

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 Banking and Insurance Committee

BILL: SB 1232

INTRODUCER: Banking and Insurance Committee

SUBJECT: OGSR/ Personal Identifying Information in Personal Injury Protection and Property
 Damage Liability Insurance Policies

DATE: January 11, 2012 REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Rubio	Burgess	BI	Favorable
2.	_____	_____	GO	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

Section 324.242, F.S., provides an exemption from public records requirements for personal identifying information and the insurance policy number contained in personal injury protection (PIP) and property damage liability insurance policies. The public records exemption will repeal on October 2, 2012, unless reviewed and saved from repeal. This bill is the result of an Open Government Sunset Review. *See*, Interim Report 2012-312.

This bill substantially amends the following section of the Florida Statutes: 324.242.

II. Present Situation:

Public Records

The State of Florida has a long history of providing public access to governmental records. The Florida Legislature enacted the first public records law in 1892.¹ One hundred years later, Floridians adopted an amendment to the State Constitution that raised the statutory right of access to public records to a constitutional level.² Article I, s. 24 of the State Constitution, provides that:

(a) Every person has the right to inspect or copy any public record made or received in connection with the official business of any public body, officer, or employee of the state, or persons acting on their behalf, except with respect to records exempted pursuant to this section or specifically made confidential by this Constitution. This section specifically includes the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government and each agency

¹ Section 1390, 1391 F.S. (Rev. 1892)

² Article I, s. 24 of the State Constitution

or department created thereunder; counties, municipalities, and districts; and each constitutional officer, board, and commission, or entity created pursuant to law or this Constitution.

In addition to the State Constitution, the Public Records Act,³ which pre-dates public records provision of the State Constitution, specifies conditions under which public access must be provided to records of an agency.⁴ Section 119.07(1) (a), F.S., states:

Every person who has custody of a public record shall permit the record to be inspected and examined by any person desiring to do so, at any reasonable time, under reasonable conditions, and under supervision by the custodian of the public record.

Unless specifically exempted, all agency records are available for public inspection. The term “public record” is broadly defined 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.⁵

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.⁶ All such materials, regardless of whether they are in final form, are open for public inspection unless made exempt.⁷

Only the Legislature is authorized to create exemptions to open government requirements.⁸ Exemptions must be created by general law and such law must specifically state the public necessity justifying the exemption. Further, the exemption must be no broader than necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of the law.⁹ A bill enacting an exemption¹⁰ may not contain other substantive provisions, although it may contain multiple exemptions that relate to one subject.¹¹ 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

³ Chapter 119, F.S.

⁴ The word “agency” is defined in s. 119.011(2), F.S., 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.” The Florida Constitution also establishes a right of access to any public record made or received in connection with the official business of any public body, officer, or employee of the state, or persons acting on their behalf, except those records exempted by law or the state constitution.

⁵ Section 119.011(11), F.S.

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

⁷ *Wait v. Florida Power & Light Company*, 372 So.2d 420 (Fla.1979).

⁸ Article I, s. 24(c) of the State Constitution.

⁹ *Memorial Hospital-West Volusia v. News-Journal Corporation*, 729 So.2d 373, 380 (Fla. 1999); *Halifax Hospital Medical Center v. News-Journal Corporation*, 724 So.2d 567 (Fla. 1999).

¹⁰ Under s. 119.15, F.S., an existing exemption may be considered a new exemption if the exemption is expanded to cover additional records.

¹¹ Art. I, s. 24 (c) of the State Constitution.

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.¹² If a record is simply made exempt from disclosure requirements an agency is not prohibited from disclosing the record in all circumstances.¹³

The Open Government Sunset Review Act¹⁴ provides for the systematic review, through a 5-year cycle ending October 2nd of the 5th year following enactment, of an exemption from the Public Records Act or the Public Meetings Law. Each year, by June 1, the Division of Statutory Revision of the Office of Legislative Services is required to certify to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives the language and statutory citation of each exemption scheduled for repeal the following year.

The act states that an exemption may be created or expanded only if it serves an identifiable public purpose and if the exemption is no broader than necessary to meet the public purpose it serves. An identifiable public purpose is served if the exemption meets one of three specified criteria and if the Legislature finds that the purpose is sufficiently compelling to override the strong public policy of open government and cannot be accomplished without the exemption. An exemption meets the three statutory criteria if it:

- 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 information of a sensitive personal nature concerning individuals, the release of which would be defamatory or cause unwarranted damage to the good name or reputation of such individuals, or would jeopardize their safety; or
- Protects information of a confidential nature concerning entities, including, but not limited to, a formula, pattern, device, combination of devices, or compilation of information that is used to protect or further a business advantage over those who do not know or use it, the disclosure of which would injure the affected entity in the marketplace.¹⁵

The act also requires consideration of the following:

- 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?

While the standards in the Open Government Sunset Review Act may appear to limit the Legislature in the exemption review process, those aspects of the act that are only statutory, as opposed to constitutional, do not limit the Legislature because one session of the Legislature

¹² Attorney General Opinion 85-62.

¹³ *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So.2d 683, 687 (Fla. 5th DCA), review denied, 589 So.2d 289 (Fla. 1991).

¹⁴ Section 119.15, F.S.

¹⁵ Section 119.15(4)(b), F.S.

cannot bind another.¹⁶ The Legislature is only limited in its review process by constitutional requirements.

Further, s. 119.15(4) (e), F.S., makes explicit that:

... notwithstanding s. 768.28 or any other law, neither the state or its political subdivisions nor any other public body shall be made party to any suit in any court or incur any liability for the repeal or revival and reenactment of any exemption under this section. The failure of the Legislature to comply strictly with this section does not invalidate an otherwise valid reenactment.

Section 324.242, F.S., Exemption

Within Florida every registrant of a motor vehicle must obtain and provide proof of holding a motor vehicle insurance policy that includes \$10,000 in personal injury protection (PIP). Additionally, s. 324.022, F.S., requires owners and operators of Florida-registered motor vehicles to maintain the ability to pay at least \$10,000 in property damage, which may be met by maintaining \$10,000 in property damage liability coverage. A higher financial requirement is placed on commercial motor vehicles, taxicab owners and operators, for-hire passenger transportation vehicles, and registered vehicle owners or operators found guilty or that have plead nolo contendere to driving under the influence.

The Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) is notified by insurers that supply policies with personal injury protection or property damage liability coverage of renewals, cancellations, and non-renewals of these policies within 45 days of their effective dates, as required by s. 324.0221, F.S. The insurer must also notify the named insured in writing of the cancellation or non-renewal of a policy and give notice of the consequences from the failure of maintaining PIP and property damage coverage, including the loss of registration, loss of driving privileges, and imposition of reinstatement fees. The records held by the DHSMV contain the insurance company code, the policy number, driver's license number, personal identifying information (name and address), and information identifying the vehicle, including the vehicle identification number and the make, model, and year of the vehicle.

This bill's predecessor s. 627.736(9)(a), F.S., was repealed as part of the Florida Motor Vehicle No-Fault Law on October 1, 2007. The Legislature designed s. 324.242, F.S., to take the place of s. 627.736(9)(a), F.S., and exempt from public records requirements personal identifying information, including the name, address, and driver's license number of insureds and former insureds and the insurance policy number contained in PIP and property damage liability motor vehicle insurance policies. The exemption serves to protect sensitive personal information concerning individuals whose reputation or safety from identity theft would be jeopardized if the information were released. The exemption also protects confidential information used for business advantage against competitors. The disclosure of this information could injure insurance companies in the market since competitors would be able to solicit the business of their policyholders.

¹⁶ *Straughn v. Camp*, 293 So.2d 689, 694 (Fla. 1974).

The information exempted by s. 324.242, F.S., is neither obtainable by alternate means nor protected under other exemptions. However under s. 324.242, F.S., the DHSMV must release the policy number for a vehicle involved in an accident to any person involved in the accident, the attorney of any person involved in the accident, or a representative of the insurer of any person involved in the accident upon receipt of a written request and copy of the crash report.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill reenacts the public records exemption provided under s. 324.242, F.S., by deleting section four containing the repeal date and provision subjecting the bill to Open Government Sunset Review.

The bill provides that this act will take effect on October 1, 2012.

Other Potential Implications:

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

Section 119.15(6)(b), F.S., provides that

“ . . . an exemption may be created, revised, or maintained only if it serves an identifiable public purpose, and the exemption may be no broader than is necessary to meet the public purpose it serves.”

This bill is the result of an Open Government Sunset Review of s. 324.242, F.S. *See*, Interim Report 2012-312 by the Committee on Banking and Insurance. In that committee staff report, it was recommended that the exemption should be reenacted.

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. Additional Information:

A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:

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

None.

B. Amendments:

None.