

RECEIVED *veg*
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Dec 30, 2014, 2:34 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

E

bjh

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

NO. 89629-1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

WADE'S EASTSIDE GUN SHOP, INC., et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES, et al.,

Appellant,

v.

SEATTLE TIMES COMPANY,

Respondent,

and

CHRISTOPHER SAVOY, et al., Defendants.

Seattle Times' Statement of Supplemental Authority

Michele Earl-Hubbard
WSBA No. 26454
Allied Law Group LLC
Attorneys for Respondent
Seattle Times
P.O. Box 33744, Seattle, WA 98133
(206) 801-7510 (Phone)
(206) 428-7169 (Fax)



 ORIGINAL

Pursuant to RAP 10.8 Respondent Seattle Times submits the following attached authority as additional relevant authority in support of the following sections of its Brief of Respondent filed July 11, 2014:

- (1) Section II.A entitled “L&I Waived its Arguments that it Did Not Violate the PRA or that the Times’ was Not Entitled to Any Award.”
- (2) Section II.E entitled “L&I Provided an Inadequate Response and Explanation.”
- (3) Section II.F entitled “L&I Silently Withheld 5,431 Records for Nine Months.”
- (4) Section II.J entitled “The Times is Entitled to an Award of Fees and Costs under the PRA and as a Prevailing Party in this Appeal.”

City of Lakewood v. Koenig, --- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 at *2-3, 5 (Wash., Dec. 11, 2014) ((headings and footnotes omitted):

: ¶ 8 The primary purpose of the PRA is to provide broad access to public records to ensure government accountability. *Livingston v. Cedeno*, 164 Wash.2d 46, 52, 186 P.3d 1055 (2008). The legislature stated clearly that 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.” LAWS OF 1992, ch. 139, § 2 (codified at RCW 42.56.030). The PRA contains no general exemptions from disclosure to protect individual privacy or vital government functions. *Progressive Animal Welfare Soc. v. University of Washington*, 125 Wash.2d 243, 258, 884 P.2d 592 (1994) (*PAWS II*) (citing *In re Rosier*, 105 Wash.2d 606, 621, 717 P.2d 1353 (1986) (Anderson, J., dissenting in part, concurring in part)). Rather, the legislature has crafted exemptions that are “*narrowly tailored to specific situations* in which privacy rights or vital governmental interests require protection.” *Resident Action Council v. Seattle Hous. Auth.*, 177 Wn.2d 417, 434, 300 P.3d 376 (2013) (emphasis added). The PRA also provides that other statutes can exempt information from the disclosure mandates of the PRA. RCW 42.56.070(1).

¶ 9 Consistent with its purpose of disclosure, the PRA directs that its exemptions must be narrowly construed, RCW 42.56.030, and that “an agency must produce otherwise exempt records insofar as redaction renders any and all exemptions inapplicable.” Resident Action Council, 177 Wash.2d at 433, 327 P.3d 600 (citing PAWS II, 125 Wash.2d at 261, 884 P.2d 592 agency withholds or redacts records, its response “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.” RCW 42.56.210(3); see PAWS II, 125 Wash.2d at 270, 884 P.2d 592. The purpose of the requirement is to inform the requester why the documents are being withheld and provide for meaningful judicial review of agency action, See PAWS II, 125 Wash.2d at 270, 884 P.2d 592; Sanders v. State, 169 Wash.2d 827, 846, 240 P.3d 120 (2010) (noting that “[c]laimed exemptions cannot be vetted for validity if they are unexplained”).

¶ 10 The plain language of RCW 42.56.210(3) and our cases interpreting it are clear that an agency must identify “with *particularity*” “the specific record or information being withheld and the specific exemption authorizing the withholding. Rental Hous. Ass'n of Puget Sound v. City of Des Moines, 165 Wash.2d 525, 537–38, 199 P.3d 393 (2009) (emphasis added) (quoting PAWS II, 125 Wash.2d at 271, 884 P.2d 592); see also PAWS II, 125 Wash.2d at 271 n. 18, 884 P.2d 592. In Rental Housing, for example, we concluded the city did not state a proper claim of exemption to trigger the PRA's one-year statute of limitations where its response letter generally characterized withheld documents but did not “specifically describ[e] each withheld individual document and the basis for withholding each document.” 165 Wash.2d at 529, 541, 199 P.3d 393. Additionally, the agency must provide sufficient explanatory information for requestors to determine whether the exemptions are properly invoked. Rental Hous., 165 Wash.2d at 539, 199 P.3d 393 also Sanders, 169 Wash.2d at 846, 240 P.3d 120.

¶ 11 We find the city's response did not meet this standard. In its response to each request, the city either failed to cite a specific exemption or failed to provide any explanation for how a cited “other” statute exemption applied to the redacted driver's license numbers in the specific records produced. Consequently the burden was shifted to

the requester to sift through the statutes cited by the city and parse out possible exemption claims. This was improper under the PRA.


¶ 18 Because the city's response did not meet the requirements of the PRA, we hold that Koenig is entitled to attorney fees. The plain language of the PRA provides that costs and reasonable attorney fees shall be awarded to a requester for vindicating "the right to receive a response." RCW 42.56.550(4). In *Sanders*, we rejected the State's argument that the only remedy for the State's insufficient withholding index was to compel an explanation of the exemptions, 169 Wash.2d at 847, 240 P.3d 120. We found that interpretation of RCW 42.56.550(4) would contravene the PRA's purpose because an agency would have "no incentive to explain its exemptions at the outset" and "[t]his forces requestors to resort to litigation, while allowing the agency to escape sanction of any kind." *Id.* (citing *Spokane Research & Def. Fund v. City of Spokane*, 155 Wash.2d 89, 103–04, 117 P.3d 1117 (2005)). We decline to depart from *Sanders*.

¶ 19 Moreover, under *Yakima County v. Yakima Herald–Republic*, 170 Wash.2d 775, 809–10, 246 P.3d 768 (2011), attorney fees are available for a violation of the right to receive a response regardless of whether records are improperly withheld. There, the Yakima Herald–Republic sought information about the expenditure of public funds for the criminal defense of two murder defendants. *Id.* at 781–82, 246 P.3d 768. In addition to intervening in the criminal case and challenging the court's order sealing attorney billing records, the newspaper also filed a public records request with the county for all records of public funds spent for the defense. *Id.* at 783–85, 246 P.3d 768. We concluded billing records held by nonjudicial entities were subject to disclosure, and we remanded for a determination about whether nonjudicial entities actually held any. *Id.* at 805–08, 246 P.3d 768. Thus, while we declined penalties as premature, we awarded costs and reasonable attorney fees to the newspaper because the county's equivocal response violated the brief explanation requirement. *Id.* at 809, 246 P.3d 768. The same principles apply here.

¶ 20 Accordingly, Koenig is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney fees, including fees on appeal, pursuant to RCW 42.56.550(4) and RAP 18.1.

¶ 21 Some records are exempt from disclosure under the PRA. Agencies withholding or redacting records must identify the specific exemptions they believe apply and provide a brief explanation as to why. We hold that the city of Lakewood violated this requirement and that Koenig is entitled to attorney costs and fees for vindicating his right to receive a response. We remand to the trial court for entry of an attorney fee award in accordance with this opinion.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of December, 2014.

By: 
Michele Earl-Hubbard, WSBA No. 26454
Allied Law Group LLC, P.O. Box 33744,
Seattle, WA 98133, (206) 443-0200
Attorneys for Respondent Seattle Times

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on December 30, 2014, I delivered a copy of the foregoing Seattle Times' Statement of Supplemental Authority by email pursuant to an electronic service agreement among the parties to the following:

John S. Barnes, WSBA# 19657
Anastasia Sandstrom, # 24163
Alan Copsey, WSBA # 23305
Attorney for Appellant Labor & Industries
Email: **LNISeaEService@atg.wa.gov**
anas@atg.wa.gov
JohnB@atg.wa.gov
AlanC@atg.wa.gov

Christopher Pirnke, WSBA# 44378
Attorney for former Plaintiffs
Email **cpirnke@insleebest.com**

Patrick Reddy, WSBA # 34092
Attorney for former Defendant Christopher Savoy and Joseph Schmidt
Email: **reddyp@emeryreddy.com**

Dated this 30th day of December, 2014.



Michele Earl-Hubbard

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)
 (Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

H

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

Supreme Court of Washington,
 En Banc.
 CITY OF LAKEWOOD, A Municipal Corporation of
 the State of Washington, Petitioner,
 v.
 David KOENIG, individually, Respondent.

No. 89648–8.
 Dec. 11, 2014.

Background: City brought action against requester for a declaratory judgment that city complied with requests under the Public Records Act (PRA). After grant of city's request to compel discovery was affirmed in part and reversed in part on appeal, 160 Wash.App. 883, 250 P.3d 113, the Superior Court, Pierce County, James R. Orlando, J., granted summary judgment in favor of city and denied requester's request for costs and attorney fees. Requester appealed. The Court of Appeals, 176 Wash.App. 397, 309 P.3d 610, reversed and remanded.

Holdings: After grant of city's petition for review, the Supreme Court, González, J., held that:

(1) city violated requirement of PRA that city provide brief explanation of how disclosure exemptions applied to redacted information, and
 (2) determination that city violated brief explanation requirement of PRA was a vindication of requester's right to receive a response, as would entitle requester to attorney fees.

Affirmed and remanded.

Madsen, C.J., filed dissenting opinion.

West Headnotes

[1] Records 326  **54**

326 Records
 326II Public Access
 326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Re-
 quirements
 326k53 Matters Subject to Disclosure;
 Exemptions
 326k54 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

Records 326  **58**

326 Records
 326II Public Access
 326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Re-
 quirements
 326k53 Matters Subject to Disclosure;
 Exemptions
 326k58 k. Personal Privacy Considera-
 tions in General; Personnel Matters. Most Cited Cases

The Public Records Act (PRA) contains no general exemptions from disclosure to protect individual privacy or vital government functions. West's RCWA 42.56.030.

[2] Records 326  **63**

326 Records
 326II Public Access
 326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Re-
 quirements
 326k61 Proceedings for Disclosure
 326k63 k. Judicial Enforcement in
 General. Most Cited Cases

Records requester did not waive claim that city

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

(Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

violated provision of Public Records Act (PRA) requiring brief explanation of how disclosure exemptions applied to redacted information, despite argument that requester limited issues before trial court and that trial court did not rule on right to receive a response, where requester clearly argued in his summary judgment motion that city failed to provide adequate explanation of claimed exemptions, and trial court expressly ruled that requester's brief-explanation violation claim was not a basis for city liability. West's RCWA 42.56.210(3).

[3] Records 326  62

326 Records

326II Public Access

326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Requirements

326k61 Proceedings for Disclosure

326k62 k. In General; Request and Compliance. Most Cited Cases

An agency must identify with particularity the specific record or information being withheld under the Public Records Act (PRA) and the specific exemption authorizing the withholding. West's RCWA 42.56.210(3).

[4] Records 326  62

326 Records

326II Public Access

326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Requirements

326k61 Proceedings for Disclosure

326k62 k. In General; Request and Compliance. Most Cited Cases

City violated requirement of Public Records Act (PRA) that city provide, in response to records request for municipal court docket information, a brief explanation of how disclosure exemptions applied to

driver's license number, which city had redacted in its response, where city cited non-PRA statutes pursuant to which number was redacted but did not explain how other statutes applied to driver's license number in specific records produced, and it was not obvious from face of either statute how exemptions applied. West's RCWA 42.56.210(3), 46.52.120, 46.52.130; WAC 44-14-04004(4)(b)(ii).

[5] Records 326  62

326 Records

326II Public Access

326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Requirements

326k61 Proceedings for Disclosure

326k62 k. In General; Request and Compliance. Most Cited Cases

City violated requirement of Public Records Act (PRA) that city provide, in response to records request for police report, a brief explanation of how disclosure exemptions applied to driver's license number, which city had redacted in its response, where city failed to identify a specific exemption authorizing redaction and instead simply cited to PRA provision that defined privacy, which included a number of exemptions. West's RCWA 42.56.210(3).

[6] Records 326  68

326 Records

326II Public Access

326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Requirements

326k61 Proceedings for Disclosure

326k68 k. Costs and Fees. Most Cited Cases

Appellate court's determination that city violated Public Records Act (PRA) by failing to provide, in response to records request, a brief explanation of how

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)
 (Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

disclosure exemptions applied to redacted information, was a vindication of requester's right to receive a response, as would entitle requester to attorney fees, including fees on appeal. West's RCWA 42.56.210(3), 42.56.550(4).

[7] Records 326  68

326 Records

326II Public Access

326II(B) General Statutory Disclosure Requirements

326k61 Proceedings for Disclosure

326k68 k. Costs and Fees. Most Cited

Cases

Attorney fees are available for a violation of a records requester's right, under the Public Records Act (PRA), to receive a response, regardless of whether records are improperly withheld. West's RCWA 42.56.550(4).

Appeal from Pierce County Superior Court; 08-2-05892-7, Honorable James R. Orlando, Judge. Matthew S. Kaser, City of Lakewood, Lakewood, WA, for Petitioner.

William John Crittenden, Attorney at Law, Seattle, WA, for Respondent.

Daniel Brian Heid, Auburn, WA, Steven L. Gross, Attorney at Law, Port Townsend, WA, Kathleen J. Haggard, Porter Foster Rorick LLP, Seattle, WA, for Amicus Curiae on behalf of Washington State Association of Municipal Attorneys.

Ramsey E. Ramerman, City of Everett, Everett, WA, for Amicus Curiae on behalf of Washington Association of Public Records Officers.

Michele Lynn Earl-Hubbard, Allied Law Group LLC, Seattle, WA, for Amicus Curiae on behalf of Allied

Daily Newspapers of Washington.

Michele Lynn Earl-Hubbard, Allied Law Group LLC, Seattle, WA, for Amicus Curiae on behalf of Washington Newspapers Publishers Association.

Michele Lynn Earl-Hubbard, Allied Law Group LLC, Seattle, WA, for Amicus Curiae on behalf of Washington COALition for Open Government.

GONZÁLEZ, J.

*1 ¶ 1 Our Public Records Act (PRA), chapter 42.56 RCW, provides attorney fees to those who must resort to the courts to vindicate either their right to inspect public records or their right to receive a response to a records request. An agency violates a requestor's right to receive a response when it withholds or redacts public records without articulating a specific applicable exemption and providing a "brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the record withheld." RCW 42.56.210(3). We are asked to decide whether the city of Lakewood's explanation for redacting driver's license numbers from records produced for David Koenig was inadequate and, if so, whether Koenig is entitled to attorney fees. We hold that the city's response was inadequate and Koenig is entitled to fees.

FACTS

¶ 2 In October 2007, Koenig requested three sets of records from the city of Lakewood. He requested (1) records about the arrest and prosecution of a Lakewood police detective in January 2005 for patronizing a prostitute; (2) records about a November 2006 auto accident in the city of Fife, where a Fife police officer struck a pedestrian with his patrol car and the Lakewood Police Department assisted with the investigation; and (3) records about Tacoma police officer Michael Justice's 1998 arrest and subsequent prosecution on fourth degree assault charges.

¶ 3 In November 2007, the city advised Koenig by

--- P.3d ---, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

(Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

letter that responsive records were available for review and pickup. The city redacted, among other things, driver's license numbers from various types of documents it produced. The city justified the redaction of driver's license numbers by citation to statutes:

Records pertaining to the arrest and prosecution of a Lakewood Police Detective on or around 1/25/05

[The detective's] Driver's License number has been redacted pursuant to RCW 46.52.120 and RCW 46.52.130.

....

Records Pertaining to Fife Collision.

The City is making available the investigation about an auto accident that occurred in the City of Fife in November of 2006. The City has redacted the dates of birth, driver's license numbers and social security numbers of (1) the involved officer; (2) the alleged victim; and (3) the listed eyewitnesses. These redactions are made pursuant to RCW 42.56.050, RCW 42.56.240, RCW 46.52.120, and RCW 46.52.130.

....

Records Pertaining to the Arrest and Prosecution of Michael Justice.

... The driver's license number of Michael Justice has been redacted pursuant to RCW 42.56.050, 46.52.120 and 46.52.130.

Clerk's Papers (CP) at 75–76. The city's letter advised Koenig: “[U]nless you have notified the City—in writing—by the close of business on December 21, 2007, that its response satisfies your requests, the City is prepared to take appropriate legal

action to determine that it has fully complied with each of these requests.” *Id.* at 77.

¶ 4 Koenig questioned the city's reliance on the statutes it cited. Among other things, Koenig asked the city to specify which exemption it claimed under RCW 42.56.240^{FN1} and to clarify whether it was also claiming driver's license numbers were exempt under the federal Driver's Privacy Protection Act of 1994 (FDPPA), 18 U.S.C. § 2721, and *Reno v. Condon*, 528 U.S. 141, 120 S.Ct. 666, 145 L.Ed.2d 587 (2000).^{FN2}

*2 ¶ 5 In a response letter dated February 25, 2008, the city supplemented the basis for its redaction of driver's license numbers to include the FDPPA and *Reno*, 528 U.S. 141, 120 S.Ct. 666, 145 L.Ed.2d 587. The city said that it redacted witness and victim dates of birth pursuant to RCW 42.56.240(2) because “the date of birth together with a name has the potential to link a particular individual with a particular identity thus creating the potential to endanger an individual's life, physical safety or property.” CP at 87–88. But the city declined to explain how RCW 42.56.240 or the other statutes it cited applied to the driver's license numbers: “Given what should be the self-evident nature of redacting an individual's driver's license number, we decline your invitation to provide further and unnecessary explanation.” *Id.* at 88. The city again warned it was “prepared to prosecute a declaratory judgment action decreeing that it [had] fully complied with [Koenig's] requests.” *Id.* at 89 (citing *Soter v. Cowles Publ'g Co.*, 162 Wash.2d 716, 174 P.3d 60 (2007)).^{FN3}

¶ 6 The city filed suit and moved for summary judgment.^{FN4} Koenig filed a cross motion for summary judgment and argued the city had not met its burden to show the driver's license numbers were properly redacted under a specific exemption and the city also violated the PRA by failing to explain why driver's license numbers are exempt. Koenig argued he was entitled to attorney fees under RCW 42.56.550(4) for the violation of the brief explanation requirement

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

(Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

regardless of whether the numbers were ruled exempt.

¶ 7 The trial court granted the city's summary judgment motion, denied Koenig's motion, and ruled that Koenig's claim against the city for violating the PRA by failing to provide a brief explanation was not a valid basis for liability. CP at 228–30 (Order on Cross Motions for Summary Judgment). Koenig appealed on the brief explanation issue. The Court of Appeals held the city violated the brief explanation requirement and Koenig was entitled to attorney costs and fees. *City of Lakewood v. Koenig*, 176 Wash.App. 397, 309 P.3d 610 (2013). We granted the city's petition for review. *City of Lakewood v. Koenig*, 179 Wash.2d 1022, 320 P.3d 719 (2014).

ANALYSIS

[1] ¶ 8 The primary purpose of the PRA is to provide broad access to public records to ensure government accountability. *Livingston v. Cedeno*, 164 Wash.2d 46, 52, 186 P.3d 1055 (2008). The legislature stated clearly that 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.” LAWS OF 1992, ch. 139, § 2 (codified at RCW 42.56.030). The PRA contains no general exemptions from disclosure to protect individual privacy or vital government functions. *Progressive Animal Welfare Soc. v. University of Washington*, 125 Wash.2d 243, 258, 884 P.2d 592 (1994) (*PAWS II*) (citing *In re Rosier*, 105 Wash.2d 606, 621, 717 P.2d 1353 (1986) (Anderson, J., dissenting in part, concurring in part)). Rather, the legislature has crafted exemptions that are “narrowly tailored to specific situations in which privacy rights or vital governmental interests require protection.” *Resident Action Council v. Seattle Hous. Auth.*, 177 Wn.2d 417, 434, 300 P.3d 376 (2013) (emphasis added). The PRA also provides that other statutes can exempt information from the disclosure mandates of the PRA. RCW 42.56.070(1).

*3 [2] ¶ 9 Consistent with its purpose of disclosure, the PRA directs that its exemptions must be

narrowly construed, RCW 42.56.030, and that “an agency must produce otherwise exempt records insofar as redaction renders any and all exemptions inapplicable.” *Resident Action Council*, 177 Wash.2d at 433, 327 P.3d 600 (citing *PAWS II*, 125 Wash.2d at 261, 884 P.2d 592); see RCW 42.56.210(1), .070. When an agency withholds or redacts records, its response “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.” RCW 42.56.210(3); see *PAWS II*, 125 Wash.2d at 270, 884 P.2d 592. The purpose of the requirement is to inform the requester why the documents are being withheld and provide for meaningful judicial review of agency action. See *PAWS II*, 125 Wash.2d at 270, 884 P.2d 592; *Sanders v. State*, 169 Wash.2d 827, 846, 240 P.3d 120 (2010) (noting that “[c]laimed exemptions cannot be vetted for validity if they are unexplained”).^{FNS}

[3] ¶ 10 The plain language of RCW 42.56.210(3) and our cases interpreting it are clear that an agency must identify “ ‘with particularity ’ “ the specific record or information being withheld and the specific exemption authorizing the withholding. *Rental Hous. Ass'n of Puget Sound v. City of Des Moines*, 165 Wash.2d 525, 537–38, 199 P.3d 393 (2009) (emphasis added) (quoting *PAWS II*, 125 Wash.2d at 271, 884 P.2d 592); see also *PAWS II*, 125 Wash.2d at 271 n. 18, 884 P.2d 592. In *Rental Housing*, for example, we concluded the city did not state a proper claim of exemption to trigger the PRA's one-year statute of limitations where its response letter generally characterized withheld documents but did not “specifically describ[e] each withheld individual document and the basis for withholding each document.” 165 Wash.2d at 529, 541, 199 P.3d 393. Additionally, the agency must provide sufficient explanatory information for requestors to determine whether the exemptions are properly invoked. *Rental Hous.*, 165 Wash.2d at 539, 199 P.3d 393 (quoting WAC 44–14–04004(4)(b)(ii)); see also *Sanders*, 169 Wash.2d at 846, 240 P.3d 120.

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

(Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

¶ 11 We find the city's response did not meet this standard. In its response to each request, the city either failed to cite a specific exemption or failed to provide any explanation for how a cited "other" statute exemption applied to the redacted driver's license numbers in the specific records produced. Consequently the burden was shifted to the requester to sift through the statutes cited by the city and parse out possible exemption claims. This was improper under the PRA.

¶ 12 The level of detail necessary for a requestor to determine whether an exemption is properly invoked will depend upon both the nature of the exemption and the nature of the document or information. The majority of exemptions are categorical and exempt "without limit a particular type of information or record." *Resident Action Council*, 177 Wash.2d at 434, 327 P.3d 600 (citing as an example RCW 42.56.230(5), which exempts "debit card numbers"). Thus, when it is clear on the face of a record what type of information has been redacted and that type of information is categorically exempt, citing to a specific statutory provision may be sufficient. But for other exemptions, including the "other" statute exemptions cited by the city here, additional explanation is necessary to determine whether the exemption is properly invoked. *See, e.g., Sanders*, 169 Wash.2d at 846, 240 P.3d 120 (finding agency's response insufficient when it claimed the controversy exemption for numerous records without specifying details such as the controversy to which each record was relevant).

*4 [4] ¶ 13 In response to the first request, the city redacted a detective's driver's license number from what appear to be a municipal court docket and a citation notice issued to a Lakewood police detective for patronizing a prostitute. The city stated that the number was redacted pursuant to RCW 46.52.120 and .130, provisions outside the PRA that provide for the confidentiality of an individual's driving record kept by the department of motor vehicles but provide that the department may furnish the abstract of a person's driving record to certain entities under certain cir-

cumstances. While it may be that information is still protected once it is given to other government agencies, this is not obvious from the face of either statute. The city declined Koenig's request for an explanation and failed to provide any information that would link RCW 46.52.120 and .130 to the specific driver's license numbers redacted in each record held by the city. This explanation would be necessary to evaluate the city's claim for validity.

[5] ¶ 14 In response to Koenig's second request, the city redacted the driver's license numbers of the detective, the victim, and witnesses from what appear to be a police report, a traffic collision report, and a handwritten note. The city plainly violated the PRA because it failed to identify a "specific exemption" authorizing redaction as required by RCW 42.56.210(3). The city simply cited to the PRA provision that defines privacy, RCW 42.56.050, and to RCW 42.56.240 (2005), which included a number of exemptions. Among other things, .240 exempted "investigative records" disclosure of which would violate privacy, RCW 42.56.240(1), and identifying information about victims and witnesses that would jeopardize their life, safety, or property, RCW 42.56.240(2). The city later clarified its response as it related to the dates of birth of witnesses and victims, claiming that information was exempt pursuant to RCW 42.56.240(2), but the city did not specify whether it also intended to claim a specific exemption under .240 for driver's license numbers. The city repeated its citations to RCW 46.52.120 and .130 without explaining how they apply.

¶ 15 In response to the third request, the city redacted a police officer's driver's license number from what appears to be a docket and repeated its citations to RCW 46.52.120, .130, and .050 without explanation.

¶ 16 The city augmented its response to include a claim of exemption under the FDPPA. However, the city failed to explain the source of the driver's license

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

(Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

numbers in each record, which is necessary for a requester to make a threshold determination about whether the federal law applies.

¶ 17 Koenig asks us to construe *Sanders*, 169 Wash.2d 827, 240 P.3d 120, as requiring a *correct* response to a records request. But our inquiry under the facts presented here does not turn on whether the explanation was correct, but rather on whether it provided sufficient explanatory information for requestors to determine whether the exemptions were properly invoked. It did not; the city's responses either failed to cite a specific exemption or failed to provide any explanation for how a cited "other" statute exemption applied to the redacted driver's license numbers in the specific records produced.

*5 [6] ¶ 18 Because the city's response did not meet the requirements of the PRA, we hold that Koenig is entitled to attorney fees. The plain language of the PRA provides that costs and reasonable attorney fees shall be awarded to a requester for vindicating "the right to receive a response." RCW 42.56.550(4).^{FN6} In *Sanders*, we rejected the State's argument that the only remedy for the State's insufficient withholding index was to compel an explanation of the exemptions, 169 Wash.2d at 847, 240 P.3d 120. We found that interpretation of RCW 42.56.550(4) would contravene the PRA's purpose because an agency would have "no incentive to explain its exemptions at the outset" and "[t]his forces requestors to resort to litigation, while allowing the agency to escape sanction of any kind." *Id.* (citing *Spokane Research & Def. Fund v. City of Spokane*, 155 Wash.2d 89, 103–04, 117 P.3d 1117 (2005)). We decline to depart from *Sanders*.

[7] ¶ 19 Moreover, under *Yakima County v. Yakima Herald–Republic*, 170 Wash.2d 775, 809–10, 246 P.3d 768 (2011), attorney fees are available for a violation of the right to receive a response regardless of whether records are improperly withheld. There, the Yakima Herald–Republic sought information

about the expenditure of public funds for the criminal defense of two murder defendants. *Id.* at 781–82, 246 P.3d 768. In addition to intervening in the criminal case and challenging the court's order sealing attorney billing records, the newspaper also filed a public records request with the county for all records of public funds spent for the defense. *Id.* at 783–85, 246 P.3d 768. We concluded billing records held by nonjudicial entities were subject to disclosure, and we remanded for a determination about whether nonjudicial entities actually held any. *Id.* at 805–08, 246 P.3d 768. Thus, while we declined penalties as premature, we awarded costs and reasonable attorney fees to the newspaper because the county's equivocal response violated the brief explanation requirement. *Id.* at 809, 246 P.3d 768. The same principles apply here.

¶ 20 Accordingly, Koenig is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney fees, including fees on appeal, pursuant to RCW 42.56.550(4) and RAP 18.1.^{FN7}

CONCLUSION

¶ 21 Some records are exempt from disclosure under the PRA. Agencies withholding or redacting records must identify the specific exemptions they believe apply and provide a brief explanation as to why. We hold that the city of Lakewood violated this requirement and that Koenig is entitled to attorney costs and fees for vindicating his right to receive a response. We remand to the trial court for entry of an attorney fee award in accordance with this opinion.

WE CONCUR: JOHNSON, OWENS, STEPHENS, and YU, JJ.

MADSEN, C.J. (dissenting).

¶ 22 The Public Records Act (PRA) grants costs and reasonable attorney fees for vindicating the "right to receive a response to a public record request within a reasonable time." RCW 42.56.550(4). The plain language of the statute simply entitles a person to receive a timely answer. Although we have interpreted

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)
 (Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

“response” to include the right to receive a “brief explanation,” *Sanders v. State*, 169 Wash.2d 827, 848, 240 P.3d 120 (2010), the majority now expands “brief explanation” to mean that an agency must correctly justify its response when it redacts or withholds a document. The PRA does not support this result.

Discussion

*6 ¶ 23 The city stated that it redacted driver's license numbers from the documents it intended to provide and then cited to specific statutes that it claimed supported the redactions. The majority holds this response insufficient because it cannot determine if the cited statutes actually support the redactions. Majority at 9. In other words, the majority holds the city's response insufficient because it cannot tell if the city is right. *Id.* The PRA, however, merely requires that the agency provide a “response,” not a correct explanation. RCW 42.56.550(4), .210(3).

¶ 24 The agency fulfilled its obligation to provide a brief explanation. In *Sanders*, we held the State's response insufficient when it withheld entire documents and claimed work product privilege under the PRA's controversy exemption. 169 Wash.2d at 847, 240 P.3d 120. We held the response insufficient because the State failed to give necessary information about what the records contained to evaluate the claim, including what controversy the records related to. *Id.* Essentially, the State explained why it withheld information—the controversy exemption—but failed to explain what information it actually withheld. *See id.* at 837, 846, 240 P.3d 120 (characterizing lack of details as merely identifying that a document exists). Here, unlike the State in *Sanders*, the city explained what information it actually withheld—driver's license numbers—and it explained why—the cited statutes. The requester in this case, unlike the requester in *Sanders*, can evaluate the exemptions and determine for himself the validity of the agency's action. Whether the city validly withheld the driver's license numbers, however, is a separate issue.

¶ 25 Although the majority denies that a brief explanation must contain a correct response, the rule it articulates has this result. The majority states that the agency must provide explanatory information sufficient “to determine whether the exemptions are properly invoked.” Majority at 7 (citing *Rental Hous. Ass'n of Puget Sound v. City of Des Moines*, 165 Wash.2d 525, 539, 199 P.3d 393 (2009)). In other words, the sufficiency of a brief explanation now depends on whether the response allows the requester or a court to determine that the agency invoked the correct exemption. In *Rental Housing*, we described the brief explanation as “ ‘enough information for a requestor to make a threshold determination of whether the claimed exemption is proper.’ ” 165 Wash.2d at 539, 199 P.3d 393 (quoting WAC 44–14–04004(4)(b)(ii)). The majority transformed a threshold determination into an ultimate determination. So instead of providing enough information for the requester to make an initial determination about the appropriateness of the exemption, the agency must now provide enough information to prove it is right.

¶ 26 The PRA does not put this burden on agencies, and neither should this court. When a requester doubts the validity of an agency's claimed exemption, the PRA directs the requester to seek clarification from the attorney general, not the agency. The PRA provides:

*7 Whenever a state agency concludes that a public record is exempt from disclosure and denies a person opportunity to inspect or copy a public record for that reason, the person may request the attorney general to review the matter. The attorney general shall provide the person with his or her written opinion on whether the record is exempt.

RCW 42.56.530.

¶ 27 The PRA already provides attorney fees when an agency wrongly withholds records. RCW

--- P.3d ---, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

(Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

42.56.550(4). Under the majority, an agency must now pay attorney fees if it wrongly withhold records or if it correctly withholds records but fails to provide a correct explanation. I do not find this correct-explanation requirement in the statute, and I do not believe that we should create one. Instead, if the agency has failed to identify a record at all or has failed to either release a record or give its reason for withholding, whether correct or incorrect, then attorney fees may be warranted. But where the agency has identified the records and given its reason for redacting or withholding the record, no attorney fees are independently warranted. Therefore, I dissent.

FN1. Former RCW 42.56.240 (2005), in effect at the time of the city's response, contained five subsections. Seven subsections have since been added through numerous legislative amendments, but none of the amendments have altered subsections (1)-(5). See LAWS OF 2013, ch. 315, § 2, ch. 190, § 7, ch. 183, § 1; LAWS OF 2012, ch. 88, § 1; LAWS OF 2010, ch. 266, § 2, ch. 182, § 5; LAWS OF 2008, ch. 276, § 202 (codified at RCW 42.56.240(6)-(12)).

FN2. The city initiated suit while Koenig and the city were already engaged in pending litigation. In that other case, the city also redacted driver's license numbers and eventually cited to the FDPPA and former RCW 46.12.390 (2005).

FN3. In *Soter*, 162 Wash.2d at 757, 174 P.3d 60, we held that under RCW 42.56.540, an agency can seek a judicial determination whether records are properly exempt, but "to impose the injunction [against release of the records], the trial court must find that a specific exemption applies *and* that disclosure would not be in the public interest and would substantially and irreparably damage a person or a vital government interest."

FN4. Even prior to the motions for summary judgment, the case went up on appeal. The first appeal concerned the trial court's order to compel Koenig to respond to discovery requests from the city. The Court of Appeals reversed the trial court in part, holding that the city could seek discovery under the PRA but that its request in this instance was not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. *City of Lakewood v. Koenig*, 160 Wash.App. 883, 250 P.3d 113 (2011).

FN5. As a threshold matter, the city asks us to hold that Koenig waived any claim that it violated the brief explanation requirement. We decline to do so. The city argues that Koenig limited the issues before the trial court in his answer and that the trial court did not rule on the right to receive a response. However, Koenig clearly argued in his summary judgment motion that the city failed to provide an adequate explanation of claimed exemptions and asked for attorney fees. The trial court expressly ruled that Koenig's brief explanation violation claim was not a basis for liability.

FN6. RCW 42.56.550(4) was amended in 2011 to remove the mandatory minimum daily penalty for a violation of a citizen's right to inspect or copy public records, LAWS OF 2011, ch. 273, § 1, but that portion of the provision is not at issue here. The relevant portion reads:

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

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

(Cite as: 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.))

time shall be awarded all costs, including reasonable attorney fees, incurred in connection with such legal action.

Id.

FN7. The city's petition for review and supplemental brief ask us to hold that driver's license numbers are exempt under the PRA. City of Lakewood's Pet. for Review at 4, 16–20; Suppl. Br. of Pet'r at 15–18. We decline to reach this issue because it is not properly before us and because we do not have briefing from all the stakeholders who might have valuable insight into the issue. We note that there is tension between the PRA's mandate of disclosure and the efforts of agencies to protect personal identifying information, the disclosure of which can put citizens at risk for identity theft and other problems. As the Court of Appeals aptly noted:

The PRA exists to ensure government transparency and accountability. RCW 42.56.030. Allowing the release of a private citizen's personal identifying information exposes private citizens to the risk of harm such as identity theft without furthering this purpose. *See Tacoma Pub. Library [v. Woessner]*, 90 Wn.App. [205,] 221–22[, 951 P.2d 357, 972 P.2d 932 (1998)] (disclosure of personal identifying information can be highly offensive because it “could lead to public scrutiny of individuals concerning information unrelated to any governmental operation”). The legislature has expressed obvious concern over the release of personal identifying information and recognized that the release of personal identifying information serves no legitimate purpose under the PRA. Accordingly, we believe that the failure to

include an express PRA exemption that impedes the crime of identity theft and protects the release of personal identifying information appears to be an unfortunate oversight, but that it is up to the legislature, not the courts, to address.

Koenig, 176 Wash.App. at 404 n. 3, 309 P.3d 610.

Wash.,2014.

City of Lakewood v. Koenig

--- P.3d ----, 2014 WL 7003790 (Wash.)

END OF DOCUMENT

OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

To: Michele Earl-Hubbard; 'LNISeaEService@atg.wa.gov'; 'anas@atg.wa.gov';
'JohnB@atg.wa.gov'; 'AlanC@atg.wa.gov'; 'cpirnke@insleebest.com';
'reddyp@emeryreddy.com'
Subject: RE: Filing in Case No. 89629-1, Wade's Eastside Gun Shop, Inc. , et al., v. L&I and Seattle Times

Received 12-30-2014

Supreme Court Clerk's Office

Please note that any pleading filed as an attachment to e-mail will be treated as the original. Therefore, if a filing is by e-mail attachment, it is not necessary to mail to the court the original of the document.

From: Michele Earl-Hubbard [mailto:michele@alliedlawgroup.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 2:29 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK; 'LNISeaEService@atg.wa.gov'; 'anas@atg.wa.gov'; 'JohnB@atg.wa.gov';
'AlanC@atg.wa.gov'; 'cpirnke@insleebest.com'; 'reddyp@emeryreddy.com'
Subject: Filing in Case No. 89629-1, Wade's Eastside Gun Shop, Inc. , et al., v. L&I and Seattle Times
Importance: High

Attached for filing please find the Seattle Times' Statement of Supplemental Authority and attached certificate of service in case no. 89629-1, Wade's Eastside Gun Shop v. L&I and Seattle Times.

This is being filed by attorney Michele Earl-Hubbard, WSBA #26454, attorney for Respondent Seattle Times. My contact information is below.

Michele Earl-Hubbard



Mailing address:
P.O Box 33744
Seattle, WA 98133
(206) 801-7510 phone
(206) 428-7169 fax
michele@alliedlawgroup.com
www.alliedlawgroup.com