Overcoming Barriers to Data-Sharing Related to the HIPAA Privacy Rule

A Guide for State and Local Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Programs

June 2004
Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the Alliance for Healthy Homes, which is solely responsible for its contents. This report’s conclusions and interpretations reflect publicly available guidance but do not constitute legal advice.

The primary author of this report is Anne Guthrie Wengrovitz. The author thanks the following individuals for their contributions, expert advice, or assistance in drafting, reviewing, and finalizing this report.

Mary Jean Brown, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Beverly Dozier, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Bonnie Dyck, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
John Fanning, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Rob Henry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Dave McCormick, Marion County (Indiana) Health Department
April Miller, Alliance for Healthy Homes
Tom Neltner, Executive Director, Improving Kids’ Environment, Indiana
Anne Phelps, Alliance for Healthy Homes
Don Ryan, Alliance for Healthy Homes
Anne Ziebarth, formerly with the Alliance for Healthy Homes
Introduction

Over the past few years, the health care system has devoted considerable energy and attention to ensuring compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA).\(^1\) A primary focus of HIPAA is on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of health care systems by standardizing the electronic exchange of administrative and financial data. HIPAA also established new national standards for protecting the privacy of personal medical information and authorized the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to implement these standards through a regulation known as the Privacy Rule.\(^2\) These new requirements have changed the way traditional health care providers, health plans, and health care clearinghouses transmit and manage health information. However, misinterpretation of the Privacy Rule has caused some concern about the authority of health departments to disclose personal health information for public health purposes related to childhood lead poisoning. In reading the letter of the law, it is important to consider the spirit of the law. HIPAA was intended to improve patient privacy protections – not to undermine legitimate public health practice. This paper reviews HIPAA requirements and exceptions, focusing on those for public health agencies, and describes permissible uses of lead-related data under the HIPAA Privacy Rule. Readers are cautioned that this paper reflects publicly available guidance but does not constitute legal advice.

What Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule Require?

The Privacy Rule establishes new national standards for protecting the privacy of certain individually identifiable health data, referred to as “protected health information” (PHI).\(^3\) It defines what information must be protected, what entities must comply, and under what circumstances they are permitted or required to share personal medical information. If an entity that handles PHI is covered by HIPAA, it is subject to strict requirements regarding information handling and disclosure, and there are civil or criminal penalties for failure to comply. However, in order to balance personal privacy with public health, the Privacy Rule contains broad authorizations for public health agencies to make the disclosures necessary to provide appropriate services, including those for lead poisoning prevention. When public health disclosure is permitted, the Privacy Rule specifies required administrative processes for covered entities, including accounting for public health disclosures, disclosure of the “minimum necessary” information, and notice of privacy policies. (These requirements are described in detail in HHS guidance, but not reviewed in this paper.)

Does the HIPAA Privacy Rule Affect CLPPPs?

While HIPAA covers many entities and regulates various kinds of data, many public agencies and considerable data are simply not subject to HIPAA. For instance, if an agency is not defined as a “covered entity” under HIPAA, this law does not apply – no matter what types of personal medical information are involved. Similarly, if data are not “protected health information,” then HIPAA does not apply. The remainder of this paper explores the application of these and related HIPAA issues to childhood lead poisoning prevention programs (CLPPPs).
Figure 1 - Public Health Disclosure Alternatives under the HIPAA Privacy Rule
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When Can Data Be Used or Disclosed Without Violating the Privacy Rule?

This paper offers six key questions to help determine whether the Privacy Rule is relevant for a particular data use or disclosure, and if so, under what circumstances the data can be used in compliance with the Privacy Rule. These decision points are also summarized in Figure 1, Public Health Disclosure Alternatives under the HIPAA Privacy Rule, on page 2.

1) Is the program covered by HIPAA?

The HIPAA Privacy Rule applies only to three types of covered entities: health plans (including Medicaid programs), health care clearinghouses, and health care providers who conduct certain health care transactions electronically. An agency that acts both as a covered and non-covered entity may qualify as a hybrid entity, by designating agency components that perform covered functions as the health care component(s) of the organization. The requirements of the Privacy Rule thereby apply only to the hybrid entity’s health care component(s), and not to the other parts of the agency (which do not perform covered services).

Most state and local health departments have already made determinations about whether they are defined as “covered entities” and thus subject to the Privacy Rule. In June 2003, the National Governors Association (NGA) and Association of State and Territorial Health Officials (ASTHO) released results of a survey on the status of state health authorities under the HIPAA Privacy Rule. Of the 44 states that responded, 29 (66%) self-declared as hybrid entities, nine (20%) as covered entities, and two (5%) as business associates of covered entities. For health departments that have not already made this determination, it should be relatively straightforward for a CLPPP to determine whether or not it is part of a covered entity and, if so, whether it is part of the covered portion of a “hybrid” agency. CLPPPs that receive Medicaid reimbursement for services are likely to be covered by HIPAA (because they are health care providers using electronic billing transactions). However, even if covered by HIPAA, CLPPPs are likely to have authority under one or more Privacy Rule provisions to disclose (consistent with the regulations) most types of data that are appropriate to lead poisoning prevention activities.

Agencies that are not covered by HIPAA are likely to include the following: State or local health departments that are not covered entities in whole or in part; State or local health departments that are part of a hybrid entity but not part of the designated health care component; State housing agencies; public housing authorities; and local housing departments. Of course, agencies should also be aware of any state-specific health privacy laws, since disclosures may not be made if state law does not allow it. This is because more protective state privacy laws still apply, even if HIPAA allows a disclosure.

2) Are the data “Protected Health Information” (PHI)?

Under the Privacy Rule, protected health information is individually identifiable health information that is electronically transmitted or transmitted or maintained in any other form or medium. The Rule specifies the kinds of data that are “individually identifiable,” including name, social security number, address, and the like. However, some lead-related information, including property addresses in some situations, do not automatically fall within HIPAA’s
purview, because they are not protected health information. A documented lead-based paint hazard or code violation in a given property is a physical condition that exists in the property completely independently of the property’s occupancy or the health status of its occupants. As such, data pertaining solely to physical conditions in a property do not qualify as protected health information when cited or released apart from health data. For example, a list of addresses of properties that have been cited for code violations or found to contain lead hazards does not constitute protected health information – regardless of whether the agency that documented the problem is a covered entity or not and regardless of the impetus for the inspection. Similarly, covered entities can release the names of the owners of such properties without impediment from the Privacy Rule.

For data that are protected health information, such as the linked names and addresses of EBL children, the Privacy Rule provides for “de-identifying” individually identifiable health information by meeting criteria or using processes specified therein. The de-identification process is also useful for community-wide analysis or for research projects. One approach being pursued in Massachusetts is to combine address data of EBL children for many years into a large data set, rendering it untraceable to individual children but providing valuable information about patterns over time. However, since the Rule is intended to provide strict privacy protections, it is conservative about what constitutes allowable de-identification.

When it is difficult to discern whether data constitute personal health information (or programmatically burdensome to avoid this categorization), health departments may want to rely instead on the Privacy Rule provisions that allow (or in some cases require) the release of data, as described in the following questions. In particular, health departments should note the broad authority granted by the public health use and disclosure provisions to accomplish program objectives, as discussed in question 6.

3) *Will the patient authorize disclosure?*

The Privacy Rule permits covered entities to use and disclose protected health information if they get written permission from the patient. This alternative can be a simple and expeditious mechanism for lead poisoning prevention programs to share protected health information if the child’s parents or guardian will authorize such disclosure. For example, families may have a self interest in authorizing such disclosure in jurisdictions where families with EBL children are entitled to receive prioritized access to lead hazard control or subsidized housing. Lead poisoning prevention programs can create authorization forms for routine use to facilitate the exchange of lead-specific information. Some CLPPs routinely request all clients to sign such an authorization during the intake process for blood lead tests. For example, the standard authorization form used by Marion County, IN is provided as Appendix A.

4) *Is the disclosure necessary to support treatment or payment?*

The Privacy Rule permits a covered entity to use and disclose protected health information for “treatment, payment, and health care operations activities” (TPO). HHS guidance clarifies that a covered entity may disclose protected health information for the treatment activities of any health care provider who has a treatment relationship with the individual (including providers not
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covered by the Privacy Rule). Thus, there are some circumstances in which disclosures by CLPPPs of PHI without authorization may qualify as TPO activities.

Disclosure of data to health care providers for the purpose of providing blood lead testing to individuals at high risk (targeting screening) would qualify under this provision. In addition, referral of lead-poisoned children for special education and related services would qualify. These data uses are consistent with PHI disclosure precedents in other public health programs for treatment, such as referral of persons with developmental disabilities to speech therapists.

Disclosures necessary to ensure lead hazard evaluation or control may also fall under the TPO provision, since the necessary treatment of a child with lead poisoning is interventions to lower the child’s blood lead level (BLL). This is especially true since Medicaid requires reimbursement for environmental investigation and case management services for lead-poisoned children. In the course of providing treatment, CLPPPs may need to notify property owners of the presence of an EBL child or the presence of lead hazards. However, since private property owners are not generally considered to be “health care providers,” other authorities, outlined below under questions 5 and 6, will more typically justify sharing information with landlords.

5) Is disclosure of health information required by law?

Some jurisdictions have expressed specific concern about the effect of HIPAA on blood lead surveillance systems and reporting requirements. For this reason, it is important to note that the Privacy Rule permits any disclosures that are required by other laws, including federal, tribal, state, or local laws (as described in this section) and for public health purposes (described in section 6 below). The Rule is consistent with the explicit direction of Congress in the underlying law:

Nothing in this part shall be construed to invalidate or limit the authority, power, or procedures established under any law providing for the reporting of disease or injury, child abuse, birth, or death, public health surveillance, or public health investigation or intervention.

Thus, the HIPAA Privacy Rule in no way limits state or local laws or regulations that require the reporting of public health data, such as mandatory blood lead reporting to surveillance systems by laboratories, local health departments, managed care organizations, physicians, Medicaid, health clinics, and/or WIC, either electronically or via other means.

The state law or “required by law” provision is not limited in scope, and is distinct from disclosures to public health authorities, so it also ensures the continued authority of state or local laws requiring notification of property owners, abatement, or any other appropriate authorized interventions.

This Privacy Rule provision is perhaps the easiest exit from HIPAA requirements.
6) **Is disclosure permissible under the Rule’s provisions for public health disclosure?**

The Privacy Rule also permits covered entities to disclose PHI, without patient authorization, for public health purposes authorized by law. Thus, CLPPPs have authority to use or disclose PHI, without patient authorization, for authorized public health purposes, even if such purposes are not expressly itemized in law or otherwise allowable under the exclusions and provisions described in questions 1 through 5 above. Notably, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has already clarified the application of this principle for public health agencies:

> For disclosures not required by law, covered entities may still disclose, without authorization, to a public health authority authorized by law to collect or receive the information for the purpose of preventing or controlling disease, injury, or disability, the minimum necessary information to accomplish the intended public health purpose of the disclosure [45 CFR 164.512 (b)] . . .

Although it is not a defined term, DHHS interpreted the phrase "authorized by law" to mean that a legal basis exists for the activity. Further, DHHS called the phrase "a term of art," including both actions that are permitted and actions that are required by law [64 FR 59929, November 3, 1999]. This does not mean a public health authority at the federal, tribal, state, or local level must have multiple disease or condition-specific laws that authorize each collection of information. Public health authorities operate under broad mandates to protect the health of their constituent populations.

This guidance from CDC makes clear that state or local laws need not specify each and every case in which use of PHI may be necessary to protect the public’s health. This broad reading of the statute by HHS and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) suggests that many, if not all, authorized public health uses of data related to lead poisoning prevention can be legally accomplished under the Privacy Rule, when the activities are undertaken by public health agencies (for public health activities) or other individuals or entities designated as their authorized agents.

Under the Privacy Rule, covered entities can designate other agencies, individuals, or entities as their agents in conducting lead poisoning prevention activities in order to be eligible to receive PHI. CLPPPs can therefore elect to designate as their agents various entities for specific purposes, such as WIC agencies or clinics, state or local housing agencies or public housing authorities, managed care organizations, school nurses, or even community-based organizations. CDC has already developed templates and sample letters for state and local health departments to grant public health authority to appropriate agents. Without such grants of authority, non-governmental entities may not be considered public health authorities. A practical advantage of this approach is that agencies can designate certain authorized agents once, for an ongoing public health program, enabling them to share data as needed on a continuing basis. CDC and HUD have already demonstrated the use of this provision for lead poisoning prevention. In a March 2004 CDC/HUD letter (Appendix B), CDC authorized HUD’s Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control (OHHLHC) to collect or receive addresses of lead poisoned children from lead poisoning prevention programs. The letter defines OHHLHC as a “public health
authority” for this purpose, merely by establishing that “HUD, CDC, and EPA are authorized by statute to conduct lead poisoning prevention activities, consistent with [their] missions and capabilities, to address the public health problem of lead poisoning…” No specific provision authorizing disclosure of address information in this situation was needed to support this determination.

The Privacy Rule only regulates the behavior of covered entities; it does not require protection of data received by a public health authority unless it is also a covered entity or the covered health care component of a covered entity. Thus, Privacy Rule restraints do not follow to recipients of data, so public housing authorities and others normally outside the scope of HIPAA must comply only with the terms of their grant of authority, but they do not accept any additional liability or record keeping burdens associated with HIPAA.

For jurisdictions that choose not to assert that notification of property owners of lead hazards or lead poisoning is justified under the “Treatment” provision (see section 4), the broad public health exemption gives ample latitude to provide appropriate environmental investigation, lead hazard control, and enforcement services to lead-poisoned children. Thus, if notification of the property owner is necessary to prevent or limit lead exposures, CLPPPs are authorized to do so as a means of preventing or controlling disease. As noted earlier, adequate treatment of a child with lead poisoning must include interventions to lower the child’s BLL, normally including environmental investigation of the child’s residence to identify the source of the lead exposure as well as steps to control identified hazards followed by clearance testing. Thus, adequate treatment requires identifying the property, and, in most cases, compelling the property owner or manager to implement effective lead hazard controls.

Finally, the Privacy Rule also provides another possibility for disclosure without patient authorization that might be invoked in some circumstances. It permits disclosure “to prevent or lessen a serious and imminent threat to the health or safety of a person or the public.” However, given the broad authorities provided to public health agencies under the Privacy Rule, most CLPPPs would need to rely on this authority only in rare cases, as the last resort.

**Appropriate Uses of Lead-Related Data**

As in many types of public health practice, the collection and analysis of various kinds of lead poisoning data are essential to efforts to identify and control lead hazards and to reduce children’s blood lead levels. Some common or expected uses of health and environmental data related to lead poisoning prevention are explored in Table 1, *Applicability of the Privacy Rule: Common data-sharing scenarios*, which begins on page 9. The table outlines which requirements or exemptions apply to specific data-sharing scenarios, but the table is not exhaustive. It merely seeks to illustrate the different kinds of authorizations that are available for public health uses of data under the Privacy Rule.
Conclusion

The worthy objective of protecting the confidentiality of personal health information should not undermine state and federal mandates to protect the public’s health. Before suppressing or withholding data that are integral to the effectiveness of public health programs, childhood lead poisoning prevention programs should examine the key questions outlined in this paper.

The Privacy Rule does not apply to many CLPPPs because they are simply not required to comply with HIPAA. For those agencies that are subject to the Privacy Rule, CLPPPs have a number of options to enable them to use and share public health data as necessary to prevent childhood lead poisoning. Instead of inappropriate invocation of HIPAA as an excuse for withholding data, CLPPPs should rely on the Privacy Rule’s provisions that permit disclosures for public health. In many cases, multiple provisions will justify the use of key data. For example, state blood lead reporting laws would be covered under the “required by law” provision, but could also be covered under the “public health purposes” provision. In fact, almost all the lead-related disclosures described in this paper are likely covered by the broad public health purpose of “preventing or controlling disease, injury, or disability,” and therefore are permissible under the Privacy Rule.

In addition, some public health agencies may find it useful to revisit their self-declarations about their status under HIPAA, because some CLPPPs may have been declared covered entities erroneously. If programs believe that they do not perform covered functions, the agencies can revise their self-categorizations and redesignate organizational components. Public health agencies are not required to register the change with OCR; the department or program need only document the change and retain that documentation.

Finally, if necessary, technical assistance and individual guidance can be secured from the Department of Health and Human Services through either the Office for Civil Rights or the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. OCR and CDC continue to expand their guidance and FAQs in response to inquiries they receive and problems that are brought to their attention.
Table 1 – Applicability of the Privacy Rule: Common data-sharing scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who holds data?</th>
<th>What would be disclosed?</th>
<th>Who would receive information?</th>
<th>For what purpose?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments that are not “covered entities”</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments that are part of “hybrid entity” but not part of “designated health care component”</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing agencies</td>
<td>Individual addresses of properties with known lead hazards</td>
<td>Public Community groups</td>
<td>Informed decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual addresses of properties with possible lead hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual addresses of properties with EBL children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual addresses of properties with code violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing authorities or local housing departments</td>
<td>Individual addresses of units associated with EBL children or with identified lead hazards</td>
<td>HUD or EPA</td>
<td>Enforcement of disclosure rule or Lead-Safe Housing Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners of property associated with EBL children or with identified lead hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Addresses of properties with documented lead hazards</td>
<td>Anyone - community groups, general public, housing agencies</td>
<td>Direct prevention resources; Informed decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses of properties with documented code violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names of property owners whose properties have had documented lead hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agency Not Covered By HIPAA

(Agencies may be subject to state or other privacy laws or regs; this table just addresses the HIPAA Privacy Rule)

Data Not Covered
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure Authorized By Individual</th>
<th>Who holds data?</th>
<th>What would be disclosed?</th>
<th>Who would receive information?</th>
<th>For what purpose?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State and local health departments</td>
<td>Any covered entity</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Allow families w/EBL children to receive priority enrollment in LHC or subsidized housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State and local health departments</td>
<td>Names and address of EBL children</td>
<td>Lead Hazard Control grantees, public housing authority</td>
<td>Targeting EBL screening for health care providers, managed care organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Lists of unscreened children Maps of unscreened children</td>
<td>Health care providers, managed care organizations</td>
<td>Targeting or quality assurance activities regarding screening Medicaid enrollees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Names of EBL children</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Referral to special education screening or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician or MCO</td>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Names of EBL children</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Referral to special education screening or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health department</td>
<td>State or local health department</td>
<td>Address of EBL child</td>
<td>Property owner/landlord PHA/Section 8 Staff</td>
<td>Order LHC or abatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories, MCOs, physicians, Medicaid, health clinics, WIC</td>
<td>State or local health department</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>When disclosure or other action, e.g., enforcement or reporting, is required by state law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who holds data?</td>
<td>What would be disclosed?</td>
<td>Who would receive information?</td>
<td>For what purpose?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Individual addresses of units associated with EBL children</td>
<td>HUD OHHLHC</td>
<td>Enforcement of disclosure rule or Lead-Safe Housing Rule (*See joint HUD/CDC letter to health departments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names of property owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Individual addresses of units associated with EBL children</td>
<td>State or local housing agencies</td>
<td>Targeting lead hazard evaluation or control resources; targeting code enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Maps and/or geocoding of EBL cases</td>
<td>Health care providers via maps</td>
<td>Direct prevention resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or local health departments</td>
<td>Maps of EBL children</td>
<td>Health care providers, managed care organizations</td>
<td>Targeting EBL screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local health departments</td>
<td>Names and addresses of EBL children</td>
<td>Lead Hazard Control grantees</td>
<td>Allow families w/EBL children or properties that have poisoned to receive priority enrollment in LHC program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local health departments</td>
<td>Names and addresses of EBL children</td>
<td>Public housing authorities</td>
<td>- Allow PHA to enforce lead-safe housing rule in subsidized properties (Section 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Allow families w/EBL children to receive priority for Section 8 housing (if local policy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC programs, Immunization programs, Local health departments, other covered public health agencies or grantees</td>
<td>Blood lead screening data, including name, address, and other PHI</td>
<td>CDC, State health department, State surveillance system</td>
<td>Electronic or hard-copy reporting of blood lead screening data to monitor screening and exposure patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contacts for technical assistance

CDC Privacy Rule Coordinator: Beverly Dozier (Bdozier@cdc.gov)

HHS Office for Civil Rights (responsible for Privacy Rule implementation and enforcement): OCRPrivacy@hhs.gov

Resources for further information

- CDC/HUD Joint Letter on Childhood Lead Poisoning Data

- HHS Office for Civil Rights HIPAA Medical Privacy website
  http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/hipaa/
  Provides direct link to statutory language, Privacy rule text, official guidance, educational materials, FAQs, and links

- CDC MMWR on HIPAA Privacy Rule and Public Health
  http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/m2e411a1.htm
  Authoritative review of HIPAA requirements and implications for public health

- CDC/ATSDR Privacy Rule site
  http://www.cdc.gov/privacyrule/
  Links to additional materials on Public Health and HIPAA

- CMS HIPAA website
  http://www.cms.hhs.gov/hipaa/
  Resources focused on Medicaid and Medicare issues

- Health Privacy Project Summary of State Health Privacy Laws
  http://www.healthprivacy.org/info-url_nocat2304/info-url_nocat.htm
  Links to individual state summaries of health privacy statutes

- Literature on GIS and personal privacy
  See, for example, http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/188739.pdf
AUTHORIZATION TO SHARE BLOOD LEAD INFORMATION

The results of blood lead testing are confidential medical information. Under Indiana law, the results of the blood lead test will be shared with other public agencies in a confidential manner. The agencies will take care to protect you and your child’s privacy. Sharing information will help your child if lead poisoning is identified. The agencies listed below investigate the cause of lead poisoning.

For a child younger than seven (7) years, Indiana Code16-41-39.4-3 requires the laboratory, which analyzes your child’s blood, to report the test result and all demographic information to the Indiana State Department of Health.

Lead-poisoned children need immediate medical attention and may also have special educational needs. In order to provide this help, the Marion County Health Department will share this information with the Indianapolis Public Schools Corporation and other public agencies, which work to prevent and treat lead poisoning in children. These agencies include Family & Social Services Administration, the federal Department of Health and Human Services, and housing agencies at the local, state, and federal level, including the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I ________________________________________, authorize the sharing of the
(PARENT’S NAME)

blood lead information of _______________________________ to the above
(CHILD’S NAME)

referenced organizations as required by federal, state and local law.
Appendix B

Contact Name
Title
Name of Health Department
Address

Subject: Confidentiality of Childhood Lead Poisoning Data

Dear Colleague:

The Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control (OHHLHC) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch (LPPB) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are issuing this letter in response to requests for clarification regarding confidentiality of childhood lead poisoning data.

Such information may be considered “identifiable” under the Department of Health and Human Services, Privacy Rule (45 CFR Parts 160 and 164) and other state or local laws and regulations. For these agencies and institutions that are “covered entities” under the Privacy Rule, the OHHLHC, for purposes of this program, is functioning as a public health authority as defined by the Rule (45 CFR 164.501). HUD, CDC, and EPA are authorized by statute to conduct lead poisoning prevention activities, consistent with our missions and capabilities, to address the public health problem of lead poisoning and to coordinate these activities.

Therefore, you may disclose to OHHLHC, without authorization, the information that is reasonably limited so that it is minimally necessary to accomplish the intended purpose of the disclosure (45 CFR 164.512(b)), including the addresses of housing units. For this program, reporting the property address where there is a history of lead-based paint hazards and/or children with elevated blood-lead levels is essential for targeting efforts to address lead-based paint hazards.

Since the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act (Title X) became law more than 10 years ago, millions of children have been protected from lead-based paint hazards. The report, “Eliminating Childhood Lead Poisoning: A Federal Strategy Targeting Lead Paint Hazards,” identified enforcement of lead regulations as a key component in the overall strategy to eliminating childhood lead poisoning. Enforcement is best targeted to high-risk properties

where children are actually or potentially exposed to lead-based paint hazards, particularly those where multiple lead poisoning cases have been identified. Therefore, the most effective way to eliminate lead poisoning is spearheaded by partnerships with all levels of government to facilitate sharing information about targeted compliance reviews to ensure compliance with the federal Lead Disclosure Rule (Section 1018 of Title X) and other applicable local laws.

The Federal Lead Disclosure Rule requires that sellers, landlords, and agents of most housing constructed prior to 1978 provide each buyer or lessee with information on the presence and knowledge of lead-based paint and/or lead-based paint hazards before the buyer or lessee is obligated under any contract to buy or lease the housing. This rule is most effective when families are warned that lead hazards exist, and are then able to make an informed decision about housing.

To date, the U.S. Department of Justice, HUD, EPA, and local health programs have completed 34 enforcement settlements, including collecting over $561,000 in penalties, and ensuring commitments to test and abate lead-based paint hazards in over 166,000 high-risk rental units. As a result of these settlements, an additional $421,750 has been made available to fund projects such as purchasing portable blood lead testing devices for hospitals, funding lead hazard abatement programs through local health or housing departments, training, and outreach programs. These settlements simultaneously resolved violations under federal, state and local laws, and both cities and states have been signatories to the settlement agreements. All this translates into more homes free of lead paint hazards that are available for families, and further progress towards ending childhood lead poisoning in the United States.

Our collaboration with you has produced a dramatic decline in the number of children with elevated blood levels over the past several decades. Yet far too many children remain at risk. Together, we can achieve the goal of eliminating childhood lead paint poisoning as a major public health problem by 2010.

Sincerely,

Mary Jean Brown, ScD, RN  
Chief, Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

David E. Jacobs, Ph.D.  
Director, Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, HUD
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