



# FULL ANALYSIS

## I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

### A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

This bill does not appear to implicate any of the House Principles.

### B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

#### **Background**

Florida law establishes the Johnnie B. Byrd, Sr., Alzheimer's Center and Research Institute (Alzheimer's Center) at the University of South Florida. The law requires the organization of a Florida not-for-profit corporation (corporation) for the sole purpose of governing and operating the Alzheimer's Center. Records of the corporation and its subsidiaries are public records.<sup>1</sup>

Current law provides a public records exemption for the Alzheimer's Center.<sup>2</sup> The following information is confidential and exempt<sup>3</sup> from public records requirements:

- Personal identifying information relating to program clients;
- Patient medical or health records;
- Materials that relate to methods of manufacture or production, potential trade secrets, potentially patentable material, actual trade secrets, or proprietary information received, generated, ascertained, or discovered during the course of research;
- Business transactions resulting from research;
- The identity of donors or prospective donors to the Alzheimer's Center who wishes to remain anonymous;
- Information received which is otherwise confidential and exempt; and
- Information received from a person from another state or nation or the Federal Government, which is confidential or exempt pursuant to those laws.

The Alzheimer's Center must provide such information to a governmental entity in the furtherance of that entity's duties and responsibilities. The governmental entity must maintain the confidential and exempt status of the information.

Pursuant to the Open Government Sunset Review Act,<sup>4</sup> the exemption will repeal on October 2, 2006, unless reenacted by the Legislature.

#### **Effect of Bill**

The bill removes the repeal date, thereby reenacting the public records exemption. It also makes editorial changes and removes superfluous language.

The bill removes the exemption for information received by the institute, which is otherwise confidential and exempt because it is unnecessary. In addition, it removes the clause reiterating the general

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 1004.445, F.S.

<sup>2</sup> Section 1004.445(9), F.S.

<sup>3</sup> There is a difference between records that are exempt from public records requirements and those that are *confidential* and exempt. If the Legislature makes a record confidential and exempt, such record cannot be released by an agency to anyone other than to the persons or entities designated in the statute. *See* Attorney General Opinion 85-62. If a record is simply made exempt from disclosure requirements, an agency is not prohibited from disclosing the record in all circumstances. *See Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So.2d 683, 687 (Fla. 5th DCA), review denied, 589 So.2d 289 (Fla. 1991).

<sup>4</sup> Section 119.15, F.S.

requirement that a governmental entity granted access to confidential and exempt information must maintain the status of that information. In *Ragsdale v. State*,<sup>5</sup> the Florida Supreme Court held that

[T]he applicability of a particular exemption is determined by the document being withheld, not by the identity of the agency possessing the record . . . the focus in determining whether a document has lost its status as a public record must be on the policy behind the exemption and not on the simple fact that the information has changed agency hands.<sup>6</sup>

In *City of Riviera Beach v. Barfield*,<sup>7</sup> the court stated “[h]ad 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.”<sup>8</sup> As such, the provision is unnecessary and has been removed, because had the Legislature intended for the confidential and exempt status to evaporate then the Legislature would have stated as much.

#### C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1 amends s. 1004.445(9), F.S., to remove the October 2, 2006, repeal date.

Section 2 provides an October 1, 2006, effective date.

### II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

#### A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

##### 1. Revenues:

This bill does not create, modify, amend, or eliminate a state revenue source.

##### 2. Expenditures:

The bill may represent a minimal non-recurring positive impact on state expenditures. A bill enacting or amending a public records exemption causes a non-recurring negative fiscal impact in the year of enactment because of training employees responsible for replying to public records requests. In the case of bills reviewed under the Open Government Sunset Review process, training costs are incurred if the bill does not pass or if the exemption is amended, as retraining is required. Because the bill eliminates the repeal of the exemption, the state may recognize a minimal nonrecurring decrease in expenditures because employee-training activities are avoided.

#### B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

##### 1. Revenues:

This bill does not create, modify, amend, or eliminate a local revenue source.

##### 2. Expenditures:

This bill does not create, modify, amend, or eliminate a local expenditure.

---

<sup>5</sup> 720 So.2d 203 (Fla. 1998).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 206, 207.

<sup>7</sup> 642 So. 2d 1135 (Fla. 4<sup>th</sup> DCA 1994), *review denied*, 651 So. 2d 1192 (Fla. 1995). In *Barfield*, Barfield argued that once the City of West Palm Beach shared its active criminal investigative information with the City of Riviera Beach the public records exemption for such information was waived. Barfield based that argument on a statement from the 1993 *Government-In-The-Sunshine Manual* (a booklet prepared by the Office of the Attorney General). The Attorney General opined “once a record is transferred from one public agency to another, the record loses its exempt status.” The court declined to accept the Attorney General’s view. As a result, that statement has been removed from the *Government-In-The-Sunshine Manual*.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 1137.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

**III. COMMENTS**

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

The bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds. The bill does not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities. The bill does not reduce the authority that municipalities have to raise revenue.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

**Open Government Sunset Review Act**

The Open Government Sunset Review Act sets forth a legislative review process for newly created or substantially amended public records or public meetings exemptions. It requires an automatic repeal of the exemption on October 2<sup>nd</sup> of the fifth year after creation or substantial amendment, unless the Legislature reenacts the exemption.

The Act provides that a public records or public meetings exemption may be created or maintained only if it serves an identifiable public purpose, and may be no broader than is necessary to meet one of the following purposes:

- Allowing the state or its political subdivisions to effectively and efficiently administer a governmental program, which administration would be significantly impaired without the exemption;
- Protecting sensitive personal information that, if released, would be defamatory or would jeopardize an individual's safety. However, only the identity of an individual may be exempted under this provision; or,
- Protecting trade or business secrets.

If, and only if, in reenacting an exemption that will repeal, the exemption is expanded (essentially creating a new exemption), then a public necessity statement and a two-thirds vote for passage are required because of the requirements of Art. 1, s. 24(c), Florida Constitution. If the exemption is reenacted with grammatical or stylistic changes that do not expand the exemption, if the exemption is narrowed, or if an exception to the exemption is created (e.g., allowing another agency access to the confidential or exempt records), then a public necessity statement and a two-thirds vote for passage are not required.

**IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE & COMBINED BILL CHANGES**

None.