

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
FINAL BILL ANALYSIS**

BILL #:	CS/CS/HB 397	FINAL HOUSE FLOOR ACTION:		
SUBJECT/SHORT TITLE	Pub. Rec./Victim of Alleged Sexual Harassment/Identifying Information	114	Y's 0	N's
SPONSOR(S):	Government Accountability Committee; Oversight, Transparency & Administration Subcommittee; Raschein and others	GOVERNOR'S ACTION:		Approved
COMPANION BILLS:	CS/CS/SB 492			

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

CS/CS/HB 397 passed the House on April 20, 2017, and subsequently passed the Senate on May 2, 2017.

Current law provides public record exemptions for various types of information related to agency investigations. Information that is exempt or confidential and exempt from public record requirements includes information related to complaints of discrimination, information related to complaints of misconduct, and information revealing the identity of a victim of certain crimes.

The bill amends s. 119.071, F.S., to provide that personal identifying information of the alleged victim in an allegation of sexual harassment is confidential and exempt from public record requirements. The bill specifies that such information may be disclosed to another governmental entity in the furtherance of its official duties and responsibilities.

The bill provides for repeal of the exemption on October 2, 2022, unless reviewed and saved from repeal through reenactment by the Legislature. The bill provides a public necessity statement as required by the State Constitution.

The bill may have a minimal fiscal impact on the state and local governments.

The bill was approved by the Governor on June 14, 2017, ch. 2017-103, L.O.F., and became effective on that date.

I. SUBSTANTIVE INFORMATION

A. EFFECT OF CHANGES:

Background

Public Records

Article I, s. 24(a) of the State Constitution sets forth the state's public policy regarding access to government records. This section guarantees every person a right to inspect or copy any public record of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. The Legislature, however, may provide by general law for the exemption of records from the requirements of Art. I, s. 24(a). The general law must state with specificity the public necessity justifying the exemption (public necessity statement) and must be no broader than necessary to accomplish its purpose.¹

Public policy regarding access to government records is addressed further in the Florida Statutes. Section 119.07(1), F.S., guarantees every person a right to inspect and copy any state, county, or municipal record. Furthermore, the Open Government Sunset Review Act² provides that a public record or public meeting exemption may be created or maintained only if it serves an identifiable public purpose. In addition, it may be no broader than is necessary to meet one of the following purposes:

- 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 sensitive personal information that, if released, would be defamatory or would jeopardize an individual's safety; however, only the identity of an individual may be exempted under this provision.
- Protects trade or business secrets.³

The Open Government Sunset Review Act requires the automatic repeal of a newly created exemption on October 2nd of the fifth year after creation or substantial amendment, unless the Legislature reenacts the exemption.⁴

Exemptions for Certain Information Related to Agency Investigations

Currently, s. 119.071(2), F.S., provides public record exemptions for various types of information related to agency investigations. Information that is exempt or confidential and exempt⁵ from public record requirements includes information related to complaints of discrimination,⁶ information related to complaints of misconduct,⁷ and information revealing the identity of a victim of certain crimes.⁸ There is not currently an exemption for information that could reveal the identity of an alleged victim of sexual harassment.

¹ Section 24(c), Art. I of the State Constitution.

² See s. 119.15, F.S.

³ Section 119.15(6)(b), F.S.

⁴ Section 119.15(3), F.S.

⁵ There is a difference between records the Legislature designates as exempt from public records requirements and those the Legislature designates as 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, the record may not be released by the custodian of public records to anyone other than the persons or entities specifically designated in statute. See 85-62 Fla. Op. Att'y Gen. (1985).

⁶ Section 119.071(2)(g), F.S.

⁷ Section 119.071(2)(k), F.S.

⁸ Sections 119.071(2)(h)1. and 119.071(2)(j), F.S.

Effect of the Bill

The bill amends s. 119.071, F.S., to provide that personal identifying information of the alleged victim in an allegation of sexual harassment is confidential and exempt from public record requirements. The bill specifies that such information may be disclosed to another governmental entity in the furtherance of its official duties and responsibilities.

The bill provides a public necessity statement as required by the State Constitution, specifying that it is a public necessity to protect personal identifying information of alleged victims because disclosure of the information could place them at risk of further harassment and retaliation. In addition, the potential for disclosure of identifying information could discourage alleged victims from reporting instances of alleged harassment.

The bill provides for repeal of the exemption on October 2, 2022, unless reviewed and saved from repeal through reenactment by the Legislature.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have an impact on state government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

See Fiscal Comments.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have an impact on local government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

See Fiscal Comments.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

The bill could have a minimal fiscal impact on agencies because agency staff responsible for complying with public record requests may require training related to the creation of the public record exemption. In addition, agencies could incur costs associated with redacting the exempt information prior to releasing a record. The costs, however, would be absorbed, as they are part of the day-to-day responsibilities of agencies.