

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 Criminal Justice

BILL: SB 256

INTRODUCER: Senator Garcia

SUBJECT: Public Records/Forensic Behavioral Health Evaluation

DATE: December 2, 2013

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Cellon	Cannon	CJ	Favorable
2.	_____	_____	GO	_____
3.	_____	_____	RC	_____

I. Summary:

SB 256 makes forensic behavioral health evaluations filed with the court pursuant to ch. 916, F.S., confidential and exempt from public records disclosure requirements.

The bill provides a statement of public necessity for the exemption as required by the Florida Constitution.

Because the bill creates new public records exemptions, the bill requires a two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature for passage.

II. Present Situation:

Public Records Laws

The Florida Constitution provides every person 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 of persons acting on their behalf.¹ The records of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches are specifically included.²

The Florida Statutes also specify conditions under which public access must be provided to government records. The Public Records Act³ guarantees every person's right to inspect and

¹ FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(a).

² *Id.*

³ Chapter 119, F.S.

copy any state or local government public record⁴ at any reasonable time, under reasonable conditions, and under supervision by the custodian of the public record.⁵

Only the Legislature may create an exemption to public records requirements.⁶ Such an exemption must be created by general law and must specifically state the public necessity justifying the exemption.⁷ 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 provisions⁸ and must pass by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting in each house of the Legislature.⁹

The Open Government Sunset Review Act (the Act) prescribes a legislative review process for newly created or substantially amended public records or open meetings exemptions.¹⁰ It requires the automatic repeal of such exemption on October 2nd of the fifth year after creation or substantial amendment, unless the Legislature reenacts the exemption.¹¹ 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 to meet such public purpose.¹²

⁴ Section 119.011(12), F.S., defines “public records” 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.” The Public Records Act does not apply to legislative or judicial records (*see Locke v. Hawkes*, 595 So.2d 32 (Fla. 1992)).

⁵ Section 119.07(1)(a), F.S.

⁶ FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(c). There is a difference between records the Legislature designates as exempt from public records requirements and those the Legislature designates *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 (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 2004); and *Williams v. City of Minneola*, 575 So.2d 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 the statutory exemption (*see Attorney General Opinion 85-62*, August 1, 1985).

⁷ FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(c).

⁸ The bill may, however, contain multiple exemptions that relate to one subject.

⁹ FLA. CONST., art. I, s. 24(c).

¹⁰ Section 119.15, F.S. An exemption is substantially amended if the amendment expands the scope of the exemption to include more records or information or to include meetings as well as records (s. 119.15(4)(b), F.S.). The requirements of the Act do not apply to an exemption that is required by federal law or that applies solely to the Legislature or the State Court System (s. 119.15(2), F.S.).

¹¹ Section 119.15(3), F.S.

¹² Section 119.15(6)(b), F.S.

Forensic Mental Health¹³

Forensic Services

Chapter 916, F.S., addresses the treatment and adjudication of individuals who have been charged with felonies and found incompetent to proceed to trial due to mental illness, intellectual disability, or autism, or who are acquitted by reason of insanity.

Department of Children and Family Services

Part II of ch. 916, F.S., relates to forensic services for persons who are mentally ill and describes the criteria and procedures for the examination, involuntary commitment, and adjudication of persons who are incompetent to proceed to trial due to mental illness or who have been adjudicated not guilty by reason of insanity. Persons committed under ch. 916, F.S., are committed to the custody of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCF).

Section 916.12(3), F.S., authorizes the court to appoint experts to evaluate a criminal defendant's mental condition. In determining whether a defendant is competent to proceed, the examining expert must provide a report to the court regarding the defendant's capacity to appreciate the charges or allegations against him, appreciate the range and nature of possible penalties, understand the adversarial nature of the legal process, consult with counsel, behave appropriately in court, and testify relevantly. A defendant must be evaluated by at least two experts prior to being involuntarily committed.¹⁴ A defendant charged with a felony who is found incompetent to proceed may be involuntarily committed if the court finds by clear and convincing evidence: (1) that the defendant is mentally ill; (2) all available, least restrictive alternatives are inadequate; and (3) there is a substantial probability that the mental illness will respond to treatment and that the defendant will be restored to competency.¹⁵

DCF provides mental health assessment, evaluation, and treatment of individuals who are committed following adjudication as incompetent to proceed or not guilty by reason of insanity. These individuals are charged with a felony offense and must be admitted to a treatment facility within 15 days of the department's receipt of the commitment packet from the court.¹⁶

Agency for Persons with Disabilities

The Agency for Persons with Disabilities (APD) provides forensic services to defendants charged with a felony who have been found incompetent to proceed due to intellectual disability or autism. Defendants with intellectual disability or autism must be evaluated by at least one expert with expertise in evaluating persons with intellectual disability or autism in order to evaluate the mental condition of the defendant.¹⁷ A defendant is considered incompetent to proceed if the expert finds that the defendant:

- Meets the definition of intellectual disability or autism;

¹³ Much of the information included in this portion of the analysis is from the Interim Report by the Senate Committee on Children, Families, and Elder Affairs, *Forensic Hospital Diversion Pilot Program* (Oct. 2010). The report is available at <http://www.flsenate.gov/Committees/InterimReports/2011/2011-106cf.pdf> (last visited March 12, 2013).

¹⁴ s. 916.12(2), F.S.

¹⁵ s. 916.13(1), F.S. *See also*, s. 916.302, F.S.

¹⁶ *See* s. 916.107(1)(a), F.S.

¹⁷ s. 916.301, F.S.

- Does not have the sufficient present ability to consult with his or her attorney with a reasonable degree of rational understanding; or
- Has no rational and factual understanding of the proceedings.¹⁸

If the expert finds that the defendant is incompetent to proceed due to the defendant's intellectual disability or autism, the expert must prepare a report for the court recommending training for the defendant in order to attain competency.¹⁹ Individuals charged with a felony and found incompetent to proceed due to intellectual disability or autism are committed to APD for appropriate training.²⁰ In certain circumstances, the court may order the conditional release of a defendant found incompetent to proceed due to intellectual disability or autism based on an approved plan for providing community-based training.²¹

Restoration of Competency

Competency restoration is designed to help defendants meaningfully participate in their own defense. If the court determines that the defendant is a danger to himself or others, it may involuntarily commit the defendant to a secure forensic facility.²² If the court finds that the defendant does not pose a risk to public safety, it may place the defendant on conditional release to receive competency restoration training in the community.²³

A defendant who is committed or placed on conditional release pursuant to ch. 916, F.S., is returned to court periodically for a review and report on his or her condition.²⁴ Generally, a review is conducted:

- No later than 6 months after the date of admission;
- At the end of any extended period of commitment;
- At any time upon the facility administrator's communication to the court that the defendant no longer meets commitment criteria; and
- Upon counsel's Motion for Review having been granted.

Once a defendant is determined to have regained his or her competence to proceed, the court is notified and a hearing is set for the judge to determine the defendant's competency.²⁵ If the court finds the defendant to be competent, the criminal proceeding resumes. If, however, the court finds the defendant incompetent to proceed, the defendant is returned to a forensic facility or community restoration on conditional release until competency is restored.²⁶

¹⁸ s. 916.3012, F.S.

¹⁹ s. 916.3012(4), F.S.

²⁰ s. 916.302, F.S.

²¹ s. 916.304, F.S.

²² s. 916.13, F.S.

²³ s. 916.17, F.S.

²⁴ ss. 916.13(2), 916.15(3) and 916.302(2)(a), F.S. See also s. 985.19(4)(e), (5) and (6), F.S., related to the court's jurisdiction and reporting requirements in juvenile cases.

²⁵ Rule 3.212, Fla.R.Crim.P.

²⁶ *Id.*

Confidentiality of Forensic Behavioral Health Evaluations

According to the Office of the State Courts Administrator, most forensic behavioral health evaluations filed with the court are neither confidential nor exempt under existing law or court rules.²⁷

A court may order records be made confidential on a case-by-case basis; however, only the Legislature may create a new general public records exemption for judicial records.²⁸

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill creates s. 916.1065, F.S., to make forensic behavioral health evaluations filed with the court pursuant to ch. 916, F.S., confidential and exempt from public records disclosure requirements. The term “forensic behavioral health evaluation” is defined in the bill as meaning:

[A]ny record, including supporting documentation, derived from a competency, substance abuse, psychosexual, psychological, psychiatric, psychosocial, cognitive impairment, sanity, or other mental health evaluation of an individual.²⁹

The bill provides the following statement of public necessity for the exemptions as required by the Florida Constitution:

The Legislature finds that it is a public necessity that forensic behavioral health evaluations filed with the court pursuant to chapter 916, Florida Statutes, be confidential and exempt from disclosure under s. 24(a), Art. I of the State Constitution. The personal health of an individual and the treatment that he or she receives is an intensely private matter. An individual’s forensic behavioral health evaluation should not be made public merely because it is filed with the court. Protecting forensic behavioral health evaluations is necessary to ensure the health care privacy rights of all persons. Making these evaluations confidential and exempt will protect information of a sensitive personal nature, the release of which could cause unwarranted damage to the reputation of an individual. Further, the knowledge that sensitive personal information is subject to disclosure could have a chilling effect on mental health experts who conduct the evaluations for use by the court. Therefore, making these evaluations confidential and exempt allows courts to effectively and efficiently make decisions relating to the competency of individuals who interact with the state courts system.

The bill takes effect July 1, 2014.

²⁷ *Senate Bill 824 (2013) Judicial Impact Statement*, Office of the State Courts Administrator, March 15, 2013 (on file with the Senate Governmental Oversight and Accountability Committee).

²⁸ *In re Amendments to Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.420*, 68 So.3d 228 (Fla. 2011).

²⁹ The types of records protected by the bill are already afforded confidentiality pursuant to s. 916.107(8), F.S., if they become part of a clinical record. In such cases, release of the records is governed by the provisions of that subsection.

IV. Constitutional Issues:**A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:**

Not applicable. This bill does not appear to affect county or municipal governments.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:**Vote Requirement**

Article I, s. 24(c), of the Florida Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting in each house of the Legislature for passage of a newly-created public records exemption. Because the bill creates new public records exemptions, the bill requires a two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature for passage.

Public Necessity Statement

Article I, s. 24(c), of the Florida Constitution requires a public necessity statement for a newly created public records exemption. Because this bill creates new public records exemptions, it includes a public necessity statement.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:**A. Tax/Fee Issues:**

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

The Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) anticipates that the bill will help to reduce court workload related to disposing of defense motions to protect forensic behavioral health evaluation information records. The bill's effect makes the defense motions unnecessary. OSCA is unable to quantify the fiscal impact resulting from the workload reduction due to the unavailability of data.³⁰

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

³⁰ Office of the State Courts Administrator 2014 Judicial Impact Statement, December 3, 2013. (on file with the Senate Criminal Justice Committee).

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Statutes Affected:

This bill creates the following section of the Florida Statutes: 916.1065

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.

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.
