

**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 Health Policy

---

BILL: CS/SB 268

INTRODUCER: Health Policy Committee and Senator Rodriguez

SUBJECT: Public Records/Emergency Physicians

DATE: February 3, 2026

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

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Smith	Brown	HP	<b>Fav/CS</b>
2.			GO	
3.			RC	

---

**Please see Section IX. for Additional Information:**

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE - Substantial Changes

---

**I. Summary:**

CS/SB 268 exempts from public records disclosure requirements certain identifying and location information of current emergency department physicians (defined in the bill as allopathic and osteopathic physicians who perform duties in a hospital emergency department), their spouses, and their children up to age 26. The bill exempts from public disclosure the home addresses, personal telephone numbers, and dates of birth of the physician and the physician's spouse and such children. The bill also exempts the place of employment of the physician's spouse and children. In addition, the exemption applies to the names and locations of the schools and day care facilities attended by the physician's children.

The bill requires custodial agencies that are not the employer of an emergency department physician to maintain the exempt status of certain personal information upon receipt of a notarized, sworn request affirming eligibility. The exemption remains in effect until the individual no longer qualifies and must be withdrawn by the requester when no longer applicable.

This exemption is subject to the Open Government Sunset Review Act and will stand repealed on October 2, 2031, unless saved by the Legislature from repeal.

The bill contains a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution. The bill creates a new public records exemption and, therefore, requires a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting for final passage in each house of the Legislature.

This bill is not expected to impact state and local government revenues and expenditures.

This bill provides an effective date of July 1, 2026.

## **II. Present Situation:**

### **Access to Public Records - Generally**

The State 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> The right to inspect or copy 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>

Additional requirements and exemptions related to public records are found in various statutes and rules, depending on the branch of government involved. For instance, s. 11.0431, F.S., provides public access requirements for legislative records. Relevant exemptions are codified in s. 11.0431(2)-(3), F.S., and adopted in the rules of each house of the legislature.<sup>3</sup> Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.420 governs public access to judicial branch records.<sup>4</sup> Lastly, ch. 119, F.S., known as the Public Records Act, provides requirements for public records held by executive agencies.

### **Executive Agency Records – The Public Records Act**

The Public Records Act provides that all state, county, and municipal records are open for personal inspection and copying by any person, and that providing access to public records is a duty of each agency.<sup>5</sup>

Section 119.011(12), F.S., defines “public records” to include:

[a]ll 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 connections with the transaction of official business by any agency.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* See also, *Sarasota Citizens for Responsible Gov’t v. City of Sarasota*, 48 So. 3d 755, 762-763 (Fla. 2010).

<sup>3</sup> See Rule 1.48, *Rules and Manual of the Florida Senate*, (2022-2024) and Rule 14.1, *Rules of the Florida House of Representatives*, Edition 2, (2022-2024).

<sup>4</sup> *State v. Wooten*, 260 So. 3d 1060 (Fla. 4<sup>th</sup> DCA 2018).

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

The Florida Supreme Court has interpreted this definition to encompass all materials made or received by an agency in connection with official business that are used to “perpetuate, communicate, or formalize knowledge of some type.”<sup>6</sup>

The Florida Statutes specify conditions under which public access to public records must be provided. The Public Records Act guarantees every person’s right to inspect and copy any public record at any reasonable time, under reasonable conditions, and under supervision by the custodian of the public record.<sup>7</sup> A violation of the Public Records Act may result in civil or criminal liability.<sup>8</sup>

The Legislature may exempt public records from public access requirements by passing a general law by a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate.<sup>9</sup> The exemption must state with specificity the public necessity justifying the exemption and must be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the exemption.<sup>10</sup>

General exemptions from the public records requirements are contained in the Public Records Act.<sup>11</sup> Specific exemptions often are placed in the substantive statutes relating to a particular agency or program.<sup>12</sup>

When creating a public records exemption, the Legislature may provide that a record is “exempt” or “confidential and exempt.” There is a difference between records the Legislature has determined to be exempt from the Public Records Act and those which the Legislature has determined to be exempt from the Public Records Act *and confidential*.<sup>13</sup> Records designated as “confidential and exempt” are not subject to inspection by the public and may only be released under the circumstances defined by statute.<sup>14</sup> Records designated as “exempt” may be released at the discretion of the records custodian under certain circumstances.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Shevin v. Byron, Harless, Schaffer, Reid and Assoc., Inc.*, 379 So. 2d 633, 640 (Fla. 1980).

<sup>7</sup> Section 119.07(1)(a), F.S.

<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. See, e.g., Halifax Hosp. Medical Center v. News-Journal Corp.*, 724 So. 2d 567 (Fla. 1999) (holding 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); *Baker County Press, Inc. v. Baker County Medical Services, Inc.*, 870 So. 2d 189 (Fla. 1st DCA 2004) (holding that a statutory provision written to bring another party within an existing public records exemption is unconstitutional without a public necessity statement).

<sup>11</sup> *See, e.g., s. 119.071(1)(a), F.S.* (exempting from public disclosure examination questions and answer sheets of examinations administered by a governmental agency for the purpose of licensure).

<sup>12</sup> *See, e.g., s. 213.053(2)(a), F.S.* (exempting from public disclosure information contained in tax returns received by the Department of Revenue).

<sup>13</sup> *WFTV, Inc. v. The Sch. Bd. of Seminole County*, 874 So. 2d 48, 53 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So. 2d 683 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991).

## Open Government Sunset Review Act

The provisions of s. 119.15, F.S., known as the Open Government Sunset Review Act<sup>16</sup> (the Act), prescribe a legislative review process for newly created or substantially amended<sup>17</sup> public records or open meetings exemptions, with specified exceptions.<sup>18</sup> The Act requires the repeal of such exemption on October 2 of the fifth year after its creation or substantial amendment, unless the Legislature reenacts the exemption.<sup>19</sup>

The Act 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>20</sup> An exemption serves an identifiable purpose if the Legislature finds that the purpose of the exemption outweighs open government policy and cannot be accomplished without the exemption, and it meets one of the following purposes:

- It allows the state or its political subdivisions to effectively and efficiently administer a governmental program, and administration would be significantly impaired without the exemption;<sup>21</sup>
- It protects sensitive, personal information, the release of which would be defamatory, cause unwarranted damage to the good name or reputation of the individual, or would jeopardize the individual's safety. If this public purpose is cited as the basis of an exemption, however, only personal identifying information is exempt;<sup>22</sup> or
- It protects information of a confidential nature concerning entities, such as trade or business secrets.<sup>23</sup>

The Act also requires specified questions to be considered during the review process.<sup>24</sup> In examining an exemption, the Act directs the Legislature to question the purpose and necessity of reenacting the exemption.

If the exemption is continued and expanded, then a public necessity statement and a two-thirds vote for passage are again required.<sup>25</sup> If the exemption is continued without substantive changes or if the exemption is continued and narrowed, then a public necessity statement and a two-thirds

<sup>16</sup> Section 119.15, F.S.

<sup>17</sup> An exemption is considered to be substantially amended if it is expanded to include more records or information or to include meetings as well as records. Section 119.15(4)(b), F.S.

<sup>18</sup> Section 119.15(2)(a) and (b), F.S., provides that exemptions required by federal law or applicable solely to the Legislature or the State Court System are not subject to the Open Government Sunset Review Act.

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

<sup>20</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b), F.S.

<sup>21</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b)1., F.S.

<sup>22</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b)2., F.S.

<sup>23</sup> Section 119.15(6)(b)3., F.S.

<sup>24</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>25</sup> See generally s. 119.15, F.S.

vote for passage are *not* required. If the Legislature allows an exemption to expire, the previously exempt records will remain exempt unless otherwise provided by law.<sup>26</sup>

### III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

**Section 1** creates a public records exemption for specified personal identifying and location information of current emergency department physicians, their spouses, and their children up to age 26. For purposes of the exemption, an “emergency department physician” is a physician licensed under ch. 458 or ch. 459, F.S., whose duties are performed in a hospital emergency department licensed under ch. 395, F.S. The following information will be exempt from public disclosure under the bill:

- The home addresses, personal telephone numbers, and dates of birth of current emergency department physicians;
- The names, home addresses, personal telephone numbers, dates of birth, and places of employment of the spouses and applicable children of such physicians; and
- The names and locations of schools and day care facilities attended by applicable children of such physicians.

Under the bill, an individual who is a current emergency department physician, or the spouse or child of such a physician, may request that a custodial agency maintain the exempt status of his or her specified personal information. To do so, the individual must submit a written and notarized request to the custodial agency. The request must include a sworn statement specifying the statutory basis for the exemption and affirming the individual’s eligibility.

The custodial agency must preserve the exempt status of the information upon receipt of a request that meets the requirements established in the bill. The agency must maintain the exemption until the qualifying conditions no longer apply to the individual who is the subject of the exemption.

The bill also imposes a duty on individuals who submit such requests to notify the custodial agency if the basis for the exemption no longer applies.

Pursuant to s. 119.071(4)(d)6., F.S., the new exemption applies to information held by an agency before, on, or after July 1, 2026 (the effective date of the exemption).<sup>27</sup>

Consistent with s. 119.15, F.S., the new exemptions will expire on October 2, 2031, unless reviewed and saved from repeal by the Legislature.

**Section 2** provides the constitutionally required public necessity statement, citing emergency department physicians’ heightened vulnerability to violence, harassment, intimidation, stalking, and related harms arising from the nature of emergency department encounters, and finding that the potential harm from disclosure outweighs any public benefit.

**Section 3** provides that the bill takes effect on July 1, 2026.

---

<sup>26</sup> Section 119.15(7), F.S.

<sup>27</sup> See s. 119.071(4)(d)6., F.S.

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

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

Not applicable. 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:**

###### **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 bill creating or expanding an exemption to the public records disclosure requirements. This bill enacts a new exemption for certain addresses, personal phone numbers, and other details of current emergency department physicians and their spouses and applicable children and, thus, the bill requires a two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature to be enacted.

###### **Public Necessity Statement**

Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution requires a bill creating or expanding an exemption to the public records disclosure requirements to state with specificity the public necessity justifying the exemption. Section 2 of the bill contains a statement of public necessity for the exemption which provides that emergency department physicians and their families may be subject to threats, harassment, intimidation, stalking, and other acts of violence arising from the physicians' work in hospital emergency departments. The statement further provides that disclosure of the exempt information could increase the risk of such harm and that protecting this information is necessary because the potential danger to emergency department physicians and their families outweighs the public benefit of disclosure.

###### **Breadth of Exemption**

Article I, section 24(c) of the State Constitution requires an exemption to the public records disclosure requirements to be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the law. The purpose of the proposed law is to protect identifying and location information that could compromise the safety of emergency department physicians and their families. This bill exempts current emergency department physicians, their spouses, and children younger than 26 years of age from the public records disclosure requirements. The records exempted in the CS are narrowly tailored to the most relevant safety concerns, limited to physicians who currently work in emergency departments, and the individual seeking the protection of the exemption must specifically request the exemption from the custodial agency. Thus, the exemption does not appear to be broader than necessary to accomplish the purpose of the law.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None identified.

D. State Tax or Fee Increases:

None identified.

E. Other Constitutional Issues:

None identified.

**V. Fiscal Impact Statement:**

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

The private sector will be subject to the cost associated with an agency's review and redactions of exempt records in response to a public records request.

C. Government Sector Impact:

The Department of Health has indicated that it would communicate the new exemption to physicians through multiple media platforms and notes that it is unknown how many licensees would request this exemption.

This bill may cause a minimal increase in workload on agencies<sup>28</sup> holding records that contain personal identifying information of public officers as well as their spouses and children because staff responsible for complying with public record requests may require training related to the new public record exemption. Additionally, agencies may incur costs associated with redacting the exempt information prior to releasing a record. However, the workload will likely be absorbed within current resources.

**VI. Technical Deficiencies:**

None identified.

**VII. Related Issues:**

None identified.

**VIII. Statutes Affected:**

This bill substantially amends section 119.071 of the Florida Statutes.

---

<sup>28</sup> Department of Health, *SBI 268 Legislative Bill Analysis* (Jan. 9, 2026) (on file with the Senate Committee on Health Policy).

**IX. Additional Information:**

- A. **Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**  
(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

**CS by Health Policy on February 2, 2026:**

The CS narrows the exemption in the underlying bill by limiting it to current emergency department physicians (not former), their spouses, and their children up to age 26. It removes the physician's place of employment and photographs from the covered information, clarifies that personal phone numbers are protected, and requires physicians and their family members to request the exemption from the custodial agency to receive the exemption. The CS requires that a requested exemption be withdrawn by the requester when it is no longer applicable.

- B. **Amendments:**

None.