

SENATE STAFF ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

BILL: CS/SB 64B

SPONSOR: Governmental Oversight and Productivity Committee and Senators Brown-Waite and Smith

SUBJECT: Public Records; Cellular Telephone Numbers

DATE: October 24, 2001 REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Rhea	Wilson	GO	Favorable/CS
2.	_____	_____	RC	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

I. Summary:

This bill creates an exemption from public records requirements for the cellular telephone numbers of law enforcement officers or former law enforcement officers used in the course of their employment in Florida.

This bill creates an exemption in section 119.07(3), Florida Statutes.

II. Present Situation:

Florida has a long history of providing public access to the meetings and records of governmental and other public entities. The first law affording access to public records was enacted by the Florida Legislature in 1909. The Public Records Law¹ and the Public Meetings Law² specify the conditions under which public access must be provided to governmental records and meetings of the executive branch and other governmental agencies.

The Public Records Law states that, unless specifically exempted, all agency records are to be available for public inspection.³ Section 119.011(1), 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.

¹ Chapter 119, F.S.
² Section 286.011, F.S.
³ Section 119.07(1), F.S.

An “agency” is defined 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, and any other public or private agency, person, partnership, corporation, or business entity acting on behalf of any public agency.”⁴

In November 1992, the public affirmed its approval of Florida’s tradition of “government in the sunshine” by enacting a constitutional amendment to guarantee the practice.⁵ The amendment had the effect of including in the State Constitution provisions similar to those of the Public Meetings Law and the Public Records Law and of applying those provisions to all three branches of government.

The constitution authorizes the Legislature to create exemptions from public access requirements by general law. Any law that creates an exemption must state with specificity the public necessity that justifies the exemption and may be no broader than necessary to comport with the public necessity. A law that creates a public records or public meetings exemption is required by the constitution to relate only to exemptions and their enforcement.

Under the Public Records Act, provision is made for an accelerated hearing to enforce public access requirements. Whenever an action is filed to enforce the act, a court is required to set an immediate hearing, giving the case priority over other pending cases.⁶ A court may not issue a stay unless it determines that there is a “substantial probability” that opening the records for inspection will result in significant damage.⁷

The Open Government Sunset Review Act of 1995,⁸ ss. 119.15 and 286.0111, F.S., provides for the systematic repeal of exemptions to the Public Records Law and Public Meetings Law 5 years after creation of, or substantial modification to, the exemption. The 1995 law also provides criteria for the Legislature to consider prior to creating or reenacting an exemption. The act authorizes the creation or expansion of an exemption only if⁹ the exemption:

- 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

⁴ Section 119.011(2), F.S.

⁵ Section 24, Art. I of the State Constitution.

⁶ Section 119.11, F.S.

⁷ Section 119.11(3), F.S.

⁸ Sections 119.15 and 286.011, F.S.

⁹ While s. 119.15, F.S., establishes standards for the creation, expansion or continuation of an exemption, the provision cannot limit the authority of the Legislature to create, expand or continue an exemption because one session of the Legislature may not bind a future session of the Legislature.

- 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.¹⁰

Section 119.07(3)(i)1., F.S., currently provides an exemption for the “. . . home addresses, *telephone numbers*, social security numbers, and photographs of active or former law enforcement personnel” As such, it could be argued that all telephone numbers (plural) of law enforcement officers are exempt. This exemption, however, does not explicitly state that cellular telephone numbers are exempt, nor does it limit that exemption to cellular telephone numbers used in the course of employment in the state.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill creates an exemption to public records requirements for the cellular telephone numbers of law enforcement officers or former law enforcement officers used in the course of their employment in Florida.

The bill contains a statement of public necessity for the exemption as required by the State Constitution. The statement notes that a cellular telephone number that is used in the course of an investigation, if made public, could identify an officer. Identification of an officer as such could compromise an investigation, undermine the ability of an officer to apprehend suspects, and compromise the physical safety of a law enforcement officer.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Economic Impact and Fiscal Note:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

¹⁰ Section 119.15(4)(b), F.S.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

None.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Amendments:

None.

This Senate staff analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's sponsor or the Florida Senate.
