

## **1. Emerging Technologies**

How do we successfully anticipate the rapidly evolving world of electronic record creation and record access? What can we do now to allow seamless inclusion of new technologies into the GRAMA framework in the future? What should be the state policy toward these future developments?

## **2. Costs and Timeliness**

What is the cost of GRAMA, now and in the future, and how should it be distributed? To what extent should the requestor's identity or purpose (private citizen, media representative, business entity) impact the distribution of costs? How can the cost and time required for the storage and retrieval of records be minimized without diminishing the accessibility or timeliness of the information? Is there value in a policy that sets different costs and timeliness standards for private once-in-a-lifetime citizen requests and those by businesses, by media representatives, or by those who prove themselves to be nuisances? If so, what should that policy be? Should there be reasonable flexibility in response times for requests that would otherwise impede the function of an official or office (i.e. Legislators during session)? What should be the overall policy regarding these issues?

## **3. Simplification and Centralization**

How can the current process of responding to GRAMA requests be simplified? Is there value in a policy that results in more centralized storage and retrieval of government records? Is there value in providing a central authority or ombudsman to facilitate GRAMA requests? If so, how? Is it possible to establish one or more "safe harbor" rules to reduce the perceived need to secure legal counsel review of GRAMA requests and responses? Can a sanctioned "informal" process be authorized in a way that protects both requestors and those responding to the request? Are there other ways to simplify the process of storing and accessing government records that should be considered? What should be the overall policy regarding these issues?

## **4. Statutory Definitions**

How does the existing GRAMA definition of "record" apply to the world of government action as it exists today, and should it be clarified or modified? If so, how? How should the various newer forms of communication be treated for purposes of statutory definition, such as texts, email, twitter-type general distributions of information, blog-type general distributions of information? Are they records, and if so, when or in what ways? Where is the line between conversation and record? How should the existing GRAMA statute be clarified or modified to deal with "personal notes and files", "private" communications from constituents, and the constitutionally protected rights of public officials and public

employees? Should the intent statement contained in GRAMA be revised in some way, and if so, to what end? Are there other elements of the statutory scheme or specific language in GRAMA that should be considered for revision due to evolving technologies, court decisions, or current practices? How should the legislature deal with staying current on the need for statutory refinements to GRAMA?