



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 28, 2005

Mr. Charles H. Weir
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2005-00844

Dear Mr. Weir:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 217650.

The San Antonio Fire Department (the "department") received a request for a copy of the audio recording of a specific 9-1-1 telephone call placed to the department. You claim that the submitted 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.

Subsections 552.301(a) and (b) of the Government Code provide:

(a) A governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold from public disclosure and that it considers to be within one of the [act's] exceptions . . . must ask for a decision from the attorney general about whether the information is within that exception if there has not been a previous determination about whether the information falls within one of the exceptions.

(b) The governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the 10th business day after the date of receiving the written request.

The department received the request for information on October 4, 2004. You did not request a decision from this office until November 19, 2004. Consequently, you failed to request a decision within the ten business day period mandated by section 552.301(a) of the Government Code. Because the request for a decision was not timely submitted, the requested information is presumed to be public information. Gov't Code § 552.302.

In order to overcome the presumption that the requested information is public information, a governmental body must provide compelling reasons why the information should not be disclosed. *Id.*; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when the information is confidential by another source of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (presumption of openness overcome by a showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests). Because you raise two other sources of law, section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, we will address your arguments.

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 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 department may withhold requested protected health information from the public only if an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” You argue that the release of the information at issue is governed by the provisions of section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, the Emergency Medical Services Act, provides:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(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 § 773.091(a), (b), (g).

You state that the submitted information, a recording of a conversation between a caller and a department dispatcher, “appears to be of the sort contemplated by subsection 773.091(a).” You also state that the dispatcher is a certified paramedic in the EMS Division of the department. However, after reviewing the submitted audio tapes, we conclude that the tapes do not consist of a communication between certified emergency medical services personnel providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient. *See* Health & Safety § 773.091(a). Furthermore, the tapes do not consist of a record of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel providing medical supervision that were created by the emergency medical services personnel or maintained by an emergency medical services provider. *See* Health & Safety § 773.091(b). The submitted tapes consist of a record of the

department's attempts to locate the caller and not of medical treatment, supervision, or evaluation. Accordingly, section 773.091 does not apply and the department must release the submitted information.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Amanda Crawford".

Amanda Crawford
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 217650

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Julie Buss
c/o Charles H. Weir
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966
(w/o enclosures)