.006, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note the remaining information pertains to the results of drug tests administered to city employees. As this office has explained on many occasions, information involving public officials and employees and public employment is generally not private because the public has a legitimate interest in such information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 473 at 3 (1987) (fact that public employee received less than perfect or even very bad evaluation not private), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 5 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for public employee's dismissal, demotion, or promotion), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). Although the information at issue may be highly intimate or embarrassing, the public has a legitimate interest in the information. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" Gov't Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. See *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. See *id.* at 348. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA. The remaining information must be released.

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](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 "J. Behnke", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 558356

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)