

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2/3/2023
BY ERIN L. LENNON
CLERK

101689-1

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington
2/2/2023 4:12 PM

No. 83200-0-I

COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION I,
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

JEREMY CONKLIN, DO, an individual,

Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON SCHOOL OF
MEDICINE, a Washington public educational institution;
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON MEDICINE,
a Washington public health system; and UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON MEDICAL CENTER, a Washington
public hospital,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Aaron P. Orheim
WSBA #47670
Talmadge/Fitzpatrick
2775 Harbor Avenue SW
Third Floor, Suite C
Seattle, WA 98126
(206) 574-6661

Attorney for Petitioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Authorities.....	ii-iii
A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER.....	1
B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION.....	1
C. ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	1
D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED.....	12
(1) <u>The PRA Requires an Agency to Produce Records in a Timely Manner, and Ensuring Timely Access to Public Records Is an Issue of Substantial Public Importance</u>	13
(2) <u>Division I’s Opinion Either Conflicts with Precedent or New Precedent Is Needed to Ensure Agencies Begin Responding More Promptly Than 917, 307, or 206 Days</u>	21
F. CONCLUSION.....	30
Appendix	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Table of Cases</u>	
<u>Washington Cases</u>	
<i>Amren v. City of Kalama</i> , 131 Wn.2d 25, 929 P.2d 389 (1997).....	14, 15
<i>Andrews v. Washington State Patrol</i> , 183 Wn. App. 644, 334 P.3d 94 (2014).....	15, 16, 23
<i>Cantu v. Yakima Sch. Dist. No. 7</i> , 23 Wn. App. 2d 57, 514 P.3d 661 (2022).....	21
<i>Doe G v. Dep’t of Corr.</i> , 190 Wn.2d 185, 410 P.3d 1156 (2018).....	12
<i>Forbes v. City of Gold Bar</i> , 171 Wn. App. 857, 288 P.3d 384 (2012).....	24, 25, 26
<i>Health Pros Nw., Inc. v. State</i> , 10 Wn. App. 2d 605, 449 P.3d 303 (2019), <i>review denied</i> , 194 Wn.2d 1025 (2020).....	17
<i>Hikel v. City of Lynnwood</i> , 197 Wn. App. 366, 389 P.3d 677 (2016).....	22
<i>Rental Hous. Ass’n v. City of Des Moines</i> , 165 Wn.2d 525, 199 P.3d 393 (2009).....	18
<i>Rufin v. City of Seattle</i> , 199 Wn. App. 348, 398 P.3d 1237 (2017), <i>review denied</i> , 189 Wn.2d 1034 (2018).....	8, 16, 26
<i>Seattle Times Co. v. Ishikawa</i> , 97 Wn.2d 30, 640 P.2d 716 (1982).....	13
<i>Spokane Research & Def. Fund v. City of Spokane</i> , 155 Wn.2d 89, 117 P.3d 1117 (2005).....	15, 16
<i>Twin Harbors Fish & Wildlife Advoc. v. Wash. Dep’t of Fish & Wildlife</i> , 21 Wn. App. 2d 1003, 2022 WL 538366 (2022).....	24, 25

<i>West v. Dep't of Fish & Wildlife,</i> __ Wn. App. 2d __, 2022 WL 369984 (2022).....	22
<i>West v. DOL,</i> 182 Wn. App. 500, 331 P.3d 72 (2014).....	22, 23
<i>West v. Thurston County,</i> 144 Wn. App. 573, 183 P.3d 346 (2008).....	16

Constitution

Wash. Const. art. 1, § 10	14
---------------------------------	----

Statutes

RCW 42.30.030	13
RCW 42.56.030	14
RCW 42.56.080(2)	17, 18
RCW 42.56.100	8, 17, 26
RCW 42.56.550	15, 18
RCW 42.56.550(2)	16
RCW 42.56.550(3)	12
RCW 44.48.150	14
RCW 49.60.030	20
RCW 70.41.235	2, 20

Rules

RAP 13.4(b)(1)	12, 21, 29
RAP 13.4(b)(2)	12, 21, 26, 29
RAP 13.4(b)(4)	12, 13, 21

Other Authorities

University of Washington, <i>2018 Financial Report</i> , https://finance.uw.edu/uwar/annualreport2018.pdf	27
---	----

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Dr. Jeremy Conklin requests that this Court grant review and reverse in part the opinion designated in section B of this petition.

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

Division I of the Court of Appeals issued an opinion in Cause No. 83200-0-1 on January 3, 2022 (appendix).

C. ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. An agency has an obligation under the Public Records Act (“PRA”) to make records “promptly available” and adopt policies that allow it to provide “the most timely possible action on requests for information.” Neither “overbreadth” of the request nor “administrative inconvenience” is an excuse to these obligations. Is it a violation delay producing records sought under the PRA for 917, 307, and 206 days and delay producing instalments of records for hundreds of days thereafter?

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Dr. Jeremy Conklin trained in osteopathic medicine after honorably serving in the Army and Air Force as a medical specialist and medical officer. He applied for a congenital cardiac surgery fellowship position with the University of

Washington School of Medicine but was denied consideration simply because he was trained and board certified as an osteopath (DO) instead of an allopath (MD). CP 3, 1392. DOs serve as physicians in all fields of medicine and Washington law recognizes that a hospital “may not discriminate against a qualified doctor of osteopathic medicine and surgery.” RCW 70.41.235.

Believing UW had unlawfully discriminated against him and committed antitrust violations, Dr. Conklin submitted three PRA requests seeking more information regarding UW’s fellowship application practices. He made requests on November 17, 2017, May 12, 2018, and June 15, 2018, seeking information related to his rejected application for a congenital cardiac fellowship. CP 240-48, 343-47.

His first two requests were substantive, asking for application materials, training materials, and other information that might support his lawsuit. He also specifically sought contracts UW had with other organizations that would show its

anticompetitive conspiracy to exclude DO-trained physicians from its fellowships. CP 240-41, 246-48. Dr. Conklin's third request asked for documents and communications related to UW's ongoing failure to comply with the PRA. CP 249.

UW responded to Dr. Conklin's PRA requests by providing an estimate of time for producing responsive documents. But those estimates were not reasonable, and UW continuously increased them to unreasonably delay producing documents. The undisputed facts show that Dr. Conklin did not receive any records or exemption logs responsive to his PRA requests for 307 days, and UW unreasonably delayed between 131 to 917 days in providing installments of documents to Dr. Conklin. CP 343-47.

FIRST REQUEST: With respect to Dr. Conklin's first request, the stipulated facts show that UW did not release any records or exemption logs to Dr. Conklin until **307** days after he made his first request. CP 344. UW released a second installment **282** days later. *Id.* UW released a third installment

168 days later. CP 346. UW released a fourth installment 54 days later. *Id.* UW released a fifth installment **131** days later. *Id.* UW said that this was the final installment, but then it released a sixth and final installment **135** days after the fifth. *Id.*

SECOND REQUEST: With respect to Dr. Conklin's second request, UW did not release any records or exemption logs to Dr. Conklin until **917** days after he made his second request. CP 345. Although it said that this was the close of his request, UW provided another installment **169** days later. CP 1381-90.

THIRD REQUEST: With respect to Dr. Conklin's third request, UW did not release any records or exemption logs to Dr. Conklin until **206** days after he made his third request. CP 345. UW released a second installment **172** days later. *Id.* UW released a third and final installment 28 days later. *Id.*¹

¹ Dr. Conklin challenges each of the bolded requests as an unreasonable time estimate/delay for producing records responsive to a PRA request. Because an agency has a duty to provide reasonable estimates for the first installment and every

Dr. Conklin immediately notified UW that its estimates of time needed to produce documents were unreasonable and that he would consider seeking fines and attorney fees under PRA. CP 242. He has maintained that **917, 307, and 206 days** are not reasonable estimates of time to begin responding to a public records request, nor is it reasonable to delay **131 to 282 days** for subsequent installments.

In January 2018, Dr. Conklin sued UW in federal court asserting antitrust and antidiscrimination claims related to the fellowship program, along with claims for violating the PRA under state law. CP 82-95. UW knew the requested records were highly relevant to those claims, as Dr. Conklin's counsel reiterated multiple times to UW's counsel. CP 243-44, 1276-73.²

subsequent installment of records, each of these delays is a separate PRA violation.

² The timing of UW's PRA responses was suspect. For example, UW provided its first response to *any* of Dr. Conklin's requests *only after* UW moved to dismiss Dr. Conklin's federal claims *and after* briefing on that motion was completed. CP 238-55, 273-74, 343-47.

In November 2018, the federal court granted UW's motion to dismiss Dr. Conklin's federal claims. CP 1164-73. Dr. Conklin voluntarily dismissed and then refiled his PRA claims in King County Superior Court. CP 1-13.

The trial court, the Honorable Judge Ruhl, declined to rule for either party at the initial show cause hearing; instead, it ordered that the parties cooperate on a discovery plan/case schedule. CP 296-302. The parties agreed to bifurcate the trial by affidavit into liability and penalties phases. CP 303-05, 313-16. Thus, the trial court set a hearing on liability only. *Id.*

Eventually the trial court considered the case in a trial by affidavit in February 2021. RP 4-97.³ No witnesses testified. *Id.*; CP 1082-83. The parties submitted briefing and documentary support for their positions and argument via Zoom. CP 348-1081; RP 4-97.

³ Trial was delayed several times because of COVID-19 and other circumstances beyond Dr. Conklin's control. CP 317-36.

UW argued that the breadth and complexity of Dr. Conklin's requests, which potentially implicated various departments at UW, largely caused the delay. CP 357-59. But the record showed that identifying and gathering documents from different departments within UW was just a fraction of the delay in this case. UW's records officers gathered and provided thousands of pages of records to employees at its Office of Public Records ("OPR") (*i.e.*, UW's internal department responsible for reviewing them and releasing them to the requestor), where they sat for many months, stretching into years, merely awaiting review for possible PRA exemptions and release. Some responsive records sat collected but unproduced for as long as **470 days** in UW's OPR. *Compare* CP 388-92 (when and how many documents were gathered and sent to OPR) *with* 397-402 (when and how many documents were released).

UW also claimed that it delayed producing documents responsive to Dr. Conklin's second and third requests because of an unwritten policy that it will not respond to a second request

from the same requestor until it finishes the first. CP 396 (“If...OPR receives multiple separate requests submitted by the same requester at different times, OPR processes the requests in the order received, prioritizing its review of records responsive to the earliest request before moving to the subsequent requests.”). Dr. Conklin pointed out that UW has the burden to adopt rules and procedures that “*shall* provide for the *fullest assistance* to inquirers and *the most timely possible* action on requests for information.” RCW 42.56.100 (emphasis added). He argued that due to this unwritten policy, UW unreasonably delayed 917 days before providing *any* documents responsive to Dr. Conklin’s second PRA request.⁴

Dr. Conklin also presented data that UW has the poorest track record of state agencies in responding to PRA requests.

⁴ As shown in cases like *Rufin v. City of Seattle*, 199 Wn. App. 348, 357, 398 P.3d 1237 (2017), *review denied*, 189 Wn.2d 1034 (2018), UW’s practices are unreasonable where the state entity responded to several requests made by the same person *concurrently*.

Public agencies closed PRA requests in 16 days on average across Washington State. CP 538-95. While higher learning institutions may be slower to respond to PRA requests than other state agencies, taking 38 days on average to close a PRA request in 2018 (CP 587), UW took an average of 63 days in 2018 to complete a PRA request. CP 526-95. UW also admitted that it had the means and ability to hire outside companies to assist with large PRA requests and review documents for potential privileges and had done so in the past. CP 496-97. UW admitted that it had backlogs of 3.6 million documents that its nine OPR staff members needed to review. CP 390. Dr. Conklin argued that a multi-billion-dollar institution like UW needed to devote more resources to complying with the PRA. *E.g.*, CP 227, 470, 1258; RP 18-19.

By the time the case was argued, UW had purportedly finished producing documents. Dr. Conklin noted that UW had not provided certain contracts he asked for in his first two PRA requests that mandated allopathic training of residents and

fellows. The trial court modified Dr. Conklin's complaint to include a claim for a PRA violation for UW's failure to search for and produce those contracts. CP 1086-88. Dr. Conklin could not raise this claim sooner because he had to wait for UW to finish its protracted responses before he could raise a claim that it had denied him records.

A few weeks later, UW "discovered" additional responsive records, versions of the contracts Dr. Conklin sought. CP 1356-67, 1381-96. Despite denying those agreements existed in federal court (CP 1151), those records were signed by Dr. Byron Joyner and apparently in the possession of Dr. Lester Permut, both participants in the federal lawsuit. CP 1359-61. UW also apparently ignored communications made by Dr. Conklin's council clarifying the agreements he was looking for and that they might be found at any of the departments or defendants within the University named in his lawsuit. CP 1280-81. Dr. Conklin argued that UW failed to conduct an adequate search and provide these contracts sooner. CP 1251-59, 1371-

79, 1410-15.

Eventually, the trial court ruled that UW was not liable for any PRA violation, neither its unreasonable time estimates/delays nor its failure to adequately search for the contracts Dr. Conklin sought. CP 1417-87. Dr. Conklin timely appealed. CP 1488-92.

On appeal, Division I affirmed and reversed in part. It correctly found that UW performed an inadequate search for the contracts Dr. Conklin sought that UW suddenly “discovered” during the PRA case. Op. 27-31. But Division I condoned UW’s inordinate delays, holding that UW did not violate the PRA even though it delayed producing installments of records by as much as *917 days*. Op. 20-27.

Dr. Conklin’s appeal was supported by *amicus curiae*, the Washington Coalition of Open Government, who confirmed that UW is among the slowest at producing records across the state. *Amicus* argued that greater guidance was needed to ensure that an agency cannot delay hundreds of days before providing initial

responses and in between providing installments of responsive records. *See generally, amicus br.* Those pleas went unanswered.

This timely petition follows.

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED⁵

Review is appropriate under RAP 13.4(b)(1), (2), and (4). Access to public records is an issue of substantial public importance under RAP 13.4(b)(4), and guidance from this Court is needed to ensure that agencies are not permitted to delay as much as 917 days before they begin providing documents responsive to PRA requests. Review is also appropriate under RAP 13.4(b)(1) and (2) because no precedent supports delays as long as those condoned by Division I in this matter. Clear guidance is needed from this Court – an agency must begin

⁵ Should this Court grant review, its review would be *de novo*, as are all matters of liability under the PRA and matters decided solely on documentary evidence. *Doe G v. Dep't of Corr.*, 190 Wn.2d 185, 191, 410 P.3d 1156 (2018) (citing RCW 42.56.550(3)).

responding sooner than 917, 307, or 206 days to a PRA request, and it must provide additional installments in timely intervals. This is true even if an agency must devote more resources to complying with the PRA's commands.

Division I's outlier opinion will only embolden state agencies to shirk their duties under the PRA in violation of public policy and precedent. Review and reversal are warranted.

(1) The PRA Requires an Agency to Produce Records in a Timely Manner, and Ensuring Timely Access to Public Records Is an Issue of Substantial Public Importance

This case presents important questions of substantial public interest. RAP 13.4(b)(4). Open access to government is a paramount interest of Washingtonians, and review by this Court is necessary to ensure that agencies release records promptly.

Open government is particularly important to the citizens of this State, as expressed many times in our Constitution and laws. *See, e.g., Seattle Times Co. v. Ishikawa*, 97 Wn.2d 30, 36,

640 P.2d 716, 719 (1982) (right to open courts) (citing Wash. Const. art. 1, § 10 (“Justice in all cases shall be administered openly”)); RCW 42.30.030 (“All meetings of the governing body of a public agency shall be open and public”); RCW 44.48.150 (Legislature finding that providing transparent information to the public “contributes to governmental accountability, public participation, agency efficiency, and open government”). Consistent with this public policy, the PRA is one of the most important tools to ensure state government is open and accountable to the people.

By enacting the PRA, the Legislature declared:

The people...do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may maintain control over the instruments that they have created.

RCW 42.56.030. “The purpose of the Act is to ensure the sovereignty of the people and the accountability of the governmental agencies that serve them.” *Amren v. City of*

Kalama, 131 Wn.2d 25, 31, 929 P.2d 389 (1997). The PRA is liberally construed to “promote full disclosure of government activity that the people might know how their representatives have executed the public trust placed in them and so hold them accountable.” *Spokane Research & Def. Fund v. City of Spokane*, 155 Wn.2d 89, 100, 117 P.3d 1117 (2005).

“The PRA provides a cause of action for two types of violations: (1) when an agency wrongfully denies an opportunity to inspect or copy a public record, or (2) when an agency has not made a reasonable estimate of the time required to respond to the request.” *Andrews v. Washington State Patrol*, 183 Wn. App. 644, 651, 334 P.3d 94 (2014) (emphasis added). The burden of proof to show thorough and diligent compliance with the PRA is on the state agency, in this case UW. RCW 42.56.550. UW failed to meet that burden.⁶

⁶ Because the citizens of this state have an absolute right to public records “it is not necessary for a party to show actual damages” to bring a PRA case. *Amren*, 131 Wn.2d at 36. Nor does RCW 42.56.550 require any finding of need for public

This Court has stated that “[i]t is...imperative that government agencies timely comply with the mandates of the P[R]A.” *Spokane Research*, 155 Wn.2d at 100. “The PRA provides a cause of action...when an agency has not made a reasonable estimate of the time required to respond to the request.” *Andrews*, 183 Wn. App. at 651 (citing RCW 42.56.550(2)). “If public records do not fall within [designated] exemptions, their disclosure must be timely. Penalties for late disclosure are mandatory.” *West v. Thurston County*, 144 Wn. App. 573, 581, 183 P.3d 346 (2008) (citing *Spokane Research*, 155 Wn.2d at 102). In determining whether an agency acted promptly in producing responsive records, courts must examine whether the agency’s response was “thorough and diligent.” *Rufin*, 199 Wn. App. at 357.

Aside from this case law, the PRA itself mandates that public agencies have an obligation to make records “promptly

records or harm caused by an agency’s violation of the PRA. The right to receive public records promptly is absolute.

available,” including providing them on an “installment basis as records that are part of a larger set of requested records are assembled or made ready for inspection or disclosure.” RCW 42.56.080(2); *see also*, RCW 42.56.100 (requiring that an agency adopt disclosure procedures that “provide for the fullest assistance to inquirers and the most timely possible action on requests for information.”). If an agency chooses to respond by providing installments, it must provide a reasonable time estimate for the first installment and every subsequent installment. *Health Pros Nw., Inc. v. State*, 10 Wn. App. 2d 605, 621, 449 P.3d 303 (2019), *review denied*, 194 Wn.2d 1025 (2020).

Division I was wrong to condone UW’s delayed estimates and installment productions ranging from 131 to 917 days. An agency must begin to respond sooner than 917, 307, and 206 days to public records requests. And once it begins responding, it must produce regular installments sooner than 282, 172, 169, 168, 135, 131 as UW did here. These were unreasonable

estimate/production times where UW merely had to review gathered documents for exemptions and create a simple exemption log. *See, e.g.*, CP 417 (excerpt of simple spreadsheet-style exemption log UW produced).

Division I was wrong to condone these delays, buying UW's arguments that its delays were reasonable because it needed to create an exemption log and Dr. Conklin's requests were "of the broadest requests [one employee] had ever managed." Op. at 22. An agency is not excused for failure to timely comply with the PRA "on the basis that the request is overbroad." RCW 42.56.080(2). Likewise, "[a]dministrative inconvenience or difficulty does not excuse strict compliance with the PRA." *Rental Hous. Ass'n v. City of Des Moines*, 165 Wn.2d 525, 535, 199 P.3d 393 (2009); *see also*, RCW 42.56.550 ("Courts shall take into account the policy of this chapter that free and open examination of public records is in the public interest, even though such examination may cause inconvenience or embarrassment to public officials or others."). As discussed

below, Division I cited *zero case law* condoning delays comparable to UW's because there is none.

Review is warranted by this Court to ensure that the public policy of openness does not bow to administrative difficulties. Agencies cannot stonewall record production because turning over information to the public is sometimes difficult. UW sat on documents it gathered for hundreds of days failing to produce them because they needed exemption review. As discussed below, that is unreadable given the plethora of case law in this state.

Condoning UW's delays is also terrible public policy, and review is necessary to ensure the public's interest in access to open records is preserved. Indeed, the public information in this very case, UW's application practices, has many relevant uses to the public interest. For example, the data Dr. Conklin sought would be vital toward educational or lobbying efforts to improve access to training for a class of physicians the Legislature has protected from discriminatory hiring. RCW 70.41.235.

Issues of discriminatory hiring are particularly important to the people of this state, as evidenced by laws like RCW 49.60.030 (Washington Law Against Discrimination), which gives Washingtonians the “right to obtain and hold employment without discrimination” and RCW 70.41.235 itself which prevents a hospital from “discriminat[ing] against a qualified doctor of osteopathic medicine and surgery.” Timely access to public records is vital to monitor and enforce such rights.

UW has cast Dr. Conklin as a jilted applicant using the PRA to get his “pound of flesh” from UW. CP 361. Not only is this derogatory language irrelevant, where the right to examine public records is absolute. But by condoning it, Division I made it more difficult for all Washingtonians to uncover important public information, including information related to hiring discrimination. If Division I’s opinion is allowed to stand, it is not hard to imagine UW or some other agency stonewalling a more regular requestor like the Seattle Times seeking information about an inflammatory story or a discriminatory

practice, delaying production for hundreds of days when advantageous to wait out the news cycle. That is untenable.

Review is appropriate to ensure the public's substantial interest in access to public records is respected. RAP 13.4(b)(4).

(2) Division I's Opinion Either Conflicts with Precedent or New Precedent Is Needed to Ensure Agencies Begin Responding More Promptly Than 917, 307, or 206 Days

Review is also appropriate under RAP 13.4(b)(1) and (2) because Division I's opinion conflicts with existing precedent. The delays condoned in this case are complete outliers among the precedent of this state. Every case has unique facts, but Division I's is an outlier to the point of conflict that this Court should resolve.

Just months ago, Division III issued *Cantu v. Yakima Sch. Dist. No. 7*, 23 Wn. App. 2d 57, 514 P.3d 661 (2022), holding that a school district was liable for delaying PRA production for 172 days, forcing requestor to file a PRA complaint. Division III held that "administrative inconvenience or difficulty in

producing records does not excuse [agency’s] lack of diligence” nor does “insufficient allocation of resources and lack of priorities.” *Id.* at 95. Here, too, UW was content to sit on already gathered documents for hundreds of days because it lacked the resources or devoted priorities necessary to get them out the door sooner. This conflict cannot stand.

Zero case law supports UW’s position that its long delays in providing records on an installment basis were reasonable. *See, e.g., Hikel v. City of Lynnwood*, 197 Wn. App. 366, 369, 389 P.3d 677 (2016) (agency began producing documents responsive to largest request it ever received within 45 days); *West v. Dep’t of Fish & Wildlife*, __ Wn. App. 2d __, 2022 WL 369984, at *1 (2022) (agency had to review over 10 gigabytes worth of data to review for a large request, but it began producing records within 71 days and sent five installments of records around one every 30 to 60 days).⁷

⁷ UW claims it had 8.6 gigabytes of data to review for Dr. Conklin’s case. Why it needed over four times as long as the

West v. DOL, 182 Wn. App. 500, 331 P.3d 72 (2014), is a helpful example of what UW could have done, even if Dr. Conklin's requests impacted many documents. There, an agency received a complex request, that implicated over 50,000 pages. *Id.* at 512-13. Fifty-five days later, the agency began providing documents to the requestor on an installment basis after reviewing the first installment for PRA exemptions. *Id.* Over the next 10 months the agency provided 47,363 pages to the requestor through at least 21 semi-regular installments. *Id.* Division I held that the agency met its obligation to respond to the requestor in a timely manner. *Id.* at 76-79.

UW came nowhere near the timely compliance exhibited by the agency in *West*. It admitted that it sat on thousands of records for years, without making them available to Dr. Conklin. Months, and even years, passed between its installment releases.

Andrews v. Washington State Patrol is another example of

agency in *West*, 307 days, to begin providing *any* records to Dr. Conklin is inexplicable.

the timely compliance required by the PRA, regardless of the request's complexity. There, the Washington State Patrol ("WSP") received a request to produce six months of "all recorded attorney-client telephone conversations" for DUI defendants, among other records. 183 Wn. App. at 647. Because of attorney/client privilege concerns, this "complex" request required WSP to "develop[] a methodology to identify responsive recordings without listening to the recordings." *Id.* at 653. Still, WSP completed its production of records within 90 days, despite simultaneously responding to "2,307" other PRA requests it received in just the two months prior. *Id.* at 649. Again, a far cry from what occurred in this case.

UW barely tried to offer any caselaw of its own to support delays lasting up to 917 days. In a footnote it mentioned *Twin Harbors Fish & Wildlife Advoc. v. Wash. Dep't of Fish & Wildlife*, 21 Wn. App. 2d 1003, 2022 WL 538366 (2022) and *Forbes v. City of Gold Bar*, 171 Wn. App. 857, 863, 288 P.3d 384 (2012). Resp'ts br. at 38 n.5. Those cases do not help UW.

In *Twin Harbors*, the requestor made a broad request, impacting “100,000 records” and “152,469 potentially responsive emails” that the state agency needed to review. 2022 WL 538366, at *4. The state agency produced a first batch of records within 45 days of the request, and then provided 38 regular installments of records “in approximately one-month intervals” thereafter. *Id.* at *1-2, 8. Again, this is nothing like what occurred here, where UW delayed 307 days before providing a first batch of records responsive to any of Dr. Conklin’s requests and delayed other installment productions by hundreds of days.

In *Forbes*, a requestor made three separate, broad requests that required the city to search the emails of various employees. The city produced a first set of records within 165 days and provided 13 more responses over the next 10 months, delaying no more than 45 days between installment productions, and completing all three of his requests within 16 months. 171 Wn. App. 857 at 865. Again, this case is nothing like *Forbes* given

that public agency's far more regular and timely productions in that case. UW also took nearly twice as long, *307 days*, to begin responding to *any* of Dr. Conklin's requests, waiting until after key events occurred in Dr. Conklin's lawsuit.

Forbes also shows that UW's policy of refusing to process multiple requests from the same requestor at the same time is unreasonable, given other agencies deal with multiple requests concurrently. *See also*, appellant's br. at 49-50 (citing other cases like *Rufin, supra*, in which agencies do not impose such policies and RCW 42.56.100 which mandates that agencies "shall provide for the *fullest assistance* to inquirers and *the most timely possible* action on requests for information." (emphasis added)). This conflict also needs to be resolved. RAP 13.4(b)(2).

Forbes reveals another fact about UW's failure to devote resources to complying with the PRA. There, the court found that a City's response times were reasonable in part because it "spent 12 percent of its income responding to public records

requests” in a given fiscal year. 171 Wn. App. at 864. Here, UW disclosed that in 2018 and 2019 it budgeted just \$2,833,577 for its Office of Public Records, CP 486, an office of just “nine employees” responsible for “manag[ing] the response to all PRA requests UW receives.” Resp’ts br. at 9. That was after it cut OPR’s budget by \$600,000 from the year before, even though it claimed it faced record backlogs of up to 3.6 million pages. *Id.*

\$2.8 million dollars is nowhere near 12 percent of UW’s annual income. In fact, UW’s annual revenue in fiscal year 2018 was \$6.426 *billion* dollars. University of Washington, *2018 Financial Report*, at 10 <https://finance.uw.edu/uwar/annualreport2018.pdf>.

Dr. Conklin does not suggest that UW must spend 12 percent of its \$6.426 billion-dollar annual operating revenue to satisfy its obligations under the PRA. But it needs to spend more than peanuts. UW’s paltry budgeting makes no sense. Given the 3.6-million-page backlog OPR faced in recent years, why does UW employ just nine persons in that office and comparatively

miniscule amount on PRA requests?⁸ Considering its backlog, why did UW cut OPR's budget by over \$600,000 beginning in 2018? CP 486. Why does it not hire professional document processing companies more often to decrease backlogs or cover staff shortages? Why does it devote so little to managing PRA requests, forcing it to adopt policies that ban concurrent production of multiple PRA requests from the same requestor because it says that is what it takes to respond to "*all* [the] requestors" that it gets in any given year? Resp'ts br. at 36 (emphasis added).⁹

⁸ \$2.8 million is 0.044 percent of \$6.426 billion, rounded up.

⁹ Division I strangely ruled that Dr. Conklin raised these arguments regarding UW's lack of sufficient resources for the first time on reply. Op. at 23-24. Not only did Dr. Conklin devote a section of argument in his opening brief to the fact that UW "Failed to Devote Sufficient Resources Toward Producing [Documents in a Timely Manner]," arguing it should have hired more help to produce documents promptly. Appellant's br. at 39-42. But he also argued this point extensively from the start in the trial court. CP 1258 (supp. trial br.), 470 (opening trial br.) ("As one of, if not the, largest and well-funded hospitals in the country, there is no excuse for UW's failing to devote enough

Simply put, UW is not devoting enough resources to its OPR and its obligations under the PRA. Because its nine overworked employees lack sufficient support, UW is one of the slowest agencies in responding to PRA requests. CP 526-95. Its delays far exceed any case cited by either party.

UW needs a wakeup call, as the Washington Coalition for Open Government pleaded in its amicus brief. Further, guidance is needed holding that an agency cannot wait 917, 307, or 206 days before providing records and delay other installments by hundreds of days, citing overbreadth or lack of staffing. Review is appropriate under RAP 13.4(b)(1) and (2) because Division I's opinion conflicts with precedent. More uniform guidance is needed from this Court on this issue of substantial public importance.

assets to meet its obligations under the PRA without a requestor having to bring it to a show cause hearing.”), 227 (show cause br.); *see also, e.g.*, RP 18-19. On *de novo* review where UW had the burden of proof, Division I was wrong to pass on this argument Dr. Conklin raised throughout the case.

F. CONCLUSION

For these reasons this Court should grant review and reverse Division I's opinion in part.

This document contains 4,992 words, excluding the parts of the document exempted from the word count by RAP 18.17.

DATED this 2nd day of February, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Aaron P. Orheim

Aaron P. Orheim

WSBA #47670

Talmadge/Fitzpatrick

2775 Harbor Avenue SW

Third Floor, Suite C

Seattle, WA 98126

(206) 574-6661

Attorney for Petitioner

Dr. Jeremy Conklin

APPENDIX

RCW 42.56.550

(1) Upon the motion of any person having been denied an opportunity to inspect or copy a public record by an agency, the superior court in the county in which a record is maintained may require the responsible agency to show cause why it has refused to allow inspection or copying of a specific public record or class of records. The burden of proof shall be on the agency to establish that refusal to permit public inspection and copying is in accordance with a statute that exempts or prohibits disclosure in whole or in part of specific information or records.

(2) Upon the motion of any person who believes that an agency has not made a reasonable estimate of the time that the agency requires to respond to a public record request or a reasonable estimate of the charges to produce copies of public records, the superior court in the county in which a record is maintained may require the responsible agency to show that the estimate it provided is reasonable. The burden of proof shall be on the agency to show that the estimate it provided is reasonable.

(3) Judicial review of all agency actions taken or challenged under RCW 42.56.030 through 42.56.520 shall be de novo. Courts shall take into account the policy of this chapter that free and open examination of public records is in the public interest, even though such examination may cause inconvenience or embarrassment to public officials or others. Courts may examine any record in camera in any proceeding brought under this section. The court may conduct a hearing based solely on affidavits.

(4) Any person who prevails against an agency in any action in the courts seeking the right to inspect or copy any public record or the right to receive a response to a public record request within a reasonable amount of time shall be awarded all costs, including

reasonable attorney fees, incurred in connection with such legal action. In addition, it shall be within the discretion of the court to award such person an amount not to exceed one hundred dollars for each day that he or she was denied the right to inspect or copy said public record.

(5) For actions under this section against counties, the venue provisions of RCW 36.01.050 apply.

(6) Actions under this section must be filed within one year of the agency's claim of exemption or the last production of a record on a partial or installment basis.

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

On said day below I electronically served a true and accurate copy of the *Petition for Review* in Court of Appeals Division I Cause No. 83200-0 to the following:

Ambika Kumar
MaryAnn Almeida
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300
Seattle, WA 98104-1610

Original E-filed with:
Court of Appeals
Clerk's Office

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: February 2, 2023 at Seattle, Washington.

/s/ Brad Roberts
Brad Roberts, Legal Assistant
Talmadge/Fitzpatrick

TALMADGE/FITZPATRICK

February 02, 2023 - 4:12 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division I
Appellate Court Case Number: 83200-0
Appellate Court Case Title: Jeremy Conklin, Appellant v. University of Washington School of Medicine, et al., Respondents

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 832000_Petition_for_Review_20230202161014D1995148_7644.pdf
This File Contains:
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was Petition for Review.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- ambikakumar@dwt.com
- brad@tal-fitzlaw.com
- christine@tal-fitzlaw.com
- jeannecadley@dwt.com
- jendejan@gmail.com
- lesliehunterboston@outlook.com
- lisamerrit@dwt.com
- maryannalmeida@dwt.com
- matt@tal-fitzlaw.com

Comments:

Petition for Review

Sender Name: Brad Roberts - Email: brad@tal-fitzlaw.com

Filing on Behalf of: Aaron Paul Orheim - Email: Aaron@tal-fitzlaw.com (Alternate Email: matt@tal-fitzlaw.com)

Address:

2775 Harbor Avenue SW
Third Floor Ste C
Seattle, WA, 98126
Phone: (206) 574-6661

Note: The Filing Id is 20230202161014D1995148

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

JEREMY CONKLIN, DO,
an individual,

Appellant,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, a Washington
public educational institution;
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
MEDICINE, a Washington public health
system; and UNIVERSITY OF
WASHINGTON MEDICAL CENTER, a
Washington public hospital,

Respondents.

No. 83200-0-1

DIVISION ONE

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

COBURN, J. — Dr. Jeremy Conklin, personally and through his attorneys, made four separate Public Records Act (PRA) requests to the University of Washington (UW) mostly related to its surgical fellowship program. Conklin contends that UW violated the PRA by providing unreasonable response estimates, delaying release of records, and conducting an inadequate search to provide responsive records. Because UW did not conduct an adequate search and did not provide some responsive documents until after UW considered the request closed, we reverse the trial court's denial of claims related to that request and award attorney fees. We remand for the trial court to determine the amount

Citations and pin cites are based on the Westlaw online version of the cited material

of attorney fees and costs on appeal and below, and to proceed with the penalty phase of trial as well as reconsider Conklin's request for an in camera review.

We otherwise affirm the trial court in denying Conklin's remaining PRA claims.

FACTS

Conklin is an osteopathic surgeon with a doctor of osteopathic medicine degree. In 2017, he applied but was not accepted to the UW's congenital cardiac surgery fellowship program. UW School of Medicine (SoM) participates in a fellowship "match" system operated by the Congenital Cardiac Surgery Fellowship Committee of the Thoracic Surgery Directors Association (TSDA). Over a period of about two years, he and his attorneys submitted to UW four separate records requests as Conklin pursued claims against UW and others in federal court, including a claim under the PRA.

UW's Public Records Request Process

UW's Office of Public Records and Open Meetings (OPR) is the institutional office at UW that is responsible for managing responses to public records requests. In January 2021, OPR had nine employees who helped manage responses to PRA requests. OPR also worked with many UW employees in other departments to collect and review documents in response to public records requests. OPR does not prioritize, dedicate extra resources to, or otherwise give preferential treatment to a requester that sues UW.

UW receives a high volume of public records requests, and OPR manages responses while considering the essential functions of the university. In 2019, OPR received 932 PRA requests, and OPR staff reviewed approximately 3.2

million pages. In 2020, OPR received 831 PRA requests, and OPR staff reviewed approximately 1.3 million pages. As of January 1, 2021, OPR had 320 open requests and 1,424,924 pages in queue to be reviewed with many more documents in the process of being gathered and transferred to OPR by divisions and colleges throughout UW.

To gather responsive documents, OPR identifies the colleges, schools, and divisions at UW that potentially have responsive records, notifies a point of contact, and asks for feedback on how long it will take to gather responsive documents. There are approximately 50 colleges, schools, and divisions at UW that OPR manages. OPR takes the feedback it receives from colleges, schools, and divisions with potentially responsive records on the time needed to gather those records and provides estimates to requesters on the length of time it will take to further respond to their requests. The colleges, schools, and divisions gather documents responsive to public records requests and submit them to OPR to review for any applicable exemptions.

OPR then reviews the records and determines whether the record is wholly releasable or partially exempt from release, in which case redactions are applied to portions of the record and marked with codes referencing the specific applicable exemption. If OPR decides the record is wholly exempt, OPR creates a log of those documents.

When OPR completes its review, it releases responsive records to the requester, including those that are partially releasable along with a cover letter explaining any exemptions applied, and, if applicable, a log of wholly exempt

records. For requests for records that take a long time to respond to completely and/or include a large volume of records, OPR will make interim releases of records to requesters on a rolling basis as the review of records is completed.

If a request for public records seeks multiple categories of documents, OPR still refers to it as a single request and processes the review and release of records from that request collectively, closing the request only when responding to all components is complete. If OPR receives multiple separate requests submitted by the same requester at different times, OPR processes the requests in the order received, prioritizing its review of records responsive to the earliest request before moving to the subsequent requests. OPR considers the requester the individual who made the public records request even if they may be making the request on behalf of someone else.

The Public Records Requests

A. First Request: PR-2017-00920

On November 16, 2017, Conklin's attorney at the time, Kristi Favard, requested the following records from UW, which identified this request as PR-2017-00920 (PR-920):

- all agreements between UW Medical Center and the Thoracic Surgery Director's Association and/or American Board of Thoracic Surgery;
- all Medicare funding information, grants, agreements, etc. regarding UW Medical Center's Medicare grants for residencies and fellowships;
- all documents regarding any osteopathic physician application (individual or in general) to any residency or fellowship at UW Medical Center for the past 10 years, including but not limited to applications, correspondence, inter office emails or memos, etc.;

- all documents regarding Dr. Jeremy Conklin's applications to the UW Medical [C]enter for residency/fellowship;
- all documents regarding RCW 70.41.235 from 1995 to present;
- all documents regarding osteopathic physicians as residents/fellows at UW Medical Center, including any lists of all residents and fellows and their professional titles (OD [v.] MD), selected over the past 10 years.

Tisa Escobar, a public records compliance officer at OPR, acknowledged receipt of the request that same day and estimated that UW would respond to the request by December 18. As of that day, OPR had 182 open requests and over 750,000 pages of records awaiting review. Escobar, who had worked in OPR since before the first request was submitted in 2017, described PR-920 as one of the broadest requests she had ever managed.

She then contacted UW Medicine, including SoM, to gather responsive records. On November 17, SoM received the request from OPR. On November 27, Courtney Ng, the records manager in the Dean's Office for SoM, sent initial notifications of the request to SoM's Graduate Medical Education Office (GME), the Department of Surgery, and SoM's Business Unit. Ng began to receive responsive records from SoM's Business Unit on November 30.

Generally, Ng or an assigned analyst assesses how long it will likely take to gather records by discussing with record holders the volume of records, technical assistance needed, as well as the schedules and functions of the personnel needed to locate and retrieve the records. Record holders in SoM often have responsibilities in education, patient care, research, and other critical functions. After receiving documents and before submitting to OPR, Ng or an

analyst reviews the records to confirm they are responsive and screens for potential exemptions such as unpublished research and protected patient information, which must be redacted prior to disclosure. Although OPR conducts its own review for exemptions, SoM's review "identifies potentially exempt material which OPR may otherwise be unable to identify as easily, e.g., because the exemptions are unique to the SoM or because identifying the exempt material requires consultation with SoM record holders."

On December 6, GME notified Ng that it had some responsive records, including partial fellowship files, but determined that fellowship applications were stored in a third-party system and potentially with departments that oversee the particular residency and fellowship programs. The office needed additional time to research how to access the records but provided her with an initial batch of responsive records. On December 13, GME alerted Ng that because there was no central records system she would need to individually reach out to different departments. That same day, Ng requested OPR extend its initial internal target production date from December 5 to February 15, 2018. On December 18, Escobar emailed Favard stating OPR found it necessary to extend UW's response date to April 27, 2018. On December 20, Favard emailed Escobar objecting to the extension, alleging that the estimated response time was unreasonable.

In January or February 2018, Escobar became aware Conklin filed a lawsuit against UW,¹ but stated she continued managing PR-920 in the same manner as she would any other request. When there were multiple open requests from the same requester, it was common for OPR to respond to the requests in the order received in order to balance the rights of all requesters. January 4, GME sent Ng a finalized list of departments and programs that matched parameters of PR-920. GME also provided all of its remaining responsive records to Ng on January 31, 2018.

On February 1, SoM reached out to 18 departments with an initial deadline for response set for February 8. Ng spent a majority of her time from February through April 2018 responding to these inquiries. On February 8, SoM sent OPR a first installment of 43 pages and one spreadsheet of application materials and communication records. OPR reported receiving the first installment from SoM on February 13 and began reviewing them and generating a log of exempt records.

The vast majority of the records from SoM were applications to residencies and fellowships sponsored by SoM, which UW believed to be exempt as public employment applications under RCW 42.56.250(2). Escobar described

¹ On January 22, 2018, Conklin filed a federal lawsuit against UW Medicine, UW Medicine/NW, University of Washington Medical Center, University of Washington School of Medicine, Paul Ramsey, M.D., Lester Permut, M.D., Seattle Children's Hospital, Children's University Medical Group, Mary Bridge Children's Foundation, American Board of Thoracic Surgery, Inc., Thoracic Surgery Directors Association, Inc., and Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, alleging that the denial of his fellowship violated antitrust laws, and that UW violated the PRA. The court dismissed his antitrust case, and the dismissal was upheld on appeal by the Ninth Circuit. See Conklin v. Univ. of Wash. Med., 798 F. App'x 180 (9th Cir. 2020).

logging exemptions as a time-consuming process. Escobar reviewed “tens of thousands of pages” for this request, splitting her time between these requests and other requests.

On March 6, SoM sent follow up emails to departments that had not yet responded. On March 15, SoM provided a second installment of records to OPR containing 33,354 pages of responsive documents. SoM provided a third installment containing 14,000 pages of documents on April 11.

On April 12, Ng contacted OPR on the phone and asked for an extension until December 31, 2018 due to the high volume of records gathered and still waiting review. The volume of records collected as of April 2018 was 8.6 gigabytes. On April 27, Escobar emailed Favard extending the response date to a February 15, 2019 estimated completion date. OPR indicated it would be releasing documents on a rolling, or installment, basis. On April 30, SoM provided OPR with a fourth installment of records containing 372 pages of emails containing applicant data. SoM received the final submission of records from outstanding departments by the same day.

On July 5, SoM sent a fifth installment of 8,064 pages of application materials to OPR. On August 30, SoM provided a sixth installment of 24,095 pages of application materials.

On September 19, Escobar emailed Favard the first partial release of records and an interim exemption log that identified on a document-by-document basis the applicable exemptions for over 28,000 pages of documents. This was

307 days from when PR-920 was submitted and 223 days from when SoM sent to OPR the first installation of records.

On November 14, SoM provided a seventh installment of 1,005 pages of emails containing applicant data to OPR.

On January 2, 2019, SoM requested OPR extend its internal deadline to May 2, 2019. On February 15, Escobar emailed Favard extending UW's response date to December 2, 2019.

On May 2, SoM requested another extension of the internal OPR deadline from May 2 to December 31, 2019. On May 16, SoM released an eighth installment of 1,184 pages of resident and fellow personnel files to OPR. On July 3, SoM extended the internal OPR deadline to June 30, 2020.

On June 5, 2019, Conklin, through his attorney of record Aaron Orheim, refiled Conklin's PRA complaint in King County Superior Court.² On June 28, Escobar emailed Favard regarding transmitting a release of records. Because the records were too large to email, the release included information about coming in person to view the records, or in the alternative, an invoice for the cost of copies provided by CD. The release letter included a deadline by which to respond or make arrangements. Favard did not respond to this email or provide payment.

² Conklin requested the superior court (1) order UW "to show cause why they have refused to allow inspection and copying of the requested documents"; (2) order UW "to immediately produce the documents requested"; (3) conduct an in camera review of the documents which UW had redacted or claimed were exempt, and (4) award Conklin "the maximum statutory per diem damages," attorney's fees, costs, and interest.

On July 12, SoM sent a ninth installment of 1,114 pages of emails containing applicant data to OPR.

By August 13, OPR was aware that Conklin had changed counsel and had asked OPR to submit a new request for records previously requested by Favard. The new request was identified as PR-2019-00602 (PR-602) and is discussed below as the fourth request.

B. Second Request: PR 2018-00342

On May 14, 2018, while PR-920 was still pending, Favard submitted a second public records request identified as PR 2018-00342 (PR-342). The request comprised of 18 categories of records including “[a]ny agreement between UW and Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) or any other organization that exclusively requires ACGME accredited training of residents and fellows for any reason.”³ On May 21, 2018, Escobar

³ The other categories were:

2. All communications with third-parties (not employees of UW or the State of Washington) regarding the selection of osteopathic physicians for residencies and fellowships at UW School of Medicine and/or regarding RCW 70.41.235.
3. All documents regarding, referring, or relating to the single accreditation system for graduate medical education (GME) agreed upon by ACGME and the American Osteopathic Association (AOA).
4. All documents regarding, referring, or relating to excluding osteopathic physicians from any residency or fellowship at UW School of Medicine or discussing eligibility for GME that does not recognize American Osteopathic Association Board of Surgery (AOBS) accreditation and/or board certification.
5. All documents regarding osteopathic physician eligibility or selection for the congenital cardiothoracic surgery fellowship at UW School of Medicine, including any and all communications or complaints regarding osteopathic physicians not being considered or eligible for

- the fellowship program and/or discussing AOA accreditation or board certification not being accepted for the fellowship.
6. All communications with the TSDA or ABTS regarding AOA/AOBS accreditation or board certification and the congenital cardiothoracic surgery fellowship.
 7. Any and all documents comparing osteopathic physician training to allopathic physician training and/or osteopathic surgeons being less skilled or qualified than allopathic surgeons.
 8. All documents, including evaluation, of technical skills of the fellow applicants and fellows selected for the congenital cardiothoracic surgery fellowship over the past five years.
 9. All evaluations of recommendation letters for every applicant for the congenital cardiothoracic surgery fellowship over the past five years.
 10. All rejection letters/emails to the congenital cardiothoracic surgery fellowship applicants over the past five years.
 11. Any and all documents regarding the selection of/for residency and fellowship positions available at UW for Northwest University graduates, including but not limited to correspondence with Northwest University regarding the same over the past five years.
 12. Any and all documents where UW has ever been accused of discrimination against osteopathic physicians or violations of RCW 70.41.235 in training residents and fellows.
 13. Any and all employment files whereby any DO physician at UW has complained about being discriminated against and/or being treated in any way because of his or status as a DO.
 14. Any and all documents regarding the congenital cardiothoracic surgery fellowship changing from one year to two over the past five years.
 15. Any and all documents about, referring to or discussing Dr. Stanley Flemming.
 16. All documents regarding, referring or relating to an applicant to an ACGME accredited fellowship program that did not satisfy the program's eligibility requirements but gained approval of the program director, fellowship selection committee, Graduate Medical Education Committee ... via ACGME Eligibility Requirements effective 1 Jul 2016.
 17. All communications between UW and other ACGME accredited

emailed Favard acknowledging receipt of the request, stating in part that OPR estimated completing its response to this PRA request by March 29, 2019. On November 8, 2018, Escobar emailed Favard regarding clarification of her request. On November 15, SoM sent a first batch of records for PR-342 to OPR.⁴ On November 27, Favard emailed Escobar replying to the clarification of her request.⁵ On March 29, 2019, Escobar emailed Favard extending UW's response to January 14, 2020. She stated that both PR-920 and PR-342 were estimated to involve reviewing over 105,000 pages. On April 12, 2019, SoM sent a second batch of records to OPR in response to PR-342. Then on January 14, 2020, Escobar emailed Favard regarding an extension to respond to the request.⁶

On November 16, 2020, Escobar emailed Orheim transmitting what she believed to be a final release of records for PR-342, stating that OPR considered

Congenital Cardiac Surgery Fellowship programs regarding exclusively selecting medical doctors, excluding osteopathic physicians, or only accepting ACGME accredited training or ABTS board certification, or about Dr. Jeremy Conklin or any other osteopathic physician, or osteopathic physicians in general.

18. All communications between UW and other ACGME accredited training programs regarding DO applicants as well as AOA accredited training.

⁴ We note that the trial court twice incorrectly found that OPR released records to Conklin's attorney when the supporting record indicated that the records were submitted from SoM to OPR on August 16, 2016 as to PR-2018-00433 and on November 15, 2018 as to PR-2018-00342.

⁵ The timing of the clarification and response came from the joint statement of stipulated facts to the trial court. The record does not provide any more information as to this clarification.

⁶ The trial court, citing the joint statement of stipulated facts, found that UW on January 14, 2020, extended the response to "December 2, 2019" for PR-342; however, the stipulated facts did not provide such information. The content of this finding suggests a scrivener's error.

this request closed. The parties appear to agree that this November release included a copy of a fellowship match agreement between SoM and TSDA. According to Ng, this was a responsive record from GME to PR-342 asking for “[a]ny agreement between UW and Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) or any other organization that exclusively requires ACGME accredited training of residents and fellows for any reason.”

C. Third Request: PR 2018-00433

On June 15, 2018, while PR-920 and PR-342 were pending, Conklin made his own PRA request identified as PR 2018-00433 (PR-433) to UW and the Office of the Attorney General seeking the following:

[A]ll communications, internal and external, by and between UW’s public records office, the WA state Attorney General, UW administration, including but not limited to the Board or Regents, Deans, President, Vice-President, and hospital/UW Med Administration, and attorneys, regarding or relating to [or] responding to any public records request submitted by or on behalf of Dr. Jeremy Conklin and/or referring or relating to responding to PRA Requests numbered 2018-00342 (Favard) and 2017-00920 (Favard).

(Alteration in original).

On June 22, 2018, Escobar emailed Conklin acknowledging receipt of his request and estimated a response would be provided by July 16, 2018. On July 16, Escobar emailed Conklin regarding an extension to respond to the request. On August 16, 2018, SoM provided its first batch of records to OPR.

On January 7, 2019, OPR made an interim release of 1,946 pages of records to Conklin. That same day, Escobar emailed Conklin regarding

extension to respond to request. Escobar emailed Conklin on April 3 regarding extension to respond to request.

On June 28, OPR made a second interim release of 1,127 pages of records to Conklin responsive to this request. On July 26, OPR sent the final release of records for PR-433, which included 1,256 pages of responsive records, along with an exemption log. OPR then considered this request closed.

D. Fourth Request: PR-2019-00602

On August 13, 2019, Orheim requested the PRA records previously requested by Favard in PR-920 and PR-342. OPR created a new file number, PR-2019-00602 (PR-602), to reflect Orheim's request to receive the records previously requested by Favard. Two days later, Escobar transmitted 1,196 pages responsive to PR-920 to Orheim.

On September 18, 2019, SoM sent OPR a tenth installment of 10,003 pages of resident and fellow personnel files. On October 9, 2019, Ng was informed that records should now be submitted under PR-602.

In the fall of 2019, SoM experienced a backlog created by a number of very large records requests that encompassed an excess of 180 gigabytes of data and about 3.6 million pages to review. Because Ng was scheduled for a pre-planned leave between October 28, 2019 and March 4, 2020, SoM hired part-time help to assist with the backlog. During Ng's leave, SoM sent to OPR an eleventh installment of 73,387 pages on November 6 and 115,984 pages as a twelfth installment on November 14.

On December 13, 2019, Escobar produced an exemption log to Orheim.

Following a show-cause hearing held on January 17, 2020,⁷ UW hired an outside vendor to assist OPR with document review and exemption logging for the requests.

On February 5, Escobar emailed Orheim producing another exemption log.

In March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the records response. Offices closed for cleaning, and significant time was dedicated to transitioning to remote offices and coordinating equipment and work schedules. OPR also had to develop new processes for making records available that would previously have been made available to requesters in person, paper, or on physical repository.

On June 15, 2020, Escobar emailed Orheim regarding what OPR believed at the time to be the final release of records and another exemption log in connection with PR-920.

In July, Ng, prompted by a call about scheduling a meeting to discuss litigation involving Conklin and UW, discovered that the part-time help had not reviewed all the records collected by SoM while she was on leave. She notified her supervisor and OPR and prioritized reviewing the remaining records. Ng sent the remaining records to OPR on July 24.

On August 24, Escobar emailed Orheim regarding reopening the PRA request. After SoM completed its review of those documents, OPR and a third-party vendor reviewed and logged exemptions for these additional documents.

⁷ The report of proceedings from this hearing is not in the record.

On October 28, 2020, OPR made available its final release of records in connection with PR-920 to Orheim. In addition to the release of records, UW released a 437-page exemption log that identified 7,851 documents encompassing 264,017 pages. OPR considered PR-920 closed.

Procedural History

Trial by affidavit was set for early 2021. The parties agreed to bifurcate the trial between liability and penalty.

In January 2021, Conklin alleged in his trial brief that UW continued to not be responsive and believed UW had not provided all agreements between UW Medical Center (UWMC) and TSDA and/or American Board of Thoracic Surgery. Conklin also argued that UW was judicially estopped from treating fellowship applications as applications for public employment. On March 2, 2021, the court ordered supplemental briefing on these issues. The court heard oral argument on February 16, 2021.

On March 16, UW provided a supplemental declaration from Ng. She explained that UW determined that it had a fellowship match agreement between SoM and TSDA that she had not seen “until a few weeks ago,” and provided a copy of a 2016 TSDA fellowship match agreement as an exhibit. She stated that this was not responsive to PR-920 because that request only asked for agreements between UWMC and TSDA, not UW SoM and TSDA. She did not mention whether it would have been responsive to PR-342.

On May 4, UW filed a second supplemental declaration from Ng. She explained that she had requested records responsive to PR-342 from GME in

2018, and GME did provide a fellowship match agreement with TSDA, which she provided to OPR as a responsive record to PR-342. Ng further explained that she “learned” that GME was not in possession of all match agreements between SoM and TSDA, and that Dr. Lester Permut, who was the director of SoM’s congenital cardiac surgery fellowship program, had additional match agreements between TSDA and SoM for different years. She did not previously ask Permut for records responsive to PR-342 because she “believed [GME] would be the only source for the agreements.” After she learned that Permut was in possession of match agreements, she gathered them and sent them to OPR as additional responsive records to PR-342.

The same day UW filed Ng’s second supplemental declaration, Escobar emailed Orheim explaining that “[t]he School of Medicine identified additional records responsive to your request [PR-342].” Attached were copies of the 2016 agreement that was an exhibit to Ng’s March 16 declaration; signed agreements from 2015 and 2017; partially signed agreement forms from 2015 and 2017; a timeline for the “2015 Match for 2016 Appointment Year”; and a copy of the “Congenital Cardiac Surgery Fellowship Match Rules and Regulations.”

Conklin alerted the trial court of the late disclosures and the trial court requested additional briefing.

UW filed a declaration from Permut, who explained,

I recall I was asked for some categories of documents around the time the federal lawsuit was filed, including, among other things, any communications regarding [Conklin]. I was not asked at that time to look for copies of the match agreement with the TSDA. It does not surprise me that the School of Medicine would look elsewhere, such as the GME office, for the TSDA match

agreement. I do not believe I am expected to keep copies of the TSDA match agreement. That said, when I was asked to look for copies of it earlier this year I did so and provided what I found.

The record provides no explanation as to when Ng asked Permut to search for the records, when Ng received the records from Permut, or when Ng sent the records to OPR. The record also provides no insight as to the source of the 2016 agreement that was attached to Ng's March 16 declaration.

In September 2021, the trial court issued findings of fact and conclusions of law, and it held UW did not violate the PRA. Conklin appeals.

Washington Coalition for Open Government filed an amicus curiae brief joining Conklin in arguing that UW should be penalized for not allocating enough resources for OPR to respond faster to PRA requests.

DISCUSSION

Standard of Review

Judicial review of agency actions taken or challenged under the PRA shall be de novo. Forbes v. City of Gold Bar, 171 Wn. App. 857, 863, 288 P.3d 384 (2012) (quoting RCW 42.56.550(3)). An appellate court reviews a trial court's PRA determination de novo "where the record consists only of affidavits, memoranda of law, and other documentary evidence" because it then "stands in the same position as the trial court." Progressive Animal Welfare Soc'y v. Univ. of Wash., 125 Wn.2d 243, 252, 884 P.2d 592 (1994).

Exemptions and Judicial Estoppel

Conklin contends that UW violated the PRA when it withheld fellowship applications because they are exempt employment applications. We disagree.

The PRA provides an exemption for “[a]ll applications for public employment other than for vacancies in elective office, including the names of applicants, resumes, and other related materials submitted with respect to an applicant.” RCW 42.56.250(2). This exemption exists “to protect relevant privacy rights” which, in the legislature’s judgment, “outweigh the PRA’s broad policy in favor of disclosing public records.” Resident Action Couns. v. Seattle Hous. Auth., 177 Wn.2d 417, 432, 327 P.3d 600 (2013).

UW submitted a declaration from Cindy Hamra, who is the assistant dean of operations and administration for SoM’s GME. Hamra explained that residents and fellows in SoM’s residencies and fellowships are paid public employees of UW, and they receive salaries and benefits. The fellows receive training in medical specialties as part of their employment.

Conklin argues the fellowship participants are not public employees because part of their funding is through federal funding—but this only bolsters the fact that they are public employees. We affirm the trial court’s ruling that the fellowship applications were properly withheld under RCW 42.56.250(2).

Conklin next appears to contend that UW is judicially estopped from claiming the fellowship applications are exempt because UW in the federal lawsuit treated “fellowship positions as mere applications for training.” Judicial estoppel is an equitable doctrine that precludes a party from asserting one position in a court proceeding and later seeking an advantage by taking a clearly inconsistent position. Arkison v. Ethan Allen, Inc., 160 Wn.2d 535, 538, 160 P.3d 13 (2007).

UW argued in the federal lawsuit that Conklin's claim under RCW 70.41.235 failed because it was a hospital-regulation statute and did not apply to the fellowship, which UW called a "postgraduate training program." Characterizing the fellowship as a "postgraduate training program," for purposes of arguing RCW 70.41.235 did not apply, does not equate to claiming fellowship positions are not public employment positions. Because UW did not take inconsistent positions between the federal and state cases, we need not consider Conklin's judicial estoppel claim.

Reasonable Time Estimates

Conklin contends that UW did not provide reasonable estimates for its responses. We disagree.

The PRA directs agencies to handle requests in a way that "prevent[s] excessive interference with other essential functions of the agency." RCW 42.56.100. The PRA does not require agencies to provide requesters a detailed explanation for their time estimates. See Ockerman v. King County, Dep't of Dev. and Env't. Servs., 102 Wn. App. 212, 217-18, 6 P.3d 1214 (2000). The PRA only requires an agency to provide a "reasonable' estimate, not a precise or exact estimate, recognizing that agencies may need more time than initially anticipated to locate the requested records." Andrews v. Wash. State Patrol, 183 Wn. App. 644, 652, 334 P.3d 94 (2014).

The PRA does not bind an agency to its original estimate; an agency is permitted additional time to locate and provide records. Hikel v. City of Lynnwood, 197 Wn. App. 366, 373, 389 P.3d 677 (2016); Forbes, 171 Wn. App.

at 863. “[W]hether an estimate is reasonable necessarily must be based on a forward-looking evaluation at the time of the estimate, not on a backward-looking evaluation after the fact.” Freedom Found. v. Dep’t of Soc. & Health Servs., 9 Wn. App. 2d 654, 667, 445 P.3d 971 (2019). “The burden of proof shall be on the agency to show that the estimate it provided is reasonable.” RCW 42.56.550(2).

Conklin appears to argue that “UW’s time estimates were not reasonable” as a matter of law based simply on the total time it took UW to produce documents.

Conklin’s reliance on various cases for reasonable response times is not helpful as he ignores the context in which the courts addressed those response times. Conklin cites Wade’s Eastside Gun Shop, Inc. v. Dep’t of Lab. & Indus., 185 Wn.2d 270, 289, 372 P.3d 97 (2016); Rufin v. City of Seattle, 199 Wn. App. 348, 351, 398 P.3d 1237 (2017); Hikel, 197 Wn. App. at 373.

None of these cases declared as a matter of law that a number of days to respond to a request without considering context sets a threshold of reasonable time estimates for release. See Wade, 185 Wn.2d at 289 (holding an agency’s response time unreasonable when it took 232 days to fully respond to a PRA request when no exemptions applied); see also Rufin, 199 Wn. App. at 358 (holding that the city responded diligently when it took 65 days to respond to a PRA request when the person managing the response placed the request in the queue along with other requests received at the time and was working on a number of other requests including one which was very complex); Hikel, 197 Wn.

App. at 373 (holding that the city violated the PRA by not providing an estimate of the time it would take to respond within five days of the records request).

Conklin also cites to average shorter response times UW executed with other public records requests, however, the record also included examples where UW took more than a year to release its first set of documents.⁸ These examples do not reveal what the case-by-case circumstances were for each request. We do not know if the records had to be obtained from multiple sources or whether those sources also provided essential functions to UW, and we do not know if the records required significant redaction or creation of exemption logs.

We conclude that, based on this record, the estimates UW provided were reasonable. Escobar described PR-920 as one of the broadest requests she had ever managed. UW kept Favard, Conklin, and Orheim apprised of extensions throughout the entire process of responding to their PRA requests. UW first updated its estimate after Ng informed OPR that some documents responsive to his requests would be located in a third-party system, and Escobar sent the second estimate after Ng informed her that SoM had collected a significant quantity of additional records needing review. Though a majority of the records included exempted records, UW was still required to review each in order to properly comply with RCW 42.56.210(3) in documenting the exemptions. RCW 42.56.210(3) provides, “Agency responses refusing, in whole or in part,

⁸ Conklin claims that “the average time UW took to complete a PRA request in 2017 and 2018 was 51 and 63 days, respectively.” However, the record also shows that UW took 565 days to release a first set of records for request PR-2017-00371 that was submitted on April 2, 2017 when UW received 15,519 pages to review as of the time of the report. UW took 780 days to release records for request PR-2017-00453 when UW received 1,780 pages.

inspection of any public record shall include a statement of the specific exemption authorizing the withholding of the record (or part) and a brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the record withheld.” While these records did not require line by line redactions, the pure number of records that were exempt still required laborious creation of hundreds of pages of exemption logs. Conklin cites to no authority to support his argument that as a matter of law the estimates given were not reasonable.

Next, Conklin, in his reply brief, substantively argued for the first time that RCW 42.56.100, which mandates that agencies “shall provide for the fullest assistance to inquirers and the most timely possible action on requests for information,” should be read to address whether an agency appropriately budgets in a manner that allows for reasonable response times.

Amicus joins in this argument advocating for penalties to “wake-up” UW to fulfill its duties under the PRA. Amicus cites Zink v. City of Mesa, 140 Wn. App. 328, 337, 166 P.3d 738 (2007), and Conklin cites Rental Hous. Ass’n v. City of Des Moines, 165 Wn.2d 525, 535, 199 P.3d 393 (2009) for the proposition that “[a]dministrative inconvenience or difficulty does not excuse strict compliance with the PRA.” Both Conklin and amicus read this language out of context. Rental Hous. Ass’n cited Zink for this proposition. Rental Hous. Ass’n, 165 Wn.2d at 535. Zink cited Hearst Corp. v. Hoppe, 90 Wn.2d 123, 131, 580 P.2d 246 (1978) for this proposition. Zink, 140 Wn. App. at 337. The Hearst court addressed the question, “What effect does administrative inconvenience or difficulty have upon the disclosure requirements of the act?” Hearst, 90 Wn.2d at

131. The court answered this question in response to an argument that “the cost and excessive disruption to the department of assessments clearly outweighs the public benefit of disclosing limited factual material from the folios, particularly when such material is readily available elsewhere in the department.” Id. The court rejected this argument, holding that “[t]he fact that the material may be available in other records is not a reason stated in the act for failure to disclose.” Id. at 132. While we know of no case that limits what can be considered in determining whether a given estimate is reasonable, neither Hearst nor Zink held that agencies violate the PRA when they do not adjust their budget or staffing to accommodate an overwhelming public records request while actively responding to multiple requests.

Our holding does not foreclose the possibility that there may be a circumstance where an agency’s staffing decisions as they relate to its ability to timely respond to PRA requests may factor into a determination of an unreasonable estimate of response time. However, because Conklin did not raise this argument until his reply brief, we decline to address it. Generally, a court will not review an issue raised and argued for the first time in a reply brief.

RAP 10.3(c).

Prompt Production of Responsive Records

Conklin purports that it was unreasonable for UW to delay 307 days before providing its first installment of records in response to Conklin’s first records request, PR-920, and for it to delay its second installment by another 282 days. While 307 days does constitute a long wait, the amount of days is not

necessarily determinative. The correct inquiry is whether UW responded with reasonable thoroughness and diligence in response to the request. Freedom Found., 9 Wn. App. 2d at 673.

An agency must respond promptly to a public records request. RCW 42.56.520(1); Rufin, 199 Wn. App. at 359. The PRA requires agencies to provide the “fullest assistance” and the “most timely possible action on requests for information.” Freedom Found., 9 Wn. App. 2d at 673 (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting Andrews, 183 Wn. App. at 651)); RCW 42.56.100. “In determining whether an agency acted promptly in producing responsive records, we examine whether the agency’s response was thorough and diligent. Whether the agency responded with reasonable thoroughness and diligence is a fact-specific inquiry.” Freedom Found., 9 Wn. App. 2d at 673 (citations omitted).

Conklin argues that OPR gathered thousands of pages of records where “they sat for many months, stretching into years, merely awaiting review for possible PRA exemptions” and that “[s]ome responsive records sat collected but unreviewed for as long as 470 days in UW’s OPR.”

Escobar of OPR asserted that PR-920 was one of the broadest and most complex PRA requests she had ever encountered. She received “tens of thousands” of documents from SoM that she had to review and from which she had to create large exemption logs because the majority of documents contained public employment applications. PR-920 was not the only request she worked on at the time—she had to balance working on that request with other PRA

requests. Escobar explained, “I manage many public records requests at a time and split my time between them.”

Conklin cites Wade to show that UW’s delays in production were “unreasonable as a matter of fact and law.” However, that was not the holding in Wade, where the court held that exemptions did not apply to withheld records, and, thus, the delay of release was unreasonable. Id. at 286. The Wade court held that determinations of unreasonable delay are based on the facts of each individual case. Id. at 283. Conklin’s reliance on timeframes that are out of context from other requests is not helpful.

Conklin also cited to Cantu v. Yakima Sch. Dist. No. 7, 23 Wn. App. 2d. 57, 514 P.3d 661(2022) to support his position. In Cantu, Division Three of this court rejected the school district’s argument that it was busy simultaneously responding to numerous large public records requests even if it was not making significant progress on Cantu’s request. Id. at 94. Division Three cited Zink for the proposition that administrative inconvenience or difficulty in producing records does not excuse lack of diligence. Id. (citing Zink, 140 Wn. App. at 337). However, as discussed above, that proposition is the progeny of Hearst, and it did not directly address whether an agency violates the PRA by spending time responding to other PRA requests. More importantly, Division Three observed that despite the school district’s claims of working on other PRA requests, it did “not appear that the District was diligently working on any of them.” Id. at 96. The facts in Cantu are distinguishable.

Conklin also argues that UW could have logged exemptions “wholesale” instead of individual documents—however, he never asked UW to log exemptions in that manner. Regardless, RCW 42.56.210(3) requires UW to document exemptions with particularity.

With the exception of PR-342, discussed below, we conclude that, based on this record, UW responded to the requests with reasonable thoroughness and diligence.

Adequate Search

Conklin argues that UW conducted an inadequate search because it did not provide all the TSDA fellowship match agreement records, which were responsive records to PR-342, until May 2021. We agree.

The main inquiry is not whether responsive documents exist, but whether the search itself was adequate. Neighborhood All. of Spokane County v. Spokane County, 172 Wn.2d 702, 719-20, 261 P.3d 119 (2011). The adequacy of a search is judged by a standard of reasonableness; the search must be reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents. Neighborhood All., 172 Wn.2d at 720.

Agencies are required to make more than a perfunctory search and to follow obvious leads as they are uncovered—the search should not be limited to one or more places if there are additional sources for the information requested. Id. at 720. The agency cannot limit its search to only one record system if there are others that are likely to turn up the information requested. Id. However, an

agency is not required to search every possible place a record may conceivably be stored, but only those places where it is reasonably likely to be found. Id.

[R]ecords are never exempt from disclosure, only production, so an adequate search is required in order to properly disclose responsive documents. The failure to perform an adequate search precludes an adequate response and production. The PRA treats a failure to properly respond as a denial. Thus, an inadequate search is comparable to a denial because the result is the same, and should be treated similarly in penalty determinations, at least insofar as the requester may be entitled to costs and reasonable attorney fees under RCW 42.56.550(4).

Id. at 721 (citations and quotations omitted). “State agencies may not resist disclosure of public records until a suit is filed and then avoid paying fees and penalties by disclosing them voluntarily thereafter.” Kitsap County Prosecuting Attorney’s Guild v. Kitsap County, 156 Wn. App. 110, 118, 231 P.3d 219 (2010). The burden is on UW to show that it made an adequate search for responsive records. Neighborhood All., 172 Wn.2d at 725.

Conklin’s first request, PR-920, asked for “all agreements between UW Medical Center and the [TSDA] and/or American Board of Thoracic Surgery.” Although Conklin argues that the TSDA match agreements should have been provided in response to this first request, the match agreements were between UW SoM and TSDA, not UWMC and TSDA. By its plain language, the match agreements would not fall under PR-920.

However, Conklin’s second request, PR-342, asked for “[a]ny agreement between UW and [ACGME] or *any other organization* that exclusively requires ACGME accredited training of residents and fellows for any reason.” (emphasis added). This request encompassed match agreements between TSDA and

SoM. Even though Conklin's counsel made this request in May 2018, he did not receive several of the responsive documents for this request until May 2021—after UW considered the request closed in November 2020 and after oral argument at trial had already occurred in February 2021.

It is undisputed that the records provided in the May 4, 2021 email were responsive to PR-342. UW contends that it was reasonable to originally only search GME for such records “when [GME] was the ordinary custodian of these records.” This claim is not supported in the record. UW only cites Ng's and Permut's declaration that they each believed GME was the record-holder for such agreements. Neither Ng nor Permut explain the basis for their conclusory beliefs. Ironically, despite UW claiming GME as the known record-holder for such agreements, GME only produced a single match agreement in response to PR-342.

UW also relies on model rule WAC 44-14-04003(10), which states “not everyone in an agency needs to be asked if there is no reason to believe he or she has responsive records,” and asking only those custodians “selected as most likely to have responsive records is usually sufficient.” Although the model rules are advisory only and nonbinding, our Supreme Court has repeatedly cited to the rules when interpreting provisions of the PRA. Kilduff v. San Juan County, 194 Wn.2d 859, 872-73, 453 P.3d 719 (2019).

UW argues there would be no reason to expect other “versions of the agreement not held by the GME would be found in a physician's personal files.” First, the records were not different “versions” of the same agreement. These

are similar types of agreements but completely different records as well as other records associated with the agreements. Second, Permut was not simply a physician among many who happened to have copies in his personal files—Permut was the director of SoM's congenital cardiac surgery fellowship program. And at the time PR-342 was submitted, GME had already previously alerted Ng that it only had partial fellowship files, that there was no central records system, and that fellowship applications could potentially be with departments that oversee the particular residence and fellowship programs. Ng did reach out to individual departments as to PR-920. But she apparently failed to do the same for PR-342, despite the fact GME only produced a single fellowship match agreement for a program that existed for more than one year.

Based on this record, we reverse the trial court and conclude that UW did not meet its burden to establish it conducted an adequate search for responsive records as to PR-342 and, thus, violated the PRA.

Daily Penalties, Attorney Fees, and Costs

Conklin requests attorney fees as the prevailing party on appeal under RAP 18.1(a).

The relevant PRA provision provides the following:

Any person who prevails against an agency in any action in the courts seeking the right to inspect or copy any public record or the right to receive a response to a public record request within a reasonable amount of time shall be awarded all costs, including reasonable attorney fees, incurred in connection with such legal action. In addition, it shall be within the discretion of the court to award such person an amount not to exceed one hundred dollars for each day that he or she was denied the right to inspect or copy said public record.

RCW 42.56.550(4).

A showing of bad faith is not required. Kitsap County Prosecuting Attorney's Guild, 156 Wn. App. at 118. State agencies may not resist disclosure of public records until a suit is filed and then avoid paying fees and penalties by disclosing them voluntarily thereafter. Id. Subsequent events do not affect the wrongfulness of the agency's initial withholding of records if the records were wrongfully withheld at the time. Id. at 119.

Because we conclude Conklin is the prevailing party as to PR-342, we grant Conklin's request for attorney fees and costs relating to that request. Because the trial court did not find a PRA violation, it did not consider attorney fees below or proceed with the penalty phase of trial. We remand to the trial court to proceed with the penalty phase of trial and determination of the amount of attorney fees and costs for both appeal and below consistent with this opinion.

In Camera Viewing

Conklin argues that the trial court abused its discretion by not viewing some exempted documents in camera.

Conklin asked the trial court to review in camera redacted emails UW produced arguing that its federal litigation counsel was advising or strategizing with UW on how to stall in responding to the PRA requests, which was in bad faith. The trial court concluded that Conklin's PRA requests were irrelevant to his claims in the federal lawsuit, that the pendency of that lawsuit provided no incentive for UW to strategically delay its responses to the PRA requests, and that his insinuation that UW "likely coordinated" with its counsel to strategically

delay responding to Conklin's PRA requests to hamper Conklin's federal lawsuit was irrelevant to the PRA claims in this case. The court thus concluded there was no need to conduct an in camera review of UW's written communications with its counsel.


An appellate court "reviews the trial court's decision on whether or not to conduct an in camera review for abuse of discretion." Forbes, 171 Wn. App. at 867.

When courts decide whether in camera review is needed to evaluate applicability of an exemption, they consider: "(1) judicial economy, (2) the conclusory nature of the agency affidavits, (3) bad faith on the part of the agency, (4) disputes concerning the contents of the documents, (5) whether the agency requests an in camera inspection, and (6) the strong public interest in disclosure." Overlake Fund v. City of Bellevue, 60 Wn. App. 787, 797, 810 P.2d 507 (1991) (emphasis omitted). Conklin does not provide any substantive argument regarding these factors and instead asks us to remand for reconsideration by the trial court. UW concedes that when there is an underlying PRA violation, then the timeliness of the response to records can be considered in the penalty phase.

Because we hold that UW violated the PRA, we also remand to the trial court for it to reconsider Conklin's request for an in camera review of exempted documents.

CONCLUSION

We reverse the trial court and hold that UW violated the PRA by not conducting an adequate search and not acting with thoroughness and diligence in responding to PR-342. We otherwise affirm the trial court in denying Conklin's PRA claims as to the other requests. We award attorney fees and costs to Conklin as to PR-342 on appeal and remand for the trial court to determine the amount of attorney fees and costs on appeal and below, and to proceed with the penalty phase of trial as well as reconsider Conklin's request for an in camera review.



WE CONCUR:



