

From: [Susan Jaworowski](#)
To: [OIP](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Objections to the SCR 192 WORKING GROUP's proposed draft (10/4/22)
Date: Sunday, October 2, 2022 12:40:01 PM

Aloha—

As someone who has worked in various branches of government for 35 years, I object to the proposed language as being far too restrictive on the public's right to know. One of the key areas that I think the committee needs to revisit is the restriction on the identity of those involved "if that person lacks discretionary authority, did not make the decision, and is not under investigation for or engaged in wrongdoing or criminal conduct[.]". What a suspicious restriction. This would hide, for instance, the identity of any lobbyists who may be at any meeting, helping to guide the decision their way, but who are not an official decision maker. The public would never know that they were there, pulling strings. It would also hide the identity of underlings who were at the meeting, who could report out a different version of events if the official version is massaged to hide the true state of events, simply because these other witnesses are not the "decision makers."

The clause on protecting those who are under investigation is perhaps the most bizarre of all. First of all, who is going to go through all of the records and look up everyone that was there and then try, somehow, to determine, who is under investigation? It is not as though the prosecutors post pending investigations so OIP could neatly check off them off a list, and of course, any civil lawsuit need not be filed until all the information is gathered, so someone may very well be under investigation, but no one will know until the suit is actually filed. This clause is frankly unworkable.

It's almost as though the people drafting this bill know of a specific situation where they want to hide certain people from being disclosed. No, and no again. The public record should be the complete public record, all people in attendance, with no attempt to sanitize who was there. There is no need, and frankly, it just looks suspicious. Everyone at the meeting should be listed in the public record. What's the harm in having everyone's name listed?

—Susan Jaworowski