

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 62B

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

SUBJECT: Public Records; Security Plans

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 amends an existing exemption from public records and meetings requirements for security plans.

This bill amends section 281.301, 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
- protects information of a confidential nature concerning entities, including, but not limited to, a formula, pattern, device, combination of devices, or compilation of

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.

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 281.301, F.S., currently provides that

Information relating to the security plans for any property owned or leased by the state or any of its political subdivisions and information relating to the security systems for any privately owned or leased property which is in the possession of any agency as defined in s. 119.011(2), including. . . .

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill amends an existing exemption to public records and meeting requirements. The bill clarifies and makes explicit in s. 281.301, F.S., that security system plans of a public or private entity, which *plans* are in the possession of an agency, are exempt. Additionally, the bill specifically defines the phrase “security system plan.” Much of the definition is contained in current law, though additions include: threat assessments, threat-response plans, emergency-evacuation plans, sheltering arrangements, or manuals for security personnel, emergency equipment or security training.

The bill also contains a statement of public necessity as required by the State Constitution. That statement notes that security plans are a vital component of public safety, whether public or private. It is noted that public safety does not include only physical safety, but many types of services on which the public relies, e.g., radio and television towers, power plants and grids, and so forth. Further, the statement explains the need for coordination of public and private plans to protect the public from terrorism and notes that public agencies need plans of private entities in order to review and coordinate security.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

¹⁰ Section 119.15(4)(b), F.S.

V. Economic Impact and Fiscal Note:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

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.
