



**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**DAVE WILSON, CHAIRMAN**

Senior Editor, *The Miami Herald*

**BOB SHAW, VICE CHAIRMAN**

Retired Editor

**MIKE VASILINDA, SECRETARY**

**& TREASURER**

President, Capitol News Service

**JON KANEY, GENERAL COUNSEL**

Kaney & Olivari

**JIM BALTZELLE**

Director of Digital Media, Southeast,

The Associated Press

**DICK BATCHELOR**

Founder and President,

Dick Batchelor Management Group, Inc.

**BRIAN CROWLEY**

Principal, Immediacy Public Relations

**MIKE DEESON**

Senior Reporter, WTSP-TV

**FRANK DENTON**

Editor, *Florida Times-Union*

**SKIP FOSTER**

President & Publisher, Tallahassee Media

Group

**GARY GREEN**

Deputy News Editor and Digital Director,

Innovation News Center

**CAROL JEAN LOCICERO**

Thomas & LoCicero

**SAMUEL J. MORLEY**

General Counsel, Florida Press Association

**TIM NICKENS**

Editor of Editorials, *Tampa Bay Times*

**ROSEMARY O'HARA**

Editorial Page Editor, *Sun Sentinel*

**PATRICK RICE**

Editor, *Daytona Beach News-Journal*

**DEAN RIDINGS**

President & CEO, Intersect Media Solutions

**APRIL SALTER**

President & Chief Operating Officer,

Salter Mitchell

**PETE WEITZEL**

Director Emeritus

**CHARLEY WILLIAMS**

Past State Board,

League of Women Voters of Florida

Director, Business Development, GEC

January 19, 2016

The Honorable Representative Janet H. Adkins  
The Florida House of Representatives  
313 House Office Building  
402 South Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Re: HB 1027 Exemption/Incapacity Petitions

Dear Representative Adkins:

We are writing to express our concerns regarding HB 1027, amending sections various sections of ch. 394, F.S., to exempt identifying information for petitions to determine incapacity. It is our position that this bill is unwarranted and unconstitutionally overbroad, and we respectfully suggest HB 1027 be withdrawn from further consideration.

Article I, s. 24(c), Fla. Con., requires that proposed exemptions be no broader than their stated purpose. House Bill 1027, we believe, violates this constitutional standard. For example, section 1 and section 2 exempt the entire petition. The statement of public necessity, however, indicates the bill exempts "all personal identifying information about *an individual for whom a petition is filed.*" (emphasis added.) There is, therefore, a glaring discrepancy regarding the breadth of information intended to be exempt. The name of the person filing the petition, for instance, is not addressed in the statement of public necessity but would be exempt according to the broad language in sections 1 and 2. The ability to know the identity of the individual filing a petition is critically important, and should not be exempt from public disclosure.

Furthermore, we question both the efficacy and purpose of this legislation. Section 394.463(2)(a)2., F.S., currently requires law enforcement to submit a written report pursuant to taking an individual into custody for the purpose of involuntary examination. That report is part of the individual's clinical record and is exempt from disclosure. However, a separate written incident

or report prepared after a specific crime has been committed which contains information given during the initial reporting of the crime, is not confidential pursuant to ch. 394, F.S. *See* AGO 93-51. This legislation does not address law enforcement records, and consequently it is not clear how the bill will serve a practical purpose given the information at issue is publicly accessible from other government sources.

In addition, the proposed bill is not supported by an adequate statement of public necessity, as the State Constitution requires. The statement is critically flawed and simply asserts that the availability of this information “would produce undue harm to an individual.” But the statement does not identify examples of such harm, either threatened or actual. Further, we have seen no evidence that a threat of harm exists to these individuals or that such harm has in fact occurred. An exception to the public’s right of access cannot be based on mere conjecture, but must be justified by ample evidence.

For these reasons, Representative Adkins, we respectfully request HB 1027 be withdrawn from consideration. Thank you for your attention to our concerns; if we may be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Petersen

Cc: The Honorable Steve Crisafulli, Speaker, Florida House of Representatives  
Jon Kaney, General Counsel, First Amendment Foundation  
Sam Morley, General Counsel, Florida Press Association

---