

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 1083 Pub. Rec./CDD Surveillance Recordings

SPONSOR(S): Artiles

TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** SB 1218

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
1) Transportation & Highway Safety Subcommittee	14 Y, 0 N	Thompson	Miller
2) Government Operations Subcommittee	10 Y, 0 N	Williamson	Williamson
3) Economic Affairs Committee	16 Y, 0 N	Thompson	Creamer

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Community development districts (CDD) are special districts that are local units of special purpose government, created pursuant to ch 190, F.S., and limited to the authority provided in that act. CDDs are governed by a five member board of supervisors, and have governmental authority to manage and finance infrastructure for planned developments.

Some CDDs utilize video cameras to provide security and surveillance within their community. The security cameras are set up at fixed locations in public areas such as community roadway entrances, pool areas, and clubhouses. The video is used to provide leads in the event of a crime on CDD property, or violations regarding misuse of CDD property or rules.

A CDD is considered an "agency" pursuant to the state's public policy regarding access to government records; thus its records are subject to Florida's public record disclosure requirements. Currently, a public record exemption does not exist that would specifically protect CDD surveillance recordings from public record disclosure requirements. As a result, CDD surveillance recordings must be disclosed to anyone who makes a request.

The bill creates a public record exemption for CDD surveillance recordings. Specifically, the bill provides that any surveillance recording created to monitor activities occurring inside or outside of a public building or on public property that is held by a CDD is confidential and exempt from public records requirements.

The bill allows a CDD to disclose surveillance recordings to a law enforcement agency in the furtherance of its official duties and responsibilities, or pursuant to a court order.

The bill provides that the public record exemption is subject to the Open Government Sunset Review Act and will stand repealed on October 2, 2019, unless reviewed and saved from repeal through reenactment by the Legislature. It also provides a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution.

The bill will not have a fiscal impact to the state, local governments, or the private sector.

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 creates a new public record exemption; thus, it requires a two-thirds vote for final passage.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Background

Public Records

Article I, s. 24(a) of the State Constitution sets forth the state's public policy regarding access to government records. The 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.¹

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 Act² 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.

The Open Government Sunset Review Act requires the automatic repeal of a newly created exemption on October 2nd of the fifth year after creation or substantial amendment, unless the Legislature reenacts the exemption.

Community Development Districts

Community development districts (CDD) are special districts that are local units of special purpose government, created pursuant to ch 190, F.S., the "Uniform Community Development District Act of 1980," and limited to the authority provided in that act. CDDs are governed by a five member board of supervisors,³ and have governmental authority to manage and finance infrastructure for planned developments.⁴ They are, in effect, a means by which private entities secure development capital through bond sales repaid by assessments on public improvements and community facilities.

Some CDDs utilize video cameras to provide security and surveillance within their community. The security cameras are set up at fixed locations in public areas such as community roadway entrances, pool areas, and clubhouses. The video is used to provide a CDD board or law enforcement with leads in the event of a crime on CDD property, or violations regarding the misuse of CDD property or rules.⁵

¹ Section 24(c), Art. I of the State Constitution.

² See s. 119.15, F.S.

³ See s. 190.006, F.S.

⁴ See s. 190.002(1)(a), F.S.

⁵ For more information on CDD surveillance cameras, see the Ballantrae Communicator article, *CDD cameras should protect us* (April-June 2014), by Jim Flateau, CDD Chair. This document is on file with the Transportation and Highway Safety Subcommittee.

Currently, the Florida Department of State's record retention schedule for state and local agencies requires surveillance recordings to be retained for at least 30 days.⁶ After 30 days, the recordings can be deleted or written over, or stored for longer periods of time. This includes CDD surveillance recordings.

A CDD is considered an "agency"⁷ pursuant to Florida's public record requirements, and unless a specific public record exemption exists that would protect the recordings from public access, a CDD is required to allow access to the records to anyone for inspection or copying.⁸

Currently, a public record exemption does not exist that would specifically protect CDD surveillance recordings from public record disclosure requirements. As a result, unless a CDD chooses to discard or record over the recordings after 30 days, they must be disclosed to anyone who makes a request.

Proposed Changes

The bill creates a public record exemption for CDD surveillance recordings. Specifically, the bill provides that any surveillance recording created to monitor activities occurring inside or outside of a public building or on public property that is held by a CDD is confidential and exempt⁹ from s. 119.07(1), F.S., and s. 24(a), Art. I of the State Constitution.

A CDD may disclose such recording to a law enforcement agency in the furtherance of its official duties and responsibilities, or pursuant to a court order.

The bill provides that the public record exemption is subject to the Open Government Sunset Review Act and will stand repealed on October 2, 2019, unless reviewed and saved from repeal through reenactment by the Legislature. It also provides a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1 creates s. 190.0121, F.S., relating to the creation of a public record exemption for surveillance recordings held by a community development district.

Section 2 provides a public necessity statement.

Section 3 provides an effective date of July 1, 2014.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

⁶ According to the State of Florida General Records Schedule GS1-SL for State and Local Government Agencies, October 1, 2013, at page 37 Item #302, surveillance recordings are only required to be maintained for 30 days. This document can be viewed at http://dhis.dos.state.fl.us/barm/genschedules/GS1-SL-2013_Final.pdf. (Last viewed 3/9/14).

⁷ Section 119.011(2), F.S., defines agency as 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.

⁸ Section 119.07(1), F.S.

⁹ There is a difference between records that the Legislature has made exempt from public inspection and those that are confidential and exempt. 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. Florida Attorney General Opinion 85-62. If instead, the record is simply made exempt from disclosure requirements, an agency is not prohibited from disclosing the record in all circumstances. *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So.2d 683, 687 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991), review denied, 589 So.2d 289 (Fla. 1991).

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

The bill will not have a fiscal impact to the state, local governments, or the private sector.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

Not applicable. This bill does not appear to require counties or municipalities to spend funds or take action requiring the expenditures of funds; reduce the authority that counties or municipalities have to raise revenues in the aggregate; or reduce the percentage of state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

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 creates a new public record exemption; 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 creates a new public record exemption; thus, it includes a public necessity statement.

Breadth of Exemption

Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution requires a newly created or expanded public record or public meeting exemption to be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the law. The bill creates the public record exemption to protect from public disclosure surveillance recordings captured by a community development district.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

Other Comments: Retroactive Application

The Supreme Court of Florida ruled that a public record exemption is not to be applied retroactively unless the legislation clearly expresses intent that such exemption is to be applied retroactively.¹⁰ The bill does not contain a provision requiring retroactive application. According to reports, CDDs have been utilizing surveillance cameras for several years. Although the Florida Department of State's record retention schedule for state and local agencies requires surveillance recordings to be retained for at least 30 days, after 30 days the recordings can be deleted or written over. However, surveillance recordings may also be stored for longer periods of time.

IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

None.

¹⁰ *Memorial Hospital-West Volusia, Inc. v. News-Journal Corporation*, 729 So.2d. 373 (Fla. 2001).