ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 29, 2008

Ms. Debra G. Rosenberg
Atlas & Hall, L.L.P.
P. O. Box 3725
McAllen, Texas 78502-3725

OR2008-05790

Dear Ms. Rosenberg:

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# 307365.

Hidalgo County (the "county"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for a specified request for proposals ("RFP") issued by the county and three bids submitted in response to this RFP. You state that you have released some information to the requestor. You claim that portions of the requested RFP are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.1175 of the Government Code.[1] While you take no position as to the public availability of the three requested bids, you contend that they may contain proprietary information subject to exception under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Accordingly, you state that you notified interested third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their bids should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have considered your arguments regarding the RFP and the information at issue.

[1]Although you did not timely raise sections 552.117 or 552.1175 of the Government Code, these provisions constitute compelling reasons to withhold information, and we will address your arguments under these exceptions. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301,.302.

As stated above, you represent to this office that, pursuant to section 552.305, you sent notices to interested third parties informing them of their right to submit arguments against public disclosure of their bids. You indicate that two of these third parties objected to the release of their bids because they contain proprietary information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110. However, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, none of the interested third parties has submitted comments explaining why its information should be withheld from disclosure. Thus, none of these companies has demonstrated that any of its information is proprietary for purposes of the Act. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the information in the submitted bids on the basis of any proprietary interest that these companies may have in the information at issue.

We note, however, that one of the submitted bids contains information subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."[2] Gov't Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked within the submitted bid under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note that one of the requested bids appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). Therefore, as no exceptions to disclosure were raised regarding the remaining information within the bids, they must be released to the requestor in accordance with copyright law.

---

[2]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

We now turn to your own arguments regarding the RFP at issue. 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. This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. 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* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 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. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), 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* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.022, .003, .021. We therefore held that 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). Thus, because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the county may withhold protected health information from the public only if the information is confidential under other law or an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), which governs access to medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-165.160. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

> (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

> (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Id. § 159.002(b)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). You assert that the submitted documents, which were attached to the requested RFP, consist of medical records that must be withheld under section 552.101 and the MPA. However, you have submitted spreadsheets listing county employees' insurance coverages for our review, rather than medical records. Furthermore, you do not state, nor do you identify, that any information contained within these spreadsheets was obtained from a medical record. Accordingly, you have failed to demonstrate how the MPA applies to the RFP at issue, and no information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, while section 552.102(a) excepts from public disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" *Id.* § 552.102(a). Section 552.102 is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982) (anything relating to employee's employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person's employment relationship and is part of employee's personnel file). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, *writ ref'd n.r.e.*), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102(a) is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102(a) privacy claims together.

Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy, but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 373 (1983). For example, a public employee's allocation of his salary to a voluntary investment program or to optional insurance coverage that is offered by his employer is a personal investment decision and information about it is excepted from disclosure under the common-law right of privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990). Likewise, an employee's designation of a

retirement beneficiary is excepted from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). However, information revealing that an employee participates in a group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by the governmental body is not excepted from disclosure. *See* ORD 600 at 10.

In this instance, portions of the submitted RFP reveal personal investment decisions made by government employees. We have marked a representative sample of the type of information that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.[3] With regard to the submitted "Benefits History" spreadsheet, your brief indicates that it may contain beneficiary information concerning county employees. However, you did not identify any beneficiaries for our review. In response to this office's request that you identify the beneficiaries from this spreadsheet, you inform us that the county is unable to do so. Accordingly, we find that you have failed to establish that any of the remaining information reveals beneficiaries of county employees. Thus, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 and common-law privacy.

In summary, the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county must also withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released to the requestor, but only in accordance with copyright law.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body

---

[3]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments under sections 552.117 and 552.1175 with regards to this information.

will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 challenge 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,

Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 307365

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Joe McLaughlin
SEIU Local 5
4299 San Felipe Street, Suite 200
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)