

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: CS/SB 7014

INTRODUCER: Governmental Oversight and Accountability Committee; and Commerce and Tourism Committee

SUBJECT: OGSR/Department of Legal Affairs

DATE: January 26, 2026

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
	<u>McMillan</u>	<u>McKay</u>		CM Submitted as Comm. Bill/Fav
1.	<u>McVaney</u>	<u>McVaney</u>	<u>GO</u>	Fav/CS
2.	<u>McMillan</u>	<u>Kruse</u>	<u>RC</u>	Pre-meeting

Please see Section IX. for Additional Information:

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE - Substantial Changes

I. Summary:

CS/SB 7014 delays the repeal dates from October 2, 2026, to October 2, 2031, for two public record exemptions related to investigations into social media platforms. The public record exemptions make confidential and exempt from public inspection and copying requirements information received by the Department of Legal Affairs or a law enforcement agency into whether a social media platform has committed an antitrust violation or failed to meet certain transparency and notification requirements.

These exemptions are subject to the Open Government Sunset Review Act and stand repealed on October 2, 2026, unless reenacted by the Legislature. The bill saves the exemptions from repeal by delaying the scheduled repeal dates, thereby maintaining the confidential and exempt status of the information until October 2, 2031.

The bill is not expected to affect state and local government revenues and expenditures.

The bill takes effect upon becoming a law.

II. Present Situation:

Public Records Law

The State Constitution provides that the public has the right to inspect or copy records made or received in connection with official governmental business.¹ 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.²

Chapter 119, F.S., known as the Public Records Act, constitutes the main body of public records laws.³ 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.⁴

The Public Records Act typically contains general exemptions that apply across agencies. Agency- or program-specific exemptions often are placed in the substantive statutes relating to that particular agency or program.

The Public Records Act does not apply to legislative or judicial records.⁵ Legislative records are public pursuant to s. 11.0431, F.S. Public records exemptions for the Legislature are codified primarily in s. 11.0431(2)-(3), F.S., and adopted in the rules of each house of the legislature.

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 connection with the transaction of official business by any agency.

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

The Florida Statutes specify conditions under which public access to governmental records must be provided. The Public Records Act guarantees every person’s right to inspect and copy any state or local government public record at any reasonable time, under reasonable conditions, and

¹ FLA. CONST. art. I, s. 24(a).

² *Id.*; *Sarasota Citizens for Responsible Gov’t v. City of Sarasota*, 48 So. 3d 755, 762-763 (Fla. 2010).

³ Public records laws are found throughout the Florida Statutes.

⁴ Section 119.01(1), F.S.

⁵ *Locke v. Hawkes*, 595 So. 2d 32, 34 (Fla. 1992); *Times Pub. Co. v. Ake*, 660 So. 2d 255 (Fla. 1995).

⁶ *Shevin v. Byron, Harless, Schaffer, Reid & Assoc.*, 379 So. 2d 633, 640 (Fla. 1980).

under supervision by the custodian of the public record.⁷ A violation of the Public Records Act may result in civil or criminal liability.⁸

Only the Legislature may create an exemption to public records requirements.⁹ An exemption must be created by general law and must specifically state the public necessity justifying the exemption.¹⁰ Further, the exemption must be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the law. A bill enacting an exemption may not contain other substantive provisions¹¹ and must pass by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting in each house of the Legislature.¹²

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*.¹³ 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.¹⁴ Records designated as “exempt” may be released at the discretion of the records custodian under certain circumstances.¹⁵

Open Government Sunset Review Act

The provisions of s. 119.15, F.S., known as the Open Government Sunset Review Act (the Act), prescribe a legislative review process for newly created or substantially amended public records or open meetings exemptions,¹⁶ with specified exceptions.¹⁷ The Act requires the repeal of such exemption 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 or repeal the sunset date.¹⁸ In practice, many exemptions are continued by repealing the sunset date, rather than reenacting the exemption.

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.¹⁹ 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:

⁷ Section 119.07(1)(a), F.S.

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

⁹ FLA. CONST. art. I, s. 24(c).

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ The bill may, however, contain multiple exemptions that relate to one subject.

¹² FLA. CONST. art. I, s. 24(c)

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

¹⁴ *Id.*

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

¹⁶ Section 119.15, F.S. Section 119.15(4)(b), F.S., provides that an exemption is substantially amended if it is expanded to include more records or information or to include meetings.

¹⁷ 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.

¹⁸ Section 119.15(3), F.S.

¹⁹ Section 119.15(6)(b), F.S.

- It allows the state or its political subdivision to effectively and efficiently administer a program, and administration would be significantly impaired without the exemption;²⁰
- It protects sensitive, personal information, the release of which 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;²¹ or
- It protects trade or business secrets.²²

The Act also requires specified questions to be considered during the review process.²³ In examining an exemption, the Act directs the Legislature to question the purpose and necessity of reenacting the exemption.

If, in reenacting an exemption or repealing the sunset date, the exemption is expanded, then a public necessity statement and a two-thirds vote for passage are again required.²⁴ If the exemption is reenacted or saved from repeal 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 expire, the previously exempt records will remain exempt unless otherwise provided by law.²⁵

Antitrust Violations

Antitrust laws “prohibit anticompetitive conduct and mergers that deprive American consumers, taxpayers, and workers of the benefits of competition.”²⁶ Federal antitrust law includes the Sherman Antitrust Act,²⁷ the Clayton Act,²⁸ and the Federal Trade Commission Act.²⁹ These laws are principally enforced by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), but can also be enforced by state attorneys general and private plaintiffs.

In 1980, the Legislature passed the Florida Antitrust Act,³⁰ which, in large part, mirrors the federal Sherman Antitrust Act.³¹ The Florida Antitrust Act prohibits contracts, combinations, or conspiracies in restraint of trade or commerce³² as well as monopolization or attempted

²⁰ Section 119.15(6)(b)1., F.S.

²¹ Section 119.15(6)(b)2., F.S.

²² Section 119.15(6)(b)3., F.S.

²³ 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?

²⁴ FLA. CONST. art. I, s. 24(c).

²⁵ Section 119.15(7), F.S.

²⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, [The Antitrust Laws](#) (last visited Dec. 3, 2025).

²⁷ 5 U.S.C. ss. 1-7.

²⁸ 15 U.S.C. ss. 12-27; 29 U.S.C. ss. 52 and 53.

²⁹ 15 U.S.C. ss. 41-58.

³⁰ Sections 542.15 – 542.36, F.S.

³¹ See s. 542.16, F.S.

³² Section 542.18.F.S.

monopolization of any part of trade or commerce.³³ A violation of the Florida Antitrust Act is punishable by up to three years imprisonment and fines up to \$1 million for a corporation and \$100,000 for any other person.³⁴ The act also contains a private right of action for any person injured by certain antitrust violations.³⁵

Antitrust Violator Vendor List

If an entity that operates a social media platform³⁶ has been convicted of or held civilly liable for antitrust violations, the Department of Management Services must place the entity, or an affiliate of the entity, on the Antitrust Violator Vendor List (list).³⁷ The entity or affiliate placed on the list may not:

- Submit a bid, proposal, or reply for any new contract to provide any goods or services to a public entity;
- Submit a bid, proposal, or reply for a new contract with a public entity for the construction or repair of a public building or public work;
- Submit a bid, proposal, or reply on new leases of real property to a public entity;
- Be awarded or perform work as a contractor, supplier, subcontractor, or consultant under a new contract with a public entity; or
- Transact new business with a public entity.³⁸

Public entities are prohibited from accepting a bid, proposal, or reply from, awarding a new contract to, or transacting new business with any entity or affiliate on the list.³⁹

The Attorney General, through the Department of Legal Affairs (DLA), may temporarily place any entity charged or accused of violating a state or federal antitrust law in a civil or criminal proceeding brought by the Attorney General, a state attorney, the FTC, or the DOJ on the list until the proceeding has concluded.⁴⁰ However, before the entity may be temporarily placed on the list, the Attorney General must make a finding of probable cause that the entity has likely violated the underlying antitrust laws.⁴¹

If probable cause exists, the Attorney General must notify the entity in writing of its intent to temporarily place the entity's name on the list, and of the entity's right to a hearing, the procedure that must be followed, and the applicable time requirements.⁴² If the entity does not request a hearing, the Attorney General must enter a final order temporarily placing the entity's name on the list. If the entity does request a hearing, the burden is on the Attorney General to prove that it is in the public interest to place the entity on the list.⁴³

³³ Section 542.19, F.S.

³⁴ Section 542.21, F.S.

³⁵ Sections 542.21 and 542.23, F.S.

³⁶ Sections 287.137(1)(f) and 501.2041(1)(g), F.S.

³⁷ Section 287.137(2), F.S.

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ Section 287.137(2)(b), F.S.

⁴⁰ Section 287.137(3)(d), F.S.

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² Section 287.137(3)(d)2., F.S. A person may not be placed on the list without receiving a notice of intent from the Attorney General.

⁴³ Section 501.137(3)(d)3.-5., F.S.

Unlawful Acts and Practices by Social Media Platforms

In 2021, the Legislature created s. 501.2041, F.S., to require a social media platform⁴⁴ to take the following actions:

- Publish the standards it uses or has used for determining how to censor, deplatform, and shadow ban;
- Apply censorship, deplatforming, and shadow banning standards in a consistent manner;
- Inform each user about any changes to its user rules, terms, and agreements before implementing the changes;
- Notify users before censoring or shadow banning their content;⁴⁵
- Provide a mechanism that allows a user to request the number of other individual platform participants who were provided or shown the user's content;
- Provide, upon request, a user with the number of other individual platform participants who were provided or shown the user's content;
- Categorize algorithms used for post-prioritization and shadow banning;
- Allow a user to opt out of post-prioritization and shadow banning algorithm categories to allow sequential or chronological posts and content;
- Provide users with an annual notice on the use of algorithms for post-prioritization and shadow banning; and
- Allow a user who has been deplatformed to access or retrieve all of the user's information, content, material, and data for at least 60 days after the user receives notice.

A social media platform is prohibited from applying post-prioritization or shadow-banning algorithms for content and material posted by or about a political candidate during their candidacy. Additionally, a social media platform is prohibited from taking action to censor, deplatform, or shadow ban a journalistic enterprise based on the content of its publication or broadcast.⁴⁶

A social media platform that fails to comply with s. 501.2041, F.S., commits an unfair or deceptive act or practice. If the DLA, by its own inquiry or as a result of a complaint, suspects that a violation is imminent, occurring, or has occurred, the DLA may investigate the suspected violation in accordance with the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act (FDUTPA). In an investigation by the DLA into alleged violations, the DLA's investigative powers include,

⁴⁴ Section 501.2041, F.S., defines "social media platform" as any information service, system, Internet search engine, or access software provider that: (1) provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server, including an Internet platform or a social media site; (2) operates as a sole proprietorship, partnership, limited liability company, corporation, association, or other legal entity; (3) does business in Florida; and (4) satisfies at least one of the following thresholds: has annual gross revenues in excess of \$100 million, as adjusted in January of each odd-numbered year to reflect any increase in the Consumer Price Index, or has at least 100 million monthly individual platform participants globally.

⁴⁵ Section 501.2041, F.S., provides that a notification must be in writing, be delivered via electronic mail or direct electronic notification to the user within 7 days after the censoring action, include a thorough rationale explaining the reason that the social media platform censored the user, and include a precise and thorough explanation of how the social media platform became aware of the censored content or material.

⁴⁶ Section 501.2041, F.S., provides that the prohibition does not apply if the content or material is obscene as defined in s. 847.001, F.S. Section 847.001, F.S., defines "obscene" as the status of material which: (1) the average person, applying contemporary community standards, would find, taken as a whole, appeals to prurient interests; (2) depicts or describes, in a patently offensive way, sexual conduct; and (3) taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.

but are not limited to, the ability to subpoena any algorithm used by a social media platform related to any alleged violation.

A user may only bring a private cause of action against a social media platform for failing to notify such user of an act of censoring or deplatforming, or for failing to apply censorship, deplatforming, and shadow banning standards in a consistent manner. The court may award the following damages to a user:

- Up to \$100,000 in statutory damages per proven claim;
- Actual damages;
- If aggravating factors are present, punitive damages;
- Other forms of equitable relief, including injunctive relief; and
- If the user was deplatformed, costs and reasonable attorney fees.

Ongoing Litigation

In 2021, NetChoice and the Computer & Communications Industry Association (NetChoice)⁴⁷ challenged the constitutionality of SB 7072 (now s. 501.2041, F.S.), in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida.⁴⁸ NetChoice claimed that the law violates their free speech rights, and argued that social media platforms are exercising editorial judgement when they moderate content on their platforms.⁴⁹ Additionally, NetChoice argued that the law is preempted by federal law.⁵⁰ The district court granted NetChoice's motion for a preliminary injunction.⁵¹

The state appealed, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit concluded that the provisions of SB 7072 (now s. 501.2041, F.S.) that restrict a social media platform's ability to engage in content moderation violate the First Amendment.⁵² Furthermore, the Eleventh Circuit found that the provision requiring a social media platform to provide "thorough rationale" for every content moderation decision it makes violates the First Amendment.⁵³ Thus, the Eleventh Circuit substantially affirmed the preliminary injunction against enforcement of the law.⁵⁴

In 2024, the Supreme Court vacated the Eleventh Circuit's decision and remanded the case back to the Eleventh Circuit for further proceedings.⁵⁵

Currently in Florida, the case remains in the discovery phase, and a trial date is set for July 13, 2026.

⁴⁷ These are trade associations that represent internet and social media companies like Facebook, Twitter (X), and Google.

⁴⁸ See *NetChoice, LLC v. Moody*, 546 F.Supp.3d 1082 (N.D. Florida 2021).

⁴⁹ *Id.* In the case, NetChoice argued that social media companies are exercising editorial judgement similar to the editorial judgment of a newspaper editor.

⁵⁰ *Id.* NetChoice argued that the law is preempted by 27 U.S.C. §230(c)(2).

⁵¹ *Id.* The district court concluded that the provisions of the law that make social media platforms liable for deprioritizing content or removing content are likely preempted by federal law, as well as found that the law's provisions violate the social media platforms' First Amendment rights by restricting their editorial judgement.

⁵² See *NetChoice, LLC v. Moody*, 34 F.4th 1196 (11th Cir. 2022).

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ *Id.* The Eleventh Circuit affirmed in part, vacated in part, and remanded.

⁵⁵ See *Moody v. NetChoice, LLC*, 603 U.S. 707 (2024).

Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act (FDUTPA)

The DLA and the State Attorney, as enforcing authorities, may seek the following remedies:

- Declaratory judgments;
- Injunctive relief;
- Actual damages on behalf of consumers and businesses;
- Cease and desist orders; and
- Civil penalties of up to \$10,000 per willful violation.⁵⁶

Remedies for private parties are limited to the following:

- A declaratory judgment and an injunction where a person is aggrieved by a FDUTPA violation; and
- Actual damages, attorney fees, and court costs, where a person has suffered a loss due to a FDUTPA violation.⁵⁷

Public Record Exemptions under Review

In 2021, the Legislature created a public record exemption for all information received by the DLA or a law enforcement agency in an investigation into whether a social media platform committed an antitrust violation (based on a case brought by a governmental entity) or⁵⁸ failed to meet certain transparency and notification requirements.⁵⁹

All information received by DLA pursuant to an investigation by DLA or a law enforcement agency is confidential and exempt from public record requirements,⁶⁰ until such time as the investigation is completed or ceases to be active. During an active investigation, confidential information may be disclosed by the DLA in the performance of its official duties and responsibilities or to another governmental entity in performance of its duties and responsibilities.⁶¹

Once an investigation is complete or once an investigation ceases to be active, the following information received by DLA remains confidential and exempt from public record requirements:

- All information to which another public records exemption applies.
- Personal identifying information.
- A computer forensic report.
- Information that would otherwise reveal weaknesses in a business's data security.

⁵⁶ Sections 501.207(1), 501.208, and 501.2075, F.S. Civil Penalties are deposited into general revenue. Section 501.2075, F.S. Enforcing authorities may also request attorney fees and costs of investigation or litigation. Section 501.2105, F.S.

⁵⁷ Section 501.211(1) and (2), F.S.

⁵⁸ Section 287.137(8), F.S.

⁵⁹ Section 501.204(10), F.S.

⁶⁰ 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. Sch. Bd. of Seminole*, 874 So.2d 48, 53 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004), *review denied* 892 So.2d 1015 (Fla. 2004); *City of Rivera Beach v. Barfield*, 642 So.2d 1135 (Fla. 4th DCA 1994); *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So.2d 683, 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 statute. See Op. Att'y Gen. Fla. (1985).

⁶¹ Sections 287.137(8)(b) and 501.2041(10)(b), F.S.

- Proprietary business information.⁶²

The 2021 public necessity statement⁶³ provided several reasons for the public record exemptions under review. Among those reasons, the Legislature stated that the premature release of the protected information “could frustrate or thwart the investigation and impair the ability of the Attorney General and the Department of Legal Affairs to effectively and efficiently administer” the relevant provisions of law.⁶⁴ Further, the exemptions exist to “continue to protect from public disclosure all information to which another public record exemption applies once an investigation is completed or ceases to be active.”⁶⁵

Pursuant to the OGSR Act, the public record exemptions will repeal on October 2, 2026, unless reviewed and saved from repeal by the Legislature.⁶⁶

Open Government Sunset Reviews regarding investigations of social media platforms

The staff of the Senate Commerce and Tourism Committee, the Senate Governmental Oversight and Accountability Committee, and the House Government Operations Subcommittee jointly met with the DLA to ascertain whether the public records exemptions codified in ss. 287.137 and 501.2041(10), F.S., remain necessary.

Public Record Exemption Findings

The DLA indicated that the public records exemption in s. 501.2041, F.S., has not been utilized due to ongoing litigation regarding the constitutionality of the provisions in s. 501.2041, F.S. The DLA additionally indicated that, as to the exemption in s. 287.137, F.S., the office has not yet attempted to temporarily place any person on the antitrust violators vendors list and, therefore, has not used the exemption. Thus, the bill delays for five years the sunset review date for, and the repeal of, the public records exemptions to allow the legislative staff to gather data on the public records exemption when in use.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

Without action by the Legislature to extend or remove the repeal date, the exemptions in ss. 287.137 and 501.2041(10), F.S., will repeal on October 2, 2026.

Sections 1 and 2 amend ss. 287.137 and 501.2041, F.S., respectively, to delay the repeal dates for two public record exemptions related to investigations into social media platforms. The bill extends the repeal dates from October 2, 2026, to October 2, 2031. The public record exemptions make confidential and exempt from public inspection and copying requirements all information received by the Department of Legal Affairs or a law enforcement agency in an investigation into whether a social media platform committed an antitrust violation based on a case brought by

⁶² Sections 287.137(8)(c) and 501.2041(10)(c), F.S.

⁶³ [Article I, s. 24\(c\), FLA. CONST.](#), requires each public record exemption to “state with specificity the public necessity justifying exemption.”

⁶⁴ Ch. 2021-33, L.O.F.

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ Sections 287.137(8)(e) and 501.2041(10)(e), F.S.

a governmental entity or committed an unlawful act or practice by failing to meet certain transparency and notice requirements.

Section 3 provides that the bill takes effect upon becoming a law.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

Not applicable. The bill does not require counties or municipalities to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds, reduce the authority that counties or municipalities have to raise revenue in the aggregate, nor reduce the percentage of state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

Vote Requirement

Article I, section 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. The bill delays for five additional years two current public record exemptions. The bill does not create or expand an exemption. Thus, the bill does not require a two-thirds vote for enactment.

Public Necessity Statement

Article I, section 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. The bill does not create or expand an exemption. Thus, a statement of public necessity is not required.

Breadth of Exemption

Article I, section 24(c) of the State Constitution requires an exemption from the public records disclosure requirements to be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the law. The exemption in the bill is limited to information that, if released, could frustrate an investigation or result in economic harm or cybersecurity threats against private social media platforms and, therefore, does not appear to be broader than necessary to accomplish the purpose of the law.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

D. State Tax or Fee Increases:

None.

E. Other Constitutional Issues:

None identified.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None identified.

B. Private Sector Impact:

The private sector will continue to 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 government sector will continue to incur costs related to the review and redaction of exempt records associated with responding to public records requests.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None identified.

VII. Related Issues:

None identified.

VIII. Statutes Affected:

This bill substantially amends sections 287.137 and 501.2041(10) of the Florida Statutes.

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 Governmental Oversight and Accountability on January 12, 2026:

Adds a provision delaying the repeal of a public records exemption codified in s. 287.137, F.S., relating to information received by DLA or a law enforcement agency regarding antitrust investigations of social media platforms. The repeal of the exemption will be delayed until October 2, 2031.

B. Amendments:

None.