

SENATE STAFF ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: Governmental Oversight and Productivity Committee

BILL: CS/SB 700

INTRODUCER: Governmental Oversight and Productivity Committee and Domestic Security Committee

SUBJECT: Emergency Management Plans/Hospitals/OGSR

DATE: March 30, 2006

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	<u>Pardue</u>	<u>Skelton</u>	<u>DS</u>	Favorable
2.	<u>Bedford</u>	<u>Wilson</u>	<u>HE</u>	Favorable
3.	<u>Rhea</u>	<u>Wilson</u>	<u>GO</u>	Fav/CS
4.	_____	_____	<u>RC</u>	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

This bill is the result of an interim project by the Domestic Security Committee. The committee substitute reenacts the public records and the public meetings exemption provisions for portions of hospitals' comprehensive emergency management plans (CEMP). The exemptions apply to those portions of a CEMP which address the response of a public or private hospital to an act of terrorism as defined by s. 775.30, F.S., and which are filed with or are in the possession of the Agency for Health Care Administration (AHCA), a state or local law enforcement agency, a county or municipal emergency management agency, the Executive Office of the Governor (EOG), the Department of Health (DOH), or the Department of Community Affairs (DCA), or which are in the custody of a public hospital. The exemptions also apply to portions of public meetings which would reveal exempt information contained in a CEMP. The bill deletes the provisions that repeal the exemptions.

This bill amends s. 395.1056(1), (2), and (3), F.S.

II. Present Situation:

Public Records – Florida has a long history of providing public access to government records. The Legislature enacted the first public records law in 1892.¹ The Florida Supreme Court has noted that ch. 119, F.S., the Public Records Act, was enacted

... to promote public awareness and knowledge of government actions in order to ensure that governmental officials and agencies remain accountable to the people.²

¹ Sections 1390, 1391, F.S. (Rev. 1892).

² *Forsberg v. Housing Authority of the City of Miami Beach*, 455 So.2d 373, 378 (Fla. 1984).

In 1992, Floridians adopted an amendment to the State Constitution that raised the statutory right of access to public records to a constitutional level.³ Article I, s. 24 of the State Constitution, provides that:

(a) Every person⁴ has the right to inspect or copy any public record made or received in connection with the official business of any public body, officer, or employee of the state, or persons acting on their behalf, except with respect to records exempted pursuant to this section or specifically made confidential by this Constitution. . . .

Unless specifically exempted, all agency⁵ records are available for public inspection. The term “public record” is broadly defined to mean:

All documents, papers, letters, maps, books, tapes, photographs, films, sound recordings, data processing software, or other material, regardless of the physical form, characteristics, or means of transmission, made or received pursuant to law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by any agency.⁶

The Florida Supreme Court has interpreted this definition to encompass all materials made or received by an agency in connection with official business which are used to perpetuate, communicate or formalize knowledge.⁷ All such materials, regardless of whether they are in final form, are open for public inspection unless made exempt.⁸

Only the Legislature is authorized to create exemptions to open government requirements.⁹ Exemptions must be created by general law and such law must specifically state the public necessity justifying the exemption. Further, the exemption must be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the law.¹⁰ A bill enacting an exemption¹¹ may not contain other substantive provisions, although it may contain multiple exemptions that relate to one subject.¹² A bill creating an exemption must be passed by a two-thirds vote of both houses.¹³

³ Article I, s. 24 of the State Constitution.

⁴ Section 1.01(3), F.S., defines “person” to include individuals, children, firms, associations, joint adventures, partnerships, estates, trusts, business trusts, syndicates, fiduciaries, corporations, and all other groups or combinations.

⁵ The word “agency” is defined in s. 119.011(2), F.S., to mean “. . . any state, county, district, authority, or municipal officer, department, division, board, bureau, commission, or other separate unit of government created or established by law including, for the purposes of this chapter, the Commission on Ethics, the Public Service Commission, and the Office of Public Counsel, and any other public or private agency, person, partnership, corporation, or business entity acting on behalf of any public agency.”

⁶ Section 119.011(11), F.S.

⁷ *Shevin v. Byron, Harless, Schaffer, Reid and Associates, Inc.*, 379 So.2d 633, 640 (Fla. 1980).

⁸ *Wait v. Florida Power & Light Company*, 372 So.2d 420 (Fla. 1979).

⁹ Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution.

¹⁰ *Memorial Hospital-West Volusia v. News-Journal Corporation*, 729 So.2d 373, 380 (Fla. 1999); *Halifax Hospital Medical Center v. News-Journal Corporation*, 724 So.2d 567 (Fla. 1999).

¹¹ Under s. 119.15, F.S., an existing exemption may be considered a new exemption if the exemption is expanded to cover additional records.

¹² Art. I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution.

¹³ *Ibid.*

The Public Records Act¹⁴ specifies conditions under which public access must be provided to records of the executive branch and other agencies. Section 119.07(1) (a), F.S., states:

Every person who has custody of a public record shall permit the record to be inspected and examined by any person desiring to do so, at any reasonable time, under reasonable conditions, and under supervision by the custodian of the public record.

If a record has been made exempt, the agency must redact the exempt portions of the record prior to releasing the remainder of the record.¹⁵ The records custodian must state the basis for the exemption, in writing if requested.¹⁶

There is a difference between records that the Legislature has made exempt from public inspection and those that are *confidential* and exempt.¹⁷ If the Legislature makes a record confidential and exempt, such information may not be released by an agency to anyone other than to the persons or entities designated in the statute.¹⁸ If a record is simply made exempt from disclosure requirements, an agency is not prohibited from disclosing the record in all circumstances.¹⁹

In *Ragsdale v. State*,²⁰ the Florida Supreme Court held that the applicability of a particular exemption is determined by the document being withheld, not by the identity of the agency possessing the record. Quoting from *City of Riviera Beach v. Barfield*,²¹ a case in which documents were given from one agency to another during an active criminal investigation, the court refuted the proposition that inter-agency transfer of a document nullifies the exempt status of a record:

We conclude that when a criminal justice agency transfers protected information to another criminal justice agency, the information retains its exempt status. We believe that such a conclusion fosters the underlying purpose of section 119.07(3)(d), which is to prevent premature *public* disclosure of criminal investigative information since disclosure could impede an ongoing investigation or allow a suspect to avoid apprehension or escape detection. In determining whether or not to compel disclosure of active criminal investigative or intelligence information, *the primary focus must be on the statutory classification of the information sought rather than upon in whose hands the information rests. Had the legislature intended the exemption for active criminal investigative information to evaporate upon the sharing of that information with another criminal justice agency, it would have expressly provided so in the statute. . . .* Although the information sought in this case is not information currently being used in an active criminal investigation, the rationale is the same; that is, *that the focus in determining whether a document has lost its status as a public record must be on the policy behind the*

¹⁴ Chapter 119, F.S.

¹⁵ Section 119.07(1)(b), F.S.

¹⁶ Section 119.07(1)(c) and (d), F.S.

¹⁷ *WFTV, Inc., v. The School Board of Seminole, etc., et al*, 874 So.2d 48 (5th DCA), rev. denied 892 So.2d 1015 (Fla. 2004).

¹⁸ *Ibid* at 53; *see also*, Attorney General Opinion 85-62.

¹⁹ *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So.2d 683, 687 (Fla. 5th DCA), review denied, 589 So.2d 289 (Fla. 1991).

²⁰ 720 So.2d 203 (Fla. 1998).

²¹ 642 So.2d 1135, 1137 (Fla. 4th DCA 1994).

*exemption and not on the simple fact that the information has changed agency hands. Thus, if the State has access to information that is exempt from public records disclosure due to confidentiality or other public policy concerns, that information does not lose its exempt status simply because it was provided to the State during the course of its criminal investigation [emphasis added].*²²

The Open Government Sunset Review Act - The Open Government Sunset Review Act²³ provides for the systematic review of an exemption five years after its enactment. Each year, by June 1, the Division of Statutory Revision of the Joint Legislative Management Committee is required to certify to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives the language and statutory citation of each exemption scheduled for repeal the following year.

The act states that an exemption may be created or expanded only if it serves an identifiable public purpose and if the exemption is no broader than necessary to meet the public purpose it serves. An identifiable public purpose is served if the exemption meets one of three specified criteria and if the Legislature finds that the purpose is sufficiently compelling to override the strong public policy of open government and cannot be accomplished without the exemption. An identifiable public purpose is served if the exemption:

- [a]llows the state or its political subdivisions to effectively and efficiently administer a governmental program, which administration would be significantly impaired without the exemption;
- [p]rotects information of a sensitive personal nature concerning individuals, the release of which would be defamatory or cause unwarranted damage to the good name or reputation of such individuals, or would jeopardize their safety; or
- [p]rotects information of a confidential nature concerning entities, including, but not limited to, a formula, pattern, device, combination of devices, or compilation of information that is used to protect or further a business advantage over those who do not know or use it, the disclosure of which would injure the affected entity in the marketplace.²⁴

The act also requires consideration of the following:

- What specific records or meetings are affected by the exemption?
- Whom does the exemption uniquely affect, as opposed to the general public?
- What is the identifiable public purpose or goal of the exemption?
- Can the information contained in the records or discussed in the meeting be readily obtained by alternative means? If yes, how?
- Is the record or meeting protected by another exemption?
- Are there multiple exemptions for the same type of record or meeting that it would be appropriate to merge?

²² *Ibid* at 206.

²³ Section 119.15, F.S.

²⁴ Section 119.15(4) (b), F.S.

While the standards in the Open Government Sunset Review Act may appear to limit the Legislature in the exemption review process, those aspects of the act that are only statutory as opposed to constitutional, do not limit the Legislature because one session of the Legislature cannot bind another.²⁵ The Legislature is only limited in its review process by constitutional requirements.

Further, s. 119.15(4) (e), F.S., makes explicit that:

... notwithstanding s. 768.28 or any other law, neither the state or its political subdivisions nor any other public body shall be made party to any suit in any court or incur any liability for the repeal or revival and reenactment of any exemption under this section. The failure of the Legislature to comply strictly with this section does not invalidate an otherwise valid reenactment.

Senate Interim Project Report 2006-213

The Senate Domestic Security Committee, in its review of Senate Interim Project Report 2006-213, accepted the recommendation that the exemptions provided for portions of hospital CEMPs continue to be sufficiently compelling to override the strong public policy of open government. In creating s. 395.1056, F.S., the Legislature found that there is a public necessity to exempt plan components of a hospital's response to terrorism because those portions of a CEMP which address the response of a public or private hospital to an act of terrorism are vital plan components that affect the health and safety of the public.²⁶ The findings further stated that if security systems or plans, vulnerability analyses, emergency evacuation transportation, sheltering arrangements, post-disaster activities (including provisions for emergency power), communications, food, and water, post-disaster transportation, supplies (including caches), staffing, emergency equipment, individual identification of residents, transfer of records, and methods of responding to family inquiries were made publicly available for inspection or copying, they could be used to hamper or disable the response of a hospital to a terrorist attack. If a hospital's response to an act of terrorism were hampered or disabled, an increase in the number of Floridians subjected to fatal injury would occur. International terrorists continue to demonstrate the ability to plan and carry out sophisticated acts of terrorism. Their capability appears to be no less today than at the time of the Legislature's original findings in 2001. As a result, the exemption is necessary for the efficient and effective administration of public safety programs.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

This bill reenacts the public records and public meetings exemptions provided for portions of hospitals' CEMPs. Section 395.1056, F.S., exempts from public disclosure, those portions of a CEMP which address the response of a public or private hospital to an act of terrorism as defined by s. 775.30, F.S., and which are filed with or are in the possession of AHCA, a state or local law enforcement agency, a county or municipal emergency management agency, EOG, DOH, or DCA. The section also gives a public access exemption to those portions of a CEMP related to terrorism response that are in the custody of a public hospital.

²⁵ *Straughn v. Camp*, 293 So.2d 689, 694 (Fla. 1974).

²⁶ See chapter 2001-362, L.O.F.

The public access exemption extends to portions of a hospital's CEMP including those portions addressing security systems or plans; vulnerability analyses; emergency evacuation transportation; sheltering arrangements; post-disaster activities including provisions for emergency power, communications, food and water; post-disaster transportation; supplies, including drug caches; staffing; emergency equipment; and individual identification of residents, transfer of records, and methods of responding to family inquiries.

Any portion of a public meeting which would reveal information contained in a CEMP which addresses the response of a hospital to an act of terrorism is also exempted.

This bill reenacts and saves s. 395.1056(1), (2), and (3), F.S., from repeal under the Open Government Sunset Review Act and amends the section by deleting the provisions that repeal the exemptions.

This bill provides for an effective date of October 1, 2006.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

The provisions of this bill have no impact on municipalities and the counties under the requirements of Art. VII, s. 18 of the Florida Constitution.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

In accordance with a review pursuant to the Open Government Sunset Review Act, this bill amends s. 395.1056, F.S., and preserves the public meetings and records exemptions in that section. The bill does not expand the exemptions. The bill complies with the requirements of Art. I, s. 24(a) and (b) of the State Constitution.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

The provisions of this bill have no impact on the trust fund restrictions under the requirements of Art. III, Subsection 19(f) of the Florida Constitution.

V. Economic Impact and Fiscal Note:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

None.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

This Senate staff analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.

VIII. Summary of Amendments:

None.

This Senate staff analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.
