



MINUTES

Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee

November 9, 2007

Third Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Michael Connolly, Co-chairperson
Senator Daryl Beall
Senator Mary Lundby

Representative Vicki Lensing, Co-chairperson
Representative Carmine Boal
Representative Elesha Gayman
Representative Bruce Hunter
Representative Libby Jacobs

MEETING IN BRIEF

.....

Organizational staffing provided
by: Rachele Hjelmaas, Senior
Legal Counsel, (515) 281-8127

Minutes prepared by: Ed Cook,
Senior Legal Counsel,
(515) 281-3994

- I. Procedural Business
- II. Committee Action — Proposed Legislative Bill Draft Provisions
- III. Open Meetings and Public Records Issues — Proposed Draft — Discussion
- IV. Miscellaneous Open Meetings and Public Records Issues — Discussion
- V. Materials Filed With the Legislative Services Agency



Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee

I. Procedural Business

Call to Order. The third meeting of the Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee was called to order by Co-chairperson Lensing at 9:00 a.m., Friday, November 9, 2007. The meeting was held in the Supreme Court Chamber at the State Capitol.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Committee Business. The Committee approved the minutes of the October 19, 2007, meeting.

Next Meeting. The fourth meeting of the Committee is scheduled for December 12, 2007, at 10:00 a.m. in the Supreme Court Chamber (Room 103), at the State Capitol.

II. Committee Action — Proposed Legislative Bill Draft Provisions

The Committee discussed tentative draft language and requested the Legislative Services Agency to prepare a preliminary bill draft for further Committee consideration and discussion at the Committee's next meeting to include the following:

Administrative Enforcement Scheme. The establishment of an Iowa Public Information Board (board) as an independent regulatory agency to provide an alternative means by which to secure compliance with and enforcement of the requirements of Code chapters 21 and 22. A person may seek enforcement of the provisions of Code chapters 21 or 22 by electing either to file a complaint with the board or to file a lawsuit in court. The board shall have authority to hire employees; issue rules and orders with the force of law; issue declaratory orders; receive, investigate, and prosecute complaints before the board in a contested case proceeding; issue subpoenas; and provide training about the requirements of Code chapters 21 and 22. The board shall offer all parties to a dispute the opportunity to resolve the dispute through mediation and settlement.

Civil Penalties. Increasing the current civil penalties for violations of both Code chapters 21 and 22 to not more than \$2,500 but not less than \$1,000 (current penalties are not more than \$500 but not less than \$100).

Criminal Sanction. Repealing a provision in the open records law making knowing violations or attempted violations a simple misdemeanor.

Time Limits on Custodian for Responding to Record Requests. Clarifying that the public be allowed to inspect or copy a public record at the time of the request, but if this is not feasible, the custodian of the record shall notify the requestor not later than five business days from the time of the request when such inspection or copying may take place unless there is good cause for the delay because of unusual circumstances. If the custodian is in doubt about the request, the custodian must make a determination within 10 days of the request and if access to the record is allowed, it must take place within five business days from the date the custodian makes the determination. A denial must be in writing and must state the reasons for the denial.

Undue Invasion of Personal Privacy. Adding an exemption to the public records law for material about an identified or identifiable person that if disclosed would constitute an unwarranted or



undue invasion of personal privacy or that would present a clear and serious danger of facilitating identity theft or other criminal activity in relation to that person.

Privacy and Court Records. Allowing the Iowa Supreme Court to issue rules requiring confidentiality of certain categories of material in court records consistent with the foregoing exemption relating to undue invasion of personal privacy.

Tentative, Preliminary, and Draft Material. Adding an exemption to the public records law for tentative, preliminary, draft, speculative, or research material, prior to final completion and prior to its submission for use in the final recommendation, adoption, or execution of any official policy or action. The Committee specifically asked that all stakeholders look at this language and provide feedback to the Committee. The Committee will also look at how other states handle this issue.

Government Employee Personnel Records. Clarifying what information in personnel records of government bodies shall be public information to include the name and compensation of the individual, the date the individual was employed by the government body, the position the individual holds or has held with the government body, the individual's qualifications for the position, and any final disciplinary action taken against the individual.

Job Applications for Government Employment. Adding an exemption to the public records law for the identity and qualifications of an applicant for public employment by a government body if the applicant requests anonymity in writing and the government body determines the anonymity is necessary to induce the applicant to apply for the position. Such information shall be exempt from disclosure until an applicant is a finalist for the public employment position, defined as one of five or fewer applicants under final consideration for the position.

Injunctions. Allowing the district court to issue an injunction prohibiting the disclosure of a public record upon a showing that disclosure would not be in the public interest because the potential harm to the public interest from disclosure outweighs any potential benefit, that disclosure would substantially and irreparably injure a person because it would invade the personal privacy of the identified subject and the harm is not outweighed by the public interest in disclosure, or that the custodian's determination to disclose a record to the public is a violation of law or is arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, or an abuse of discretion.

Final Settlement Agreements. Specifying that all final binding settlement agreements between an agency or other unit of state or local government shall be available for public inspection and shall include a brief summary indicating the identity of the parties, the nature of the dispute, relevant facts in dispute, and the terms of the settlement.

Applicability of Public Records Law to Nongovernmental Bodies. Clarifying current law that states that a government body shall not prevent the examination or copying of a public record by contracting with a nongovernmental body to perform any of its duties or functions by including language that all records in the possession or under the control of a nongovernmental body that are part of the execution or performance of the duties of the nongovernmental body under contract with a governmental body are public records.



Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee

Consistency in Exemptions. Adding an exemption to the public records law making records containing information that would permit a governmental body subject to the open meetings law to hold a closed meeting consistent.

Electronic Meetings. Adding a provision to the definition of a meeting in the open meetings law to provide that electronic meetings that are preserved by one or more members of a governmental body and sent to a majority of its members or a series of such communications each sent only to a minority of its members but that in the aggregate is sent to a majority of its members shall not be defined as a meeting under the open meetings law if the electronic communications are either posted on the body's Website or bulletin board or copies are made available to the public.

Walking Quorums. Adding a provision to the open meetings law defining a meeting to include the calculated use of a series of communications each between less than a majority of the members of a governmental body that reaches a majority of the members and that is intended to discuss and develop a final agreement of the majority outside of a meeting.

Reconvened Meetings Notice. Creating an exception to the public meeting notice requirement for a meeting that is reconvened within four hours of the start of a recess in a meeting where the time, date, and place of the reconvened meeting is announced in open session and is recorded in the minutes and there is no change in the agenda.

Chapter 22 Definitions. Adding definitions to the public records law clarifying the definitions of "record," "government record," "public record," "confidential record," and "optional public record."

Township Trustees. Eliminate the exemption from public notice requirements for township trustees.

Library Records. Allow a parent of a minor child to check on what materials their child may be checking out of the library.

III. Open Meetings and Public Records Issues — Proposed Draft — Discussion

Professor Arthur Bonfield, University of Iowa, addressed the Committee concerning proposed draft legislation on various open meeting and public records issues discussed during the previous meeting of the committee. Unless otherwise noted, the Committee agreed to keep each proposed draft item in the working draft of the Committee but to delay a final decision as to the inclusion of any particular draft proposal until a later meeting.

A. Administrative Enforcement Scheme

Professor Bonfield. The proposed draft creates an Iowa Public Information Board. The board is composed of five members, appointed by the Governor and subject to confirmation by the Senate. Key provisions of the draft creating an Iowa Public Information Board include the following:



1. Election of Remedies

Any aggrieved person can elect to seek enforcement of the requirements of Code chapters 21 and 22 by filing suit in district court or by filing a complaint with the board. If both a lawsuit and a complaint with the board are filed as to the same incident, then the board assumes primary jurisdiction of the action.

2. Board Powers

The board has the power to do the following:

- Appoint an executive officer.
- Hire staff.
- Issue rules to implement and enforce the requirements of Code chapters 21 and 22 and to interpret the requirements of those chapters.
- Issue declaratory orders.
- Receive complaints alleging violations of Code chapters 21 and 22 and to investigate, mediate, determine probable cause, and, if probable cause is found, prosecute in a contested case proceeding.
- Issue subpoenas.
- Issue orders with the force of law, after appropriate board proceedings, determining whether there has been a violation of Code chapter 21 or 22, requiring compliance with specified provisions of those chapters, imposing civil penalties, and imposing any other appropriate remedies calculated to declare, terminate, or remediate any violation of those chapters.
- Secure representation for the board in judicial proceedings to enforce its orders by using, at its option, attorneys on the board's staff, the Attorney General's Office, or other attorneys hired by the board.
- Make training available to persons subject to the requirements of Code chapters 21 and 22.
- Make information on open meetings and public records law available to the public.
- Prepare an annual report concerning board activities during the prior year.
- Recommend legislative changes.

3. Filing of Complaints

A complaint must be filed within 60 days from the time the alleged violation occurred or complainant could have become aware of the violation with reasonable diligence. Board proceedings shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible and at no cost to the complainant.

4. Mediation and Settlement

Upon receipt of a complaint alleging a violation of Code chapter 21 or 22, the board shall offer the parties the opportunity to resolve the dispute through mediation and settlement.



Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee

5. Enforcement

If any party declines mediation or settlement or if mediation or settlement is unsuccessful, the board shall investigate and make a determination as to whether the complaint is within its jurisdiction and whether there is probable cause to believe that the complaint states a violation of Code chapter 21 or 22. If not, the board shall issue a written order explaining its reasons for its conclusions. If probable cause is found, the board shall then cause to be commenced before the board a Code chapter 17A contested case proceeding against the respondent. At the conclusion of the proceeding, the board shall, by majority vote, issue a final determination and the final board order resulting from such proceeding may be enforced by the board in court and is subject to judicial review.

6. Defenses

A respondent may defend against a proceeding before the board on the ground that the violation was only harmless error, or that clear and convincing evidence demonstrated that grounds existed to justify a court to issue an injunction against disclosure.

7. Jurisdiction

The board does not have jurisdiction over the judicial or legislative branch of government.

Committee Discussion

Senator Lundby. Is the per diem amount for members of the board sufficient to attract good members? In addition, is the provision allowing an action to be commenced within 60 days after the complainant became aware of it with reasonable diligence too vague?

Co-chairperson Connolly. Should the board be specifically directed to consider utilizing the Iowa League of Cities and the Iowa Association of Counties in providing training?

Co-chairperson Lensing. Attorneys representing boards and commissions should be required to attend training on open meetings and public records issues.

Representative Boal. Is there a potential concern that the board will not meet often enough in order to resolve open meetings and public records issues expeditiously?

Professor Bonfield. The draft language provides the board with the flexibility to provide training in any manner it decides, including the ability to require an attorney for a government body to attend. The board could set minimum training standards and delegate the training to authorized entities.

B. Penalties

Professor Bonfield. The proposed draft increases the civil penalties that may be imposed by a court or by the new board from the current range of between \$100 to \$500 to a range of \$1,000 to \$2,500. In addition, the draft proposal repeals criminal sanctions for Code chapter 22 violations.

Committee Discussion

Co-chairperson Lensing. One concern is that a defense to a civil action is relying on the attorney for the government body and many attorneys don't have adequate training on these issues.



Representative Hunter. The proposed increase in civil penalties seems somewhat excessive.

Senator Beall. If the criminal penalties are removed, then the civil penalties should be increased and be higher than \$100.

C. Time Limits on Custodian for Responding to Record Requests

Professor Bonfield. The proposed draft provides that a custodian of a public record should, at the time of the request, permit inspection or copying of the record if feasible in the ordinary course of business. If immediate compliance is not feasible, the custodian shall immediately notify the requestor, orally or in writing, as to when such inspection or copying may take place, which shall be no later than five business days from the time of the request unless there is good cause to delay further because of unusual circumstances. If a further delay is required, the custodian shall furnish the requestor with a written statement of the reasons for that delay and the date by which the request will be satisfied. If the custodian is in doubt as to whether the requested records are public records, the custodian must make a determination within 10 business days.

Committee Discussion

Senator Lundby. Is there anything that can be done about annoying and harassing requests for records? Professor Bonfield noted that Iowa law makes no distinction based upon the purpose for the records request or the possible cost for compliance.

Co-chairperson Connolly. The provision allowing for a custodian to delay responding to a records request beyond five days for good cause is troubling, but a need exists to allow more time to respond to some records requests.

Senator Beall. The costs charged for responding to records requests need examination.

Representative Boal. The Iowa League of Cities and Iowa Association of Counties should be consulted as to what should be charged for requests, and Senator Beall indicated that the Iowa Newspaper Association should also be consulted.

D. Undue Invasion of Privacy

Professor Bonfield. The draft proposal provides that material about and linked to identified or identifiable individual persons that, if disclosed, would constitute an unwarranted or undue invasion of personal privacy or that would present a clear and serious danger of facilitating identity theft or other criminal activity in relation to that person should be considered a confidential record under Code section 22.7. Public records law should provide for a modicum of protection for personal privacy.

Committee Discussion

Senator Beall. The draft proposal lists some examples as to what material would likely cause an undue invasion of privacy, but the list is not exclusive. Should the new board determine what additional material should be considered confidential? Professor Bonfield indicated that the records custodian would make the initial determination but the board could issue rules defining the types of material covered.



E. Privacy and Court Records

Professor Bonfield. The draft proposal authorizes the Iowa Supreme Court to issue rules requiring confidentiality of certain categories of material that if disclosed would be an undue invasion of privacy or present a danger of identity theft or other criminal activity. The proposal should address the concerns raised by the Iowa Supreme Court but they need to examine the draft proposal to ensure it satisfies their concerns.

F. Tentative, Preliminary, and Draft Material

Professor Bonfield. While inclusion of a provision shielding release of this material was not agreed upon by the Committee at its last meeting, a narrowly crafted exemption is necessary if a strong enforcement model is established. States with strong enforcement, such as Connecticut, have an exemption for this material that generally is broader than the draft proposal. The draft proposal provides an exemption for tentative, preliminary, draft, speculative, or research material, prior to its final completion for the purpose for which it is intended and prior to its submission for use in the final formulation, recommendation, adoption, or execution of any official policy or action by the public officials authorized to make such decisions for the government body. The materials shall be treated as a public record at the time they are actually used as the basis for the final formulation, recommendation, adoption, or execution of any official policy or action of a government body.

Committee Discussion

Senator Lundby. A concern about shielding preliminary information is that delaying release of such material may be too late to impact the determination of the policy. The proposed draft language is too broad and makes it hard to determine when particular material becomes available for inspection.

Committee Action. The Committee agreed to keep this provision in the proposed draft but the Committee specifically asked that all stakeholders look at this language and provide feedback and possible alternatives to the Committee for consideration.

G. Government Employee Personnel Records

Professor Bonfield. The draft proposal maintains the current exemption from mandatory disclosure for personally identifiable information in personnel records of government bodies relating to individuals who are officials, officers, or employees of the government bodies but provides that information pertaining to the name and compensation of the individual, the date the individual was employed by the government body, the positions the individual holds or has held with the government body, the individual's qualifications for the position that the individual holds or has held, and any final disciplinary action taken against the individual that resulted in the individual's discharge, suspension, demotion, or loss of pay, are disclosable as a public record.

Committee Discussion. Several members of the Committee expressed concern about the provision that information relating to a disciplinary action would not be a public record until it is final. What if a teacher is accused of molesting a student but that information would not be public



until final disciplinary action is taken? Conversely, releasing information prior to a final determination could harm an innocent person. Professor Bonfield noted that if a person subject to a disciplinary action leaves employment prior to final action, that information would not be subject to mandatory disclosure.

H. Job Applicants for Government Employment

Professor Bonfield. The proposed draft tries to strike a balance between the goal of openness and the desire to attract qualified candidates to public employment. The draft makes no distinction based upon the type of position, making it applicable to university president and coach searches as well as entry-level government positions. The draft proposal provides that the identity and qualifications of an applicant for employment by a government body can be confidential if the applicant requests anonymity in writing and the government body determines that anonymity is necessary to induce the applicant to apply for the public employment position. The information shall be exempt from disclosure until an applicant is considered by the government body to be one of three or fewer finalists for a position in public employment.

Committee Discussion

Senator Beall. Many searches for higher profile positions include a semifinalist and finalist round and the proposal would limit disclosure only until the finalist stage. Should a higher number of finalists be listed or should semifinalists for a position also be subject to disclosure?

Senator Lundby. Would this requirement be applicable to the Governor when department heads and directors are selected? Professor Bonfield stated that the Governor's executive privilege authority would likely override the requirements of this statute.

Committee Action. The Committee agreed to increase from three to five the number of finalists that would be subject to disclosure.

I. Code Chapter 22 Injunction Provision

Professor Bonfield. The draft proposal allows a district court to issue an injunction prohibiting the disclosure of a public record upon a showing that disclosure would not be in the public interest because the potential harm to the public interest from disclosure outweighs any potential benefit, that disclosure would substantially and irreparably injure a person because it would invade the personal privacy of the identified subject and the harm is not outweighed by the public interest in disclosure, or that the custodian's determination to disclose a record to the public is a violation of law or is arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, or an abuse of discretion. Current law requires a showing that the release would not be in the public interest and would substantially and irreparably harm any person or persons. However, current law is too restrictive and the proposal attempts to provide a mechanism to protect privacy concerns while maintaining openness. The inclusion of a provision permitting an injunction if release would be an abuse of discretion is necessary for local government officials since the state, under the Iowa Administrative Procedures Act, can already be sued if the release of confidential information as defined under Code section 22.7 is considered arbitrary. Costless enforcement creates a need for a strengthened injunction provision to protect privacy concerns.



Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee

Committee Discussion

Representative Boal. The proposal seems acceptable but she wondered if the new requirements justifying an injunction are too easily met.

J. Final Settlement Agreements

Professor Bonfield. The draft proposal requires that a summary of all final binding settlement agreements shall be open. The summary shall include the identity of the parties, the nature of the dispute, the facts of the dispute, and the terms of the settlement. The proposal also includes a provision that a state agency can delete the identity of the other person or entity involved if it determines that is necessary to secure an agreement.

Committee Action. The Committee agreed to draft language requiring final settlement agreements to be open but decided to strike from the draft the provision allowing the deletion of the identity of the party to the agreement under certain circumstances.

K. Applications of Public Records Law to Nongovernmental Bodies

Professor Bonfield. The draft provides that all records created by any nongovernmental body in performance of duties imposed on the body by a contract with a governmental body whereby the nongovernmental body performs a function of the governmental body is considered a government record. The draft also provides that the lawful custodian of the records is the applicable governmental body. The draft also deletes introductory language in one provision of Code section 22.7 concerning records relating to a charitable donation made to certain foundations. While the description in the law of the types of records relating to charitable donation should be maintained, the introductory paragraph to the list of records is problematic, as it could be implied that the private foundations described should be considered government bodies.

Committee Discussion

Representative Jacobs. Would this new provision making records of nongovernmental bodies that contract with a government body public create any unintended consequences, such as making certain medical records now public? Professor Bonfield indicated that current provisions in Code section 22.7, and the proposed privacy exemption, would protect the release of these records.

Committee Action. The consensus of the Committee was to include this provision in the proposed draft.

L. Consistency in Exemptions

Professor Bonfield. The draft amends Code chapter 22 to provide that records containing information that would permit a governmental body to hold a closed session under Code chapter 21 should be a confidential record under Code section 22.7.

Committee Action. The consensus of the Committee was to include this provision in the proposed draft.



M. Electronic Meetings

Professor Bonfield. A key goal for open meetings law is to ensure that the public knows how the decision makers reached a particular decision. A particular problem occurs when decision makers utilize e-mails to assist in formulating policy. The draft proposal attempts to strike a compromise by providing that e-mail communications sent to a majority of the members of a government body, or a series of such communications each sent only to a minority of its members but that in aggregate is sent to a majority of its members, shall not be deemed to constitute a "meeting" if the e-mails, to the extent such e-mails are not otherwise exempted from disclosure, are either posted on the Website of the body, or on its public bulletin board, or copies are made available for public inspection at the next regular meeting of the body.

Committee Action. In response to Committee discussion about the use of text messaging, the Committee agreed that the reference in the draft proposal to "e-mail" be changed to "electronic communications that are preserved."

N. Walking Quorums

Professor Bonfield. While the practice of "walking quorums" needs to be eliminated, it is difficult to draft a solution to this problem. One way of addressing the problem is to determine the "evil" you are trying to eliminate and then draft a solution to fix that. In this case, the "evil" is having a government body make a decision outside of a meeting and then using the meeting to merely rubber stamp the already-arrived-at decision. The proposed draft contains two alternative proposals to try and deal with this issue, primarily by trying to define "meeting" for purposes of open meetings law so as to include walking quorums. The first alternative defines "meeting" to include the calculated use of a series of communications, each between less than a majority of the members of a governmental body or their personal intermediaries, that reaches a majority of the members of the body and is intended to develop a collective final agreement of a majority outside of a meeting with respect to specific action to be taken by the majority at a meeting. The second alternative defines "meeting" to include a series of prearranged gatherings, each of which involves less than a majority of a governmental body's members but that collectively involves a majority of its members where the series of gatherings includes deliberation or action upon the same matter with the specific intention of developing in those gatherings a collective final agreement of a majority outside of a meeting concerning action to be taken by a majority at a meeting. While proving intent is difficult, both alternatives require a finding, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the government body had the specific intent to avoid the open meetings law.

Committee Discussion

Co-chairperson Connolly. My preference is for the first alternative. The use of the term "prearranged" in the second alternative could be problematic. Another concern is with three-member boards where discussion between two of the members could result in open meetings law issues.

Senator Lundby. Would either alternative prevent board members from discussing issues with staff? Professor Bonfield indicated that this would not be a problem with either alternative.



Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee

Committee Action. The Committee decided in favor of the first alternative.

O. Reconvened Meetings Notice

Professor Bonfield. The draft proposal provides that the public notice requirements apply to reconvened meetings unless the meeting is reconvened within four hours of the start of its recess where announcement is made in open session of the time, date, and place of the reconvened meeting and recorded in the minutes of the meeting and there is no change in the agenda.

P. Code Chapter 22 Definitions

Professor Bonfield. The draft proposal intends to clarify current law by categorizing government records more appropriately by adding new definitions for "record," "government record," "public record," "confidential record," and "optional public record." The proposal defines the terms as follows:

"Record" includes information of every kind, nature, and form preserved or stored in any medium, including but not limited to paper, electronic, or film media.

"Government record" means all records owned by, created by, in the possession of, or under the control of a state or local government.

"Public record" includes all government records which the public has a right to examine and copy and includes all government records that are not designated by law as either confidential records or optional public records.

"Confidential record" means all government records designated confidential by law.

"Optional public record" means all government records designated confidential by law unless otherwise ordered by a court, the lawful custodian of the record, or by another person authorized to release the record.

Ms. Kathleen Richardson, Executive Secretary, Iowa Freedom of Information Council. The council does not support this proposal. While there may be no legal issues with the proposal, a concern is whether or not this change makes it more confusing, not less, for government officials dealing with public records issues.

Committee Action. The Committee agreed to include this provision in the proposed draft.

IV. Miscellaneous Open Meetings and Public Records Issues — Discussion

A. Township Trustees

Senator Beall. Current law exempts township trustees from the public notice requirements of Code section 21.4. This exemption should be eliminated.

Committee Action. The Committee agreed to include a provision in the proposed draft striking this exemption.



B. Library Records

Representative Boal. Concern has been raised that current public records law prevents a parent of a minor child from being able to access library records to know what materials their child has checked out from the library.

Professor Bonfield. Code section 22.7(13) regarding library records is unclear but it makes no distinction as to whether the records pertain to an adult or a minor child. The law should allow a parent to check on what materials their child may be checking out of the library.

Committee Action. The Committee agreed the current law should be amended to correct this unintended result.

C. Code Chapter 305 Retention of Public Records Issues

Co-chairperson Connolly. We need to examine how long the confidential nature of certain records should be maintained since many of these records are of use for historians. Other issues relative to this chapter should be presented to the Committee.

Senator Lundby. One possibility would be to have the Government Oversight Committee deal with these issues.

D. Public Hospitals

Senator Beall noted that the Iowa Hospital Association supports extending the open meetings exception for city enterprises in Code section 388.9 to county hospitals and supports an exception to the open meetings and public records laws to allow public hospitals to discuss quality process improvements.

E. Stakeholder Input

Senator Connolly noted that the co-chairpersons met with the Governor's office and the Attorney General to solicit their input in crafting proposed open meetings and public records legislation. Input from representatives of county and city government, as well as school boards, needs to be solicited as well prior to deciding on proposed draft legislation.

V. Materials Filed With the Legislative Services Agency

The following materials listed were distributed at or in connection with the meeting and are filed with the Legislative Services Agency. The materials may be accessed from the <Additional Information> link on the Committee's Internet Webpage:

<http://www.legis.state.ia.us/aspx/Committees/Committee.aspx?id=216>.

1. University of Iowa Law Professor Arthur Bonfield — Proposed Decisionmaking Agenda — November 2, 2007.



Freedom of Information, Open Meetings, and Public Records Study Committee

3655IC