

**The Florida Senate**  
**BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

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

---

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Committee on Governmental Oversight and Accountability

---

BILL: SB 762

INTRODUCER: Senator Abruzzo

SUBJECT: Public Records/Involuntary Assessment and Stabilization Petition

DATE: January 29, 2016

REVISED: \_\_\_\_\_

|    | ANALYST        | STAFF DIRECTOR | REFERENCE | ACTION             |
|----|----------------|----------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 1. | <u>Crosier</u> | <u>Hendon</u>  | <u>CF</u> | <u>Favorable</u>   |
| 2. | <u>Kim</u>     | <u>McVaney</u> | <u>GO</u> | <u>Pre-meeting</u> |
| 3. | _____          | _____          | <u>RC</u> | _____              |

---

## I. Summary:

SB 762 amends s. 397.6815, F.S., to make petitions for involuntary assessment and stabilization of a person impaired due to substance abuse confidential and exempt from the public record disclosure and copying requirements of Art. I, s. 24(a) of the State Constitution and s. 119.07(1), F.S.

These petitions may be released:

- With the approval of the respondent, or other specified individuals, if necessary to ensure continuity of the respondent's health care.
- Upon the court's order for good cause.
- To the Department of Corrections if the respondent is committed or is to be returned to the custody of the Department of Corrections from the Department of Children and Families.

The bill provides for repeal of the exemption on October 2, 2021, unless reviewed and reenacted by the Legislature. It also provides a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution.

The bill provides for a retroactive application of the public record exemption.

The bill has an effective date of July 1, 2016.

## II. Present Situation:

The Florida Constitution provides that the public has the right to inspect or copy records made or received in connection with official governmental business.<sup>1</sup> This applies to the official business

---

<sup>1</sup> FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(a).

of any public body, officer or employee of the state, including all three branches of state government, local governmental entities, and any person acting on behalf of the government.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to the Florida Constitution, the Florida Statutes provide that the public may access legislative and executive branch records.<sup>3</sup> Chapter 119, F.S., constitutes the main body of public records laws, and is known as the Public Records Act.<sup>4</sup> The Public Records Act states that

it is the policy of this state that all state, county and municipal records are open for personal inspection and copying by any person. Providing access to public records is a duty of each agency.<sup>5</sup>

According to the Public Records Act, a public record includes virtually any document or recording, regardless of its physical form or how it may be transmitted.<sup>6</sup> The Florida Supreme Court has interpreted public records as being “any material prepared in connection with official agency business which is intended to perpetuate, communicate or formalize knowledge of some type.”<sup>7</sup> A violation of the Public Records Act may result in civil or criminal liability.<sup>8</sup>

The Legislature may create an exemption to public records requirements.<sup>9</sup> An exemption must pass by a two-thirds vote of the House and the Senate.<sup>10</sup> In addition, an exemption must explicitly lay out the public necessity justifying the exemption, and the exemption must be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the exemption.<sup>11</sup> A statutory exemption which does not meet these criteria may be unconstitutional and may not be judicially saved.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(a).

<sup>3</sup> The Public Records Act does not apply to legislative or judicial records. *Locke v. Hawkes*, 595 So. 2d 32 (Fla. 1992). Also see *Times Pub. Co. v. Ake*, 660 So. 2d 255 (Fla. 1995). The Legislature’s records are public pursuant to s. 11.0431, F.S. Public records exemptions for the Legislatures are primarily located in s. 11.0431(2)-(3), F.S.

<sup>4</sup> Public records laws are found throughout the Florida Statutes.

<sup>5</sup> Section 119.01(1), F.S.

<sup>6</sup> Section 119.011(12), F.S., defines “public record” 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.” 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>7</sup> *Shevin v. Byron, Harless, Schaffer, Reid and Assoc. Inc.*, 379 So. 2d 633, 640 (Fla. 1980).

<sup>8</sup> Section 119.10, F.S. Public records laws are found throughout the Florida Statutes, as are the penalties for violating those laws.

<sup>9</sup> FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(c).

<sup>10</sup> FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(c).

<sup>11</sup> FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(c).

<sup>12</sup> *Halifax Hosp. Medical Center v. New-Journal Corp.*, 724 So.2d 567 (Fla. 1999). In *Halifax Hospital*, the Florida Supreme Court found that a public meetings exemption was unconstitutional because the statement of public necessity did not define important terms and did not justify the breadth of the exemption. *Id.* at 570. The Florida Supreme Court also declined to narrow the exemption in order to save it. *Id.* In *Baker County Press, Inc. v. Baker County Medical Services, Inc.*, 870 So. 2d 189 (Fla. 1st DCA 2004), the court found that the intent of a statute was to create a public records exemption. The *Baker County Press* court found that since the law did not contain a public necessity statement, it was unconstitutional. *Id.* at 196.

When creating a public records exemption, the Legislature may provide that a record is ‘confidential and exempt’ or ‘exempt.’<sup>13</sup> Records designated as ‘confidential and exempt’ may be released by the records custodian only under the circumstances defined by the Legislature. Records designated as ‘exempt’ may be released at the discretion of the records custodian.<sup>14</sup>

### **Open Government Sunset Review Act**

In addition to the constitutional requirements relating to the enactment of a public records exemption, the Legislature may subject the new or broadened exemption to the Open Government Sunset Review Act (OGSR).

The OGSR prescribes a legislative review process for newly created or substantially amended public records.<sup>15</sup> The OGSR provides that an exemption automatically repeals on October 2nd of the fifth year after creation or substantial amendment; in order to save an exemption from repeal, the Legislature must reenact the exemption.<sup>16</sup> In practice, many exemptions are continued by repealing the sunset date rather than reenacting the exemption.

Under the OGSR the purpose and necessity of reenacting the exemption are reviewed. The Legislature must consider the following questions during its review of an exemption:<sup>17</sup>

- 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 so, 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?

If the Legislature expands an exemption, then a public necessity statement and a two-thirds vote for passage are required.<sup>18</sup> If the exemption is reenacted without substantive changes or if the exemption is narrowed, then a public necessity statement and a two-thirds vote for passage are not required. If the Legislature allows an exemption to sunset, the previously exempt records will remain exempt unless otherwise provided for by law.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> If the Legislature designates a record as confidential, such record may not be released to anyone other than the persons or entities specifically designated in the statutory exemption. *WFTV, Inc. v. The School Board of Seminole*, 874 So. 2d 48 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004).

<sup>14</sup> A record classified as exempt from public disclosure may be disclosed under certain circumstances. *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So. 2d 687 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991).

<sup>15</sup> Section 119.15, F.S. According to s. 119.15(4)(b), F.S., a substantially amended exemption is one that is expanded to include more information or to include meetings. The OGSR does not apply to an exemption that is required by federal law or that applies solely to the Legislature or the State Court System pursuant to s. 119.15(2), F.S. The OGSR process is currently being followed; however, the Legislature is not required to continue to do so. The Florida Supreme Court has found that one legislature cannot bind a future legislature. *Scott v. Williams*, 107 So. 3d 379 (Fla. 2013).

<sup>16</sup> Section 119.15(3), F.S.

<sup>17</sup> Section 119.15(6)(a), F.S.

<sup>18</sup> FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(c).

<sup>19</sup> Section 119.15(7), F.S.

### **The Marchman Act**

Section 397.301, F.S., creates the Hal. S. Marchman Alcohol and Other Drug Services Act (the “Marchman Act”). This act was created by the Legislature to provide assistance to substance abuse impaired persons through health and rehabilitative services. Currently, s. 397.6811, F.S., allows a petition for involuntary assessment and stabilization to be filed by a person’s spouse or guardian, any relative, a private practitioner, the director of a licensed service provider or any three adults who have personal knowledge of the person’s substance abuse impairment.

### **III. Effect of Proposed Changes:**

**Section 1** amends s. 397.6815, F.S., to provide that petitions for involuntary assessment and stabilization filed with the court under this part are confidential and exempt from s. 119.07(1), F.S., and s. 24(a), Art. I of the State Constitution and shall be released under the following circumstances:

- With the approval of the respondent, or other specified individuals, if necessary to ensure continuity of the respondent’s health care.
- Upon the court’s order for good cause.
- To the Department of Corrections if the respondent is committed or is to be returned to the custody of the Department of Corrections from the Department of Children and Families.

The bill provides for retroactive application of the public records exemption.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, the bill provides for repeal of the exemption on October 2, 2021, unless reviewed and saved from repeal by the Legislature, pursuant to the OGSR.<sup>21</sup>

**Section 2** provides a statement of public necessary as required by the State Constitution.<sup>22</sup> The public necessity statement provides that allowing petitions to be confidential and exempt from s. 119.07(1), F.S. and s. 24(a), Art. I of the State Constitution protects a person’s personal health information and sensitive personal information which, if released, could cause unwarranted damage to the person’s reputation. Additionally, the knowledge that such information could be disclosed could have a chilling effect on the willingness of individuals to seek treatment.

### **IV. Constitutional Issues:**

#### **A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:**

None.

#### **B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:**

None.

<sup>20</sup> 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. *Memorial Hospital-West Volusia, Inc. v. News-Journal Corporation*, 729 So.2d 373 (Fla.2001).

<sup>21</sup> Section 119.15(3), F.S.

<sup>22</sup> Section 24(c), Art. I of the State Constitution.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

**V. Fiscal Impact Statement:**

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

None.

**VI. Technical Deficiencies:**

The exemption is limited to the petition filed with the court for involuntary assessment. The bill would not make any other document, such as a related court order, confidential and exempt from public disclosure. A court order would probably include a finding of fact and will probably include sensitive information.

The OGSR does not apply to public records exemption that apply solely to the State Court System, pursuant to s. 119.15(2)(b), F.S. Therefore, it is unnecessary to subject this exemption to review in five years. This provision can be deleted.

**VII. Related Issues:**

None.

**VIII. Statutes Affected:**

This bill substantially amends section 397.6815 of the Florida Statutes.

**IX. Additional Information:**

A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Changes:

(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

B. Amendments:

None.