

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

**BILL #:** CS/HB 529 Public Records  
**SPONSOR(S):** Health Quality Subcommittee; Renuart  
**TIED BILLS:** **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** CS/SB 60

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
1) Health Quality Subcommittee	11 Y, 0 N, As CS	Guzzo	O'Callaghan
2) Government Operations Subcommittee	9 Y, 0 N	Stramski	Williamson
3) Health & Human Services Committee	13 Y, 0 N	Guzzo	Calamas

### SUMMARY ANALYSIS

CS/HB 529 creates a public record exemption for information relating to the identification and location of current or former personnel of the Department of Health (DOH), whose duties include the:

- Investigation or prosecution of complaints filed against health care practitioners; or
- Inspection of practitioners or facilities licensed by DOH.

In addition to providing a public record exemption for DOH personnel, the bill provides that the following information relating to the families of such personnel is exempt from public record requirements:

- Names, home addresses, telephone numbers, and places of employment of the spouses and children of such personnel; and
- Names and locations of schools and day care facilities attended by the children of such personnel.

The bill provides for repeal of the exemption on October 2, 2018, unless reviewed and saved from repeal by the Legislature. In addition, the bill provides a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution.

The bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact.

The bill provides an effective date of upon becoming a law.

**Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution, requires a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting for final passage of a newly created or expanded public record or public meeting exemption. The bill expands the current public record exemption; thus, it requires a two-thirds vote for final passage.**

## FULL ANALYSIS

### I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

#### A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

##### **Present Situation**

##### Public Records

Article I, s. 24(a) of the State Constitution sets forth the state's public policy regarding access to government records. This section guarantees every person a right to inspect or copy any public record of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. The Legislature, however, may provide by general law for the exemption of records from the requirements of Article I, s. 24(a) of the State Constitution. The general law must state with specificity the public necessity justifying the exemption (public necessity statement) and must be no broader than necessary to accomplish its purpose.<sup>1</sup>

Public policy regarding access to government records is addressed further in the Florida Statutes. Section 119.07(1), F.S., guarantees every person a right to inspect and copy any state, county, or municipal record. Furthermore, the Open Government Sunset Review Act<sup>2</sup> provides that a public record or public meeting exemption may be created or maintained only if it serves an identifiable public purpose. In addition, it may be no broader than is necessary to meet one of the following purposes:

- Allows the state or its political subdivisions to effectively and efficiently administer a governmental program, which administration would be significantly impaired without the exemption.
- Protects 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.
- Protects trade or business secrets.

##### Public Record Exemptions

Current law provides public record exemptions for identification and location information of certain current or former public employees and their spouses and children.<sup>3</sup> Examples of public employees covered by these exemptions include law enforcement personnel, firefighters, local government personnel who are responsible for revenue collection and enforcement or child support enforcement, justices and judges, and local and statewide prosecuting attorneys. Legislation was passed in 2012 to provide a public record exemption for personal and identifying information of current or former county tax collectors, and investigators or inspectors of the Department of Business and Professional Regulation.<sup>4</sup>

Although the types of exempt information vary, the following information is exempt from public record requirements for all of the above-listed public employees:

- Home addresses and telephone numbers of the public employees;
- Home addresses, telephone numbers, and places of employment of the spouses and children of public employees; and
- Names and locations of schools and day care facilities attended by the children of the public employees.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 24(c), Art. I of the State Constitution.

<sup>2</sup> See s. 119.15, F.S.

<sup>3</sup> See s. 119.071(4)(d), F.S.

<sup>4</sup> CS/CS/HB1089; Chapter 2012-214, L.O.F.

If exempt information is held by an agency<sup>5</sup> that is not the employer of the public employee, the public employee must submit a written request to that agency to maintain the public record exemption.<sup>6</sup>

Currently, personal information of Department of Health investigative staff and their spouses and children is not exempt from public disclosure.<sup>7</sup>

### Department of Health – Complaints and Investigations

The Department of Health (DOH) is responsible for the regulation of health care practitioners pursuant to chapter 456, F.S. Specific facilities and professions regulated by DOH require inspections prior to beginning practice and on a periodic basis. Specifically, these facilities and professionals include:<sup>8</sup>

- Pain Management Clinics;
- Pharmacies;
- Dental Laboratories;
- Massage Establishments;
- Electrolysis Establishments;
- Optical Establishments;
- Dispensing Practitioners; and
- Any place in which drugs and medical supplies are manufactured, packed, packaged, made, stored, sold, offered for sale, exposed for sale, or kept for sale.

Many individuals may be involved in some fashion throughout the investigation process. Section 456.073(1), F.S., requires DOH inspectors and investigators to investigate any complaint that is determined to be legally sufficient. After review of a complaint, if the allegations and supporting documentation show that a violation may have occurred, the complaint is considered legally sufficient for investigation. A complaint is legally sufficient if it contains ultimate facts that show a violation of chapter 456, F.S., any of the practice acts relating to the professions regulated by DOH, or of any rule adopted by DOH or a regulatory board has occurred.

The Investigative Services Unit (ISU) functions as the investigative arm of DOH as it investigates complaints against health care practitioners and facilities regulated by DOH. ISU includes staff of professional investigators and senior pharmacists who conduct interviews, collect documents and evidence, prepare investigative reports for the Prosecution Services Unit (PSU), and serve subpoenas and official orders of DOH. Upon completion of collecting information and conducting interviews, the investigator writes an investigative report and the report is forwarded to DOH's attorneys for legal review.<sup>9</sup>

Attorneys within the PSU then review the investigative report to recommend a course of action, which may include:<sup>10</sup>

- Emergency orders against licensees who pose an immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of individuals;

---

<sup>5</sup> Section 119.011(2), F.S., defines "agency" 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.

<sup>6</sup> Section 119.071(4)(d)3., F.S.

<sup>7</sup> *But See* s. 119.071(4)(d)2.a., F.S., re: Department of Health investigators of child abuse.

<sup>8</sup> Sections 456.069 and 465.017, F.S.

<sup>9</sup> Florida Department of Health, Division of Medical Quality Assurance, [http://www.doh.state.fl.us/mqa/enforcement/enforce\\_csu.html](http://www.doh.state.fl.us/mqa/enforcement/enforce_csu.html) (last visited March 8, 2013).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

- Expert reviews for complex cases that require professional health care experts to render an opinion;
- Closing orders if the investigation or the expert review does not support the allegations;<sup>11</sup> or
- Administrative complaints when the investigation supports the allegations.

When an administrative complaint is filed, the subject has the right to choose a hearing, consent/stipulation agreement, or voluntarily relinquish their license. In all of these instances, the case is then presented to the professional board or DOH for final agency action. If the subject appeals the final decision, the PSU attorney defends the final order before the appropriate appellate court.

According to DOH, investigators have recently had to be involved in more investigations that include criminal elements.<sup>12</sup> Investigators who inspect massage establishments are identifying and reporting to law enforcement possible human trafficking activities. Further, investigators have forged strong relationships with law enforcement in an effort to combat the health care concerns caused by illegal pill mills and controlled substance abuse in Florida. As DOH investigators are exposed to more and more potentially dangerous criminal situations, they have become concerned about the release of personal information that may be used by criminals, or individuals under investigation by DOH, to target investigative staff and their families.

### **Effect of Proposed Changes**

The bill further expands the current public record exemption for identification and location information of public employees to include current and former DOH personnel whose duties include the investigation or prosecution of complaints filed against health care practitioners or the inspection of practitioners or facilities licensed by DOH. The bill provides that the following information is exempt<sup>13</sup> from public record requirements if such personnel make a reasonable effort to protect the information from being accessible through other means available to the public:

- Home addresses, telephone numbers, and photographs of current or former DOH personnel whose duties include investigating or prosecuting complaints against health care practitioners, or inspecting practitioners or facilities licensed by DOH;
- Names, home addresses, telephone numbers, and places of employment of the spouses and children of such personnel; and
- Names and locations of schools and day care facilities attended by the children of such personnel.

The bill provides for repeal of the exemption on October 2, 2018, unless reviewed and saved from repeal by the Legislature.

The bill provides a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Cases closed with no finding of probable cause are generally confidential and are not available through a public records request.

<sup>12</sup> HB 529 Bill Analysis, Economic Statement and Fiscal Note, Department of Health, at page 3, February 1, 2013 (on file with the Health Quality subcommittee).

<sup>13</sup> There is a difference between records the Legislature designates as exempt from public record requirements and those the Legislature deems confidential and exempt. A record classified as exempt from public disclosure may be disclosed under certain circumstances. See *WFTV, Inc. v. The School Board of Seminole*, 874 So.2d 48, 53 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004), review denied 892 So.2d 1015 (Fla. 2004); *City of Riviera Beach v. Barfield*, 642 So.2d 1135 (Fla. 4th DCA 1994); *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So.2d 687 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991) If the Legislature designates a record as confidential and exempt from public disclosure, such record may not be released, by the custodian of public records, to anyone other than the persons or entities specifically designated in the statutory exemption. See Attorney General Opinion 85-62 (August 1, 1985).

<sup>14</sup> See s. 24(c), Art. I of the State Constitution.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

**Section 1:** Amends s. 119.071, F.S., relating to general exemptions from inspection or copying of public records.

**Section 2:** Provides a public necessity statement.

**Section 3:** Provides that the bill shall be effective upon becoming a law.

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

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

See FISCAL COMMENTS.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

See FISCAL COMMENTS.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

The bill could create a minimal fiscal impact on state or local agencies with staff responsible for complying with public record requests as staff could require training related to the expansion of the public record exemption. In addition, an agency could incur costs associated with redacting the exempt information prior to releasing a record. The costs, however, would be absorbed, as they are part of the day-to-day responsibilities of the agency.

**III. COMMENTS**

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

Not applicable. This bill does not appear to affect county or municipal governments.

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 final passage of a newly created or expanded public record or public meeting exemption. The bill expands current public record exemptions; thus, it requires a two-thirds vote for final passage.

Public Necessity Statement

Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution, requires a public necessity statement for a newly created or expanded public record or public meeting exemption. The bill expands current public record exemptions; thus, it includes a public necessity statement.

### Breadth of Exemption

Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution, requires a newly created public record or public meeting exemption to be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the law. The bill creates a public record exemption for information relating to the identification and location of certain personnel of the Department of Health. The exemption does not appear to be in conflict with the constitutional requirement that the exemption must be no broader than necessary to accomplish its purpose.

#### B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

No additional rule-making authority is necessary to implement the provisions of the bill.

#### C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

It is unclear what the term “reasonable efforts” on line 191 of the bill means and what actions personnel would have to take to protect identifying information.

### **IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES**

On February 19, 2013, the Health Quality Subcommittee adopted an amendment and reported the bill favorably as a committee substitute. The amendment narrows the scope of the public record exemption and clarifies whose identifying information is exempt from disclosure.

This analysis is drafted to the committee substitute as passed by the Health Quality Subcommittee.