

THE CIVIL BEAT  
LAW CENTER FOR THE PUBLIC INTEREST

700 Bishop Street, Suite 1701  
Honolulu, HI 96813

Office: (808) 531-4000  
Fax: (808) 380-3580  
info@civilbeatlawcenter.org

House Committee on Legislative Management  
Honorable Ty J.K. Cullen, Chair  
Honorable Mark M. Nakashima, Vice Chair

**RE: Testimony in Support of H.R. 104**  
Hearing: March 21, 2019 at 3:05 p.m.

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee:

My name is Brian Black. I am the Executive Director of the Civil Beat Law Center for the Public Interest, a nonprofit organization whose primary mission concerns solutions that promote governmental transparency. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony **supporting H.R. 104.**

**Please note that the Senate has moved forward alternative resolutions to this version (S.C.R. 107 / S.R. 81) that the Law Center would prefer. We would ask that the Committee amend H.R. 104 to follow S.R. 81.**

H.R. 104 requests that the Office of Information Practices (OIP) experiment with a random sample of public complaints in the search for a way to reduce the time needed to resolve those complaints. This bill reinforces the legislative intent that OIP's review be "*expeditious, informal, and at no cost to the public.*"

OIP is not resolving complaints in an expeditious manner. Reviewing data from OIP, the Law Center discovered in 2017 that time taken to resolve complaints has quadrupled in recent years, fewer complaints on average are being resolved each year, and OIP's backlog is trending upward despite a downward trend in new filings. Successive reports have not shown improvement. The Law Center's three years of reports are posted at [www.civilbeatlawcenter.org/resources](http://www.civilbeatlawcenter.org/resources).

When we advise members of the public regarding options for resolving UIPA or Sunshine disputes, the Law Center must explain that an appeal to OIP will take at least a year, but closer to two years or more. Some give up. Others who move forward with OIP often complain later that the information they sought is no longer useful when OIP orders disclosure. Timely access is critical.

Although a legislative resolution should not be necessary for OIP to re-examine its internal processes and seek out more efficient methods for resolving complaints, any effort in this direction would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify in **support** of H.R. 104.



49 South Hotel Street, Room 314 | Honolulu, HI 96813  
[www.lwv-hawaii.com](http://www.lwv-hawaii.com) | 808.531.7448 | [voters@lwv-hawaii.com](mailto:voters@lwv-hawaii.com)

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT  
Thursday, March 21, 2019, 3:05 PM Hearing in State Capitol Room 312

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 111 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 104  
REQUESTING THAT THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION PRACTICES CONDUCT AN ALTERNATIVE APPEAL  
RESOLUTION PILOT PROJECT.

**TESTIMONY**

Douglas Meller, Legislative Committee, League of Women Voters of Hawaii

Chair Cullen and Committee Members:

The League of Women Voters of Hawaii supports HCR 111 and HR104. An appropriately sized randomly chosen sample would allow the OIP to determine whether the experimental approach is useful for "easy" cases (with obvious precedents) and to determine whether the experimental approach is useful for "other" cases. To allow sufficient time for the proposed experiment to generate statistically significant data, we suggest amending these resolutions to request the OIP to report preliminary findings to the 2020 Legislature and to submit a final report to the 2021 Legislature.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony.



March 21, 2019

Rep. Ty Cullen  
House Legislative Management Committee  
State Capitol  
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Senate Resolution 104 and Senate Concurrent Resolutions 111

Chairman Cullen and Committee Members:

The Hawaii Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists supports the two resolutions, which would request a pilot project by the Office of Information Practices to randomly select records requests for quick informal guidance.

We believe that the OIP should try different methods to lessen its heavy backlog.

Time is of the essence for the media and the public in many records requests, and long wait times frustrate these people.

Thank you,

Stirling Morita  
President  
Hawaii Chapter SPJ



# OFFICE OF INFORMATION PRACTICES

STATE OF HAWAII  
NO. 1 CAPITOL DISTRICT BUILDING  
250 SOUTH HOTEL STREET, SUITE 107  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813  
TELEPHONE: 808-586-1400 FAX: 808-586-1412  
EMAIL: oip@hawaii.gov

To: House Committee on Legislative Management

From: Cheryl Kakazu Park, Director

Date: March 21, 2019, 3:05 p.m.  
State Capitol, Conference Room 312

Re: Testimony on H.C.R No. 111 and H.R. No. 104  
Requesting That the Office of Information Practices Conduct an  
Alternative Appeal Resolution Pilot Project

---

---

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on this resolution, which requests that the Office of Information Practices (OIP) prepare short, informal, nonenforceable guidance for randomly selected appeals, and report back to the Legislature regarding the effects. **The Office of Information Practices (OIP) is willing to experiment with this or other methods of alternative appeal resolution that would help it to resolve appeals faster, and thus supports this measure.**

Appeals are just one type of formal case that OIP works on, and they are the sole focus of these resolutions. Currently, the OIP attorney assigned to each appeal file does a preliminary assessment of the file once the agency's response has come in, both for "triage" to determine if the appeal may be quickly resolved by mediation or a straightforward decision relying on clearly applicable precedent, and to determine whether there are follow-up responses that should be obtained from the agency or the requester even if the file is not suitable for quick resolution. OIP provides the agency's response to the person who submitted the appeal upon

request. In those files the assigned attorney believes are suitable for mediation, the assigned attorney will typically contact the agency and the requester to share OIP's inclination and seek to work out an agreement; however, OIP does not normally provide a written preliminary inclination as part of the process. In cases selected for mediation, if the parties do not reach agreement on all the issues, OIP will provide an enforceable written determination at a future time, with the unsuccessfully mediated cases going back in line with all other appeals, to be resolved generally on a first-come, first-served basis. Between the cases OIP is able to resolve without an opinion and those it resolves with an opinion, **OIP's current process has been gaining ground against its backlog of pending appeal files**, helped by a lower number of new appeal files over the last year. Thus, as of February 28, 2019, OIP had closed 35 of the 97 appeals that it had pending on July 1, 2018, and had closed 6 of the 29 new appeals filed after July 1, 2018.

The process proposed by this resolution would be a significant departure from the way OIP currently selects cases for mediation, as it would entail taking a random selection of incoming appeal files, regardless of how voluminous the records or how complex the issues involved, and quickly issuing short, informal guidance with the hope that the parties involved will accept and follow that guidance in lieu of waiting what may be a year or more for a binding full opinion. It may be challenging to implement insofar as it may require quickly assessing and offering guidance on files involving hundreds of pages of withheld records to review. In such cases, however, OIP believes it will be able to follow the proposed process by offering guidance based on just a representative sampling of voluminous records. While the proposal will also likely take more time to process a case with complex or novel legal issues and would thus reduce the number of "easy" cases that could have otherwise be processed during that time, OIP might ultimately save time by doing a

less detailed inclination rather than a thoroughly researched and explained opinion. When any party does not wish to accept OIP's nonbinding guidance, the proposal will allow OIP to provide a full and enforceable opinion at a later time, as determined by OIP's usual policies.

Because the proposed experiment involves a random sample of cases processed in a way that is significantly different from what OIP does currently, OIP believes its results will be very illuminating. **The process proposed by this measure may turn out to decrease the amount of time required on average to resolve an appeal, it may turn out to have no significant effect, or it may turn out to increase the amount of time required on average to resolve an appeal as compared to OIP's current process.** If it turns out that offering early guidance even in the cases involving voluminous records or complex issues improves the average time required to resolve files overall, that will be important to know and OIP could adopt the practice going forward. If, on the other hand, it turns out that doing so is less time-efficient than OIP's current practice of seeking to mediate only selected cases, then OIP will at least have the knowledge that its current selective mediation actually is a more efficient approach than the proposed approach.

**To properly assess the effects of the proposed approach without skewing the results from a different methodology, however, OIP will not be able to continue its own current form of selective mediation efforts.** Notably, the Senate Committee on Government Operations recently passed out SCR 107 and SR 81, which request that OIP experiment with an approach more closely akin to what it is currently doing, so the **results would be skewed if both the Senate and House adopted different methodologies for OIP to follow.**

**If the House chooses to adopt the methodology provided in these resolutions, then OIP would also be amenable to the amendment proposed by the League of Women Voters to have the pilot project run for a year and a half instead of just half a year, with OIP reporting preliminary results to the 2020 Legislature and a final report to the 2021 Legislature.**

Thank you for considering OIP's comments.