18

## THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

## HOUSE RESOLUTION

No. 50

Session of 2017

INTRODUCED BY HARPER, FREEMAN, FARRY, MURT, JAMES, READSHAW, BAKER, D. COSTA, WATSON, SCHLOSSBERG, NEILSON, MILLARD, GILLEN, B. MILLER AND PICKETT, JANUARY 31, 2017

AS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AS AMENDED, FEBRUARY 8, 2017

## A RESOLUTION

Directing the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to 1 conduct a comprehensive review of the fiscal impact on 2 Commonwealth agencies and local governmental agencies for implementation of the Right-to-Know Law and to make recommendations. 5 6 WHEREAS, The General Assembly enacted the act of February 14, 7 2008 (P.L.6, No.3), known as the Right-to-Know Law; and 8 WHEREAS, The Right-to-Know Law dramatically expanded citizens' access to public records, financial records, judicial 10 records and legislative records across this Commonwealth; and 11 WHEREAS, The Right-to-Know Law requires State and local 12 agencies, the Senate, the House of Representatives and the 13 Judiciary to appoint: Open records officers who are responsible for 14 15 thoroughly reviewing and completely responding to Right-to-16 Know Law requests in a timely manner. 17 Appeals officers who must conduct administrative

appeals to review decisions made by the open records officer;

- 1 and
- 2 WHEREAS, The Right-to-Know Law is credited by many for making
- 3 the operation of State and local government more transparent;
- 4 and
- 5 WHEREAS, It is believed that this new transparency in
- 6 government has had a dramatic fiscal impact on agencies,
- 7 particularly local government agencies, that must dedicate
- 8 scarce resources to the following tasks:
- 9 (1) Reviewing Right-to-Know Law requests and collecting
- 10 records responsive to the requests.
- 11 (2) Redacting sensitive or privileged information from
- 12 the records.
- 13 (3) Reproducing the records.
- 14 (4) Responding to Right-to-Know Law requests;
- 15 and
- 16 WHEREAS, The Right-to-Know Law prohibits an agency from
- 17 adopting a policy or regulation to place a limitation on the
- 18 number of records which may be requested or requiring a
- 19 requester to disclose the purpose or motive in requesting access
- 20 to records; and
- 21 WHEREAS, Agencies are prohibited from assessing
- 22 administrative costs for an agency's review of records
- 23 requested, the search for or retrieval of documents or the staff
- 24 time or salaries for employees whose duty assignments are
- 25 limited due to compliance with the Right-to-Know Law; and
- 26 WHEREAS, The Right-to-Know Law requires agencies to respond
- 27 to requests within five days of the date that the request is
- 28 made and authorizes extensions for responses of 30 days for
- 29 limited circumstances; and
- 30 WHEREAS, In their dissenting opinion, three judges of the

- 1 Commonwealth Court expressed their concern in Pennsylvania
- 2 Gaming Control Board v. Office of Open Records, 48 A.3d 503,
- 3 (Pa. Commonwealth 2012) that the court had expanded the law so
- 4 that "an unaddressed request written on the back of a brown
- 5 paper bag and given to a Penndot plow driver by the side of the
- 6 road on a snowy winter night" now must be considered a valid
- 7 Right-to-Know Law request; and
- 8 WHEREAS, Numerous other appellate court decisions reviewing
- 9 the Right-to-Know Law have expanded the administrative and legal
- 10 burdens placed on State and local agencies; and
- 11 WHEREAS, The Right-to-Know Law limits the ability of State
- 12 and local agencies to recover from the fiscal impact of the
- 13 various tasks associated with the Right-to-Know Law requests;
- 14 therefore be it
- 15 RESOLVED, That the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee
- 16 conduct a comprehensive review relating to the implementation of
- 17 the Right-to-Know Law and prepare a report of its findings which
- 18 shall include all of the following:
- 19 (1) Annual costs associated with administration of the
- 20 Right-to-Know Law for Commonwealth, judicial and legislative
- 21 agencies.
- 22 (2) Annual costs associated with the administration of
- the Right-to-Know Law for local agencies of various sizes and
- 24 classification.
- 25 (3) Recommendations to the General Assembly on
- amendments to the Right-to-Know Law which would decrease the

<--

<--

<--

- 27 administrative burdens of the law on State and local agencies
- 28 WHILE STILL ENSURING REASONABLE PUBLIC ACCESS TO PUBLIC
- 29 RECORDS AND INFORMATION.
- 30 (4) Recommendations to the General Assembly on

- amendments to the Right-to-Know Law which may be necessary to
- 2 offset the costs associated with administration of the Right-
- 3 to-Know Law for State and local agencies WHILE STILL ENSURING <--
- 4 REASONABLE PUBLIC ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND INFORMATION;
- 5 and be it further
- 6 RESOLVED, That the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee
- 7 submit a report of its findings to the House of Representatives
- 8 within one year of the adoption of this resolution.