

**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 Rules

---

BILL: SB 7018

INTRODUCER: Ethics and Elections Committee

SUBJECT: OGSR/Agency Investigations

DATE: February 28, 2018

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

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
	<u>Carlton</u>	<u>Ulrich</u>		<b>EE Submitted as Committee Bill</b>
1.	<u>Peacock</u>	<u>Caldwell</u>	<u>GO</u>	<b>Favorable</b>
2.	<u>Carlton</u>	<u>Phelps</u>	<u>RC</u>	<b>Favorable</b>

---

**I. Summary:**

SB 7018 is based on an Open Government Sunset Review of a public records exemption for complaints of misconduct filed with an agency against an agency employee and all information obtained from an investigation by the agency of the complaint of misconduct. The bill removes the scheduled October 2, 2018, repeal date.

Since the bill does not create or expand an exemption to public records law, the bill requires a majority vote of each house of the Legislature for passage.

The bill has an effective date of October 1, 2018.

**II. Present Situation:**

**Public Records Law**

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 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>

---

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

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

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

[i]t 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 open meetings requirements by passing a general law by a two-thirds vote of the House and the Senate.<sup>9</sup> The exemption must explicitly lay out the public necessity justifying the exemption, and must be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the exemption.<sup>10</sup> A statutory exemption which does not meet these two criteria may be unconstitutional and may not be judicially saved.<sup>11</sup>

When creating a public records exemption, the Legislature may provide that a record is ‘confidential and exempt’ or ‘exempt.’<sup>12</sup> Records designated as ‘confidential and exempt’ may be released by the records custodian only under the circumstances defined by the Legislature.

---

<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 Legislature 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” 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.”

<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> *Id.*

<sup>11</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.

<sup>12</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).

Records designated as ‘exempt’ may be released at the discretion of the records custodian under certain circumstances.<sup>13</sup>

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

The Open Government Sunset Review Act (referred to hereafter as the “OGSR”) prescribes a legislative review process for newly created or substantially amended public records or open meetings exemptions.<sup>14</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>15</sup> In practice, many exemptions are continued by repealing the sunset date rather than reenacting the exemption.

The OGSR provides that a public records or open meetings exemption may be created or maintained only if it serves an identifiable public purpose and is no broader than is necessary.<sup>16</sup> An exemption serves an identifiable purpose if it meets one of the following purposes *and* the Legislature finds that the purpose of the exemption outweighs open government policy and cannot be accomplished without the exemption:

- It allows the state or its political subdivision to effectively and efficiently administer a program, and administration would be significantly impaired without the exemption;<sup>17</sup>
- Releasing sensitive personal information would be defamatory or would jeopardize an individual’s safety. If this public purpose is cited as the basis of an exemption, however, only personal identifying information is exempt;<sup>18</sup> or
- It protects trade or business secrets.<sup>19</sup>

The OGSR also requires specified questions to be considered during the review process.<sup>20</sup> In examining an exemption, the OGSR asks the Legislature to carefully question the purpose and necessity of reenacting the exemption.

If the Legislature expands an exemption, a public necessity statement and a two-thirds vote for passage are required.<sup>21</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

<sup>13</sup> *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So. 2d 683 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991).

<sup>14</sup> Section 119.15, F.S. Section 119.15(4)(b), F.S., provides that an exemption is considered to be substantially amended if it 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.

<sup>15</sup> Section 119.15(3), F.S.

<sup>16</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b), F.S.

<sup>17</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b)1., F.S.

<sup>18</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b)2., F.S.

<sup>19</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b)3., F.S.

<sup>20</sup> Section 119.15(6)(a), F.S. The specified questions are:

- 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?

<sup>21</sup> FLA. CONST. Art. I, s. 24(c).

not required. If the Legislature allows an exemption to sunset, the previously exempt records will remain exempt unless provided for by law.<sup>22</sup>

### **Public Record Exemption under Review**

Current law requires that complaints of misconduct filed with an agency<sup>23</sup> against an agency employee be kept confidential and exempt<sup>24</sup> from public records requirements.<sup>25</sup> If an agency investigates such a complaint, the information obtained from the investigation is also confidential and exempt.<sup>26</sup> The complaint and the investigative information remain confidential and exempt until either the investigation ceases to be active or the agency provides written notice to the employee who is the subject of the complaint.<sup>27</sup> The written notice may be delivered personally or by mail and must state that the agency has concluded the investigation with a finding to proceed with disciplinary action or file charges<sup>28</sup> or not to proceed.<sup>29</sup>

The 2013 public necessity statement<sup>30</sup> for the exemption provides the following policy rationale for its enactment:

The disclosure of information, such as the nature of the complaint against an agency employee and testimony and evidence given in the investigation of the complaint, could injure an individual and deter that person from providing information pertaining to internal investigations, thus impairing the ability of an agency to conduct an investigation that is fair and reasonable. In the performance of its lawful duties and responsibilities, an agency may need to obtain information for the purpose of determining an administrative action. Without an exemption from public record requirements to protect information of a sensitive personal nature provided to an agency in the course of an internal investigation, such information becomes a public record when received and must be divulged upon request. Disclosure of information obtained during an internal investigation conducted by an agency inhibits voluntary participation of individuals during internal investigations and makes it difficult if not impossible to determine the truth.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Section 119.15(7), F.S.

<sup>23</sup> See *supra* note 6.

<sup>24</sup> There is a difference between records the Legislature designates 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 683 (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 statute. (See Attorney General Opinion 85-62, August 1, 1985).

<sup>25</sup> Section 119.071(2)(k)1., F.S.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> Section 119.071(2)(k)1.b., F.S.

<sup>29</sup> Section 119.071(2)(k)1.a., F.S.

<sup>30</sup> Article I, s. 24(c), FLA. CONST., requires each public record exemption “state with specificity the public necessity statement justifying” its existence.

<sup>31</sup> Chapter 2013-248, L.O.F.

The public records exemption regarding complaints of misconduct filed with a state agency against an agency employee will repeal on October 2, 2018, unless reenacted by the Legislature.

### **Open Government Sunset Review Results**

During the 2017 interim, staff with the Senate Committee on Ethics and Elections sent a questionnaire to every state agency, county, city, sheriff's office, public defender's office, and state attorney's office. In all, 62 questionnaire responses were received.<sup>32</sup> A majority of respondents recommended that the exemption be reenacted without changes and no respondents recommended letting the exemption repeal. Many respondents reported that their agency had received public record requests for the exempt information. The most common rationale offered for maintaining the exemption was that the temporary confidentiality it afforded the agency allowed it to maintain the fairness and integrity of the investigation that in turn encouraged all parties involved to be candid and forthcoming.

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

**Section 1** amends s. 119.071(2), F.S., to remove the scheduled repeal date of October 2, 2018, in the public records exemption.

Effectively, the bill permits the public records exemption for complaints of misconduct filed with an agency against an agency employee and all information obtained from an investigation by the agency of the complaint of misconduct to continue as it currently exists.

**Section 2** provides an effective date of October 1, 2018.

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

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

The mandate restrictions do not apply because the bill does not require counties and municipalities to spend funds, reduce counties' or municipalities' ability to raise revenue, or reduce the percentage of state tax shared with counties and municipalities.

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

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 records exemption. The bill does not create or expand a public records exemption, therefore it does not require a two-thirds vote for final passage.

The bill reenacts an existing public records exemption for complaints of misconduct filed with an agency against an agency employee and all information obtained from an investigation by the agency of the complaint. The bill complies with the requirements of article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution that public records exemptions may only be addressed in legislation separate from substantive changes to law.

---

<sup>32</sup> The questionnaire and responses are on file with the Senate Committee on Ethics and Elections.

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:**

None.

**VII. Related Issues:**

None.

**VIII. Statutes Affected:**

This bill substantially amends section 119.071 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.