

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS**

**BILL #:** HB 7113      PCB GO 06-23      OGSR Public Records Exemption/Interference with Custody  
**SPONSOR(S):** Governmental Operations Committee, Rivera  
**TIED BILLS:** HB 7111                              **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** SB 710

---

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
Orig. Comm.: Governmental Operations Committee	6 Y, 0 N	Williamson	Williamson
1) _____	_____	_____	_____
2) _____	_____	_____	_____
3) _____	_____	_____	_____
4) _____	_____	_____	_____
5) _____	_____	_____	_____

---

**SUMMARY ANALYSIS**

The Open Government Sunset Review Act requires the Legislature to review each public records and each public meetings exemption five years after enactment. If the Legislature does not reenact the exemption, it automatically repeals on October 2<sup>nd</sup> of the fifth year after enactment.

Current law provides a third-degree felony for the offense of "interference with custody"; however, a spouse who flees with a child because he or she is the victim of domestic violence or believes the welfare of the child is in danger does not commit a felony of the third degree. The fleeing spouse must file a report with the sheriff's office or the state attorney's office of the county where the child resided at the time he or she was taken. The report must contain the name of the person taking the child, the current address and telephone number of the person and child, and the reasons the child was taken.

In order to conform to changes proposed in PCB GO 06-22, this bill reenacts and expands the public records exemption for the current address and telephone number of the person fleeing with a child and of the child. The bill expands the exemption to include the current address and telephone number of the person fleeing with an incompetent person and of the incompetent person.

The bill provides for future review and repeal of the exemption. It also provides a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution, and provides a contingent effective date.

The bill may have a minimal non-recurring fiscal impact on state and local governments.

**The bill requires a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting for passage.**

## FULL ANALYSIS

### I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

#### A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

**Provide limited government** – The bill expands the public records exemption that accompanies the interference with custody statute thereby decreasing public access to government information.

#### B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

##### **Background**

##### Interference with Custody

In 1974, the Legislature created the offense of interference with custody. At present, there are two variations to the offense:

- It is a third-degree felony for any person, without legal authority, to knowingly or recklessly take a child 17 years of age or under or any incompetent person from the custody of his or her parent, guardian, a public agency in charge of the child or incompetent person, or any other lawful custodian.<sup>1</sup>
- It is a third-degree felony, in the absence of a court order determining custody or visitation rights, for a parent, stepparent, guardian, or relative who has custody of a child or incompetent person to take or conceal the child or incompetent person with a malicious intent to deprive another person of his or her right to custody.<sup>2</sup>

The statute does not apply if a spouse flees with a child or incompetent person because he or she:

- Is the victim of domestic violence or reasonably believes that he or she is about to become a victim of such violence; or
- Believes the welfare of the child or incompetent person is in danger.<sup>3</sup>

This exception to the statute does not apply to a person fleeing with an incompetent person for the aforementioned reasons.

In order to avail himself or herself of the exception for spouses, a person who takes a child must file a report with the sheriff's office or the state attorney's office of the county where the child resided at the time he or she was taken. Within 10 days of taking the child, the report must be filed and must contain the name of the person taking the child, the current address and telephone number of the person and child, and the reasons the child was taken.<sup>4</sup> Within a reasonable time, the person also must commence a custody proceeding consistent with the federal Parental Kidnapping Prevention Act or the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act.<sup>5</sup>

##### Public Records Exemption

The current address and telephone number of the person taking the child and of the child, which are contained in the report made to the sheriff or state attorney, are confidential and exempt<sup>6</sup> from public

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 787.03(1), F.S.

<sup>2</sup> Section 787.03(2), F.S.

<sup>3</sup> Section 787.03(6)(a), F.S.

<sup>4</sup> The sheriff or state attorney must be informed of any change of address or telephone number. Section 787.03(6)(b)3., F.S.

<sup>5</sup> Section 787.03(6)(b), F.S.

<sup>6</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

records requirements.<sup>7</sup> The public records exemption was scheduled for repeal on October 2, 2005, because of the Open Government Sunset Review Act.<sup>8</sup> During the 2005 Regular Session, the Legislature reenacted the public records exemption and saved it from repeal. Because the interference with custody statute contained substantive language inconsistencies, the repeal date was extended from October 2, 2005, to October 2, 2006, in order to trigger an additional review of the substantive language.<sup>9</sup> As a result, the exemption will repeal on October 2, 2006, unless reenacted by the Legislature.

### PCB GO 06-22

PCB GO 06-22 revises the interference with custody statute to broaden an existing exception for a spouse who takes a minor during the course of fleeing domestic violence or protecting the welfare of the minor, and reports their whereabouts to the sheriff or state attorney. It provides that the exception is applicable not only to the taking of a minor but also to the taking of an incompetent person. As such, it is recommended that the public records exemption be amended to reflect this change.

### **Effect of Bill**

The bill reenacts and expands the public records exemption to conform to the recommended changes to the interference with custody statute made in PCB GO 06-22. The bill expands the exemption to include the current address and telephone number of the person fleeing with an incompetent person and of the incompetent person. The sheriff or state attorney may allow an agency, as defined in the Public Records Act, to inspect and copy such records in the furtherance of that agency's duties and responsibilities.

The bill extends the repeal date from October 2, 2006, to October 2, 2011. It also provides a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution, and provides a contingent effective date.

### C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1 amends s. 787.03, F.S., to reenact and expand the public records exemption regarding the interference with custody.

Section 2 provides a public necessity statement.

Section 3 provides an October 1, 2006, effective date contingent upon the passage of additional legislation.

## **II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT**

### A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

#### 1. Revenues:

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

#### 2. Expenditures:

See FISCAL COMMENTS.

---

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>7</sup> Section 787.03(6)(c), F.S.

<sup>8</sup> Section 119.15, F.S.

<sup>9</sup> House of Representatives Staff Analysis of HB 1699, March 11, 2005, at 3.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

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

2. Expenditures:

See FISCAL COMMENTS.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

The bill may create a minimal non-recurring increase in state and local government expenditures. A bill enacting or amending the public records law causes a non-recurring negative fiscal impact in the year of enactment due to training employees who are 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 employees must be retrained. Because the bill expands the public records exemption, employee-training activities are required thus causing a minimal nonrecurring increase in expenditures.

### 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:

Vote Requirement

Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution, requires a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting for passage of a newly created public records or public meetings exemption. The bill *expands* the current exemption, essentially creating a new public records exemption. Thus, the bill requires a two-thirds vote for passage.

Public Necessity Statement

Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution, requires a statement of public necessity (public necessity statement) for a newly created public records or public meetings exemption. The bill *expands* the current exemption, essentially creating a new public records exemption. Thus, the bill includes a public necessity statement.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not appear to create, modify, or eliminate rulemaking authority.

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.