



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 3, 2009

Ms. Martha T. Williams
Attorney for the City of Rosenberg
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019

OR2009-17159

Dear Ms. Williams:

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# 363112.

The City of Rosenberg (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for a specified report, a specified audit, the personnel file of a named individual, and the most recent performance evaluations for two named individuals. You indicate the city has or will release some of the responsive information. You state the city does not have some of the responsive information.¹ You claim portions of the submitted personnel file are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.³

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist at the time the request for information was received or create new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W. 2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App. – San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

²Although you raise section 552.024 of the Government Code for portions of the information, we understand you to raise section 552.117 of the Government Code as this is the proper exception for the substance of your argument.

³We note the city did not raise sections 552.117 and 552.137 as exceptions to disclosure within ten business days of the date the city received the request. *See Gov't Code* § § 552.301(b), .302. However, because sections 552.117 and 552.137 are mandatory exceptions that can provide a compelling reason to

Initially, you inform us that the city asked for clarification regarding the type of information sought from the submitted personnel file. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed). You inform us the city has not received a response from the requestor. We note that a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate a request for information to information that the governmental body holds. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561(1990). In this case, as you have submitted responsive information for our review and raised exceptions to disclosure for this information, we consider the city to have made a good faith effort to identify the information that is responsive to the request, and we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Section 552.101 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"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8, for portions of 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* 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, 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 Act in Open Records Decision Number 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted 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 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* Open Records Decision No. 681 at 8 (2004); *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .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

withhold information from disclosure, we will consider your claims under these exceptions. *See id*; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 150 at 2 (1977), 319 (1982).

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 information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held that section 6103(a) renders tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as “a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Internal Revenue Service] with respect to a return . . . or the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, . . . penalty, . . . , or offense[.]” *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the IRS regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *dismissed in part, aff’d in part, vacated in part, and remanded*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted W-4 forms, which we have marked, pursuant to federal law.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information subject to the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”) subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code § 151.001. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (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(a)-(c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343

(1982). Medical records must be released on the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (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. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See id.* § 159.002(c); Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). We have marked medical records that are confidential pursuant to the MPA and may only be released in accordance with the MPA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

You assert that portions of the remaining information are protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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. *See 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *See id.* at 683. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Furthermore, this office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history).

We note, however, that generally the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern); 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes personal medical and financial information that is of no legitimate public concern. Thus, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the

Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining information is intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). You inform us, and the submitted information reflects, that the employee at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked that pertains to this employee under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

A portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.130 provides that information relating to a driver's license or permit issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the Texas driver's license information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address we have marked is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Thus, unless the city receives consent for its release, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked pursuant to section 552.137. *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Title 26, section 6103(a) of the United States Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 159.002 of the Occupations Code and in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.117, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.130 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Pamela Wissemann
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PFW/jb

Ref: ID# 363112

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)