FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION STATEMENT ON SENATE BILL 325, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE DISCLOSURE OF THE RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AND ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE CONCERNING MASS REQUESTS UNDER THE ACT.

March 3, 2026

Section 1

Section 1 of Senate Bill 325 revives an exhaustive debate in the Legislature that has been held on an almost annual basis. The concept of adding yet another classification of worker, in this case teachers who hold professional educator certificates and are employed by public schools, whose home address would be "protected" has, for the most part, been opposed by advocates of transparency and open records for years.

The Commission understands the security concerns which initially led to the enactment of Section 1-217 of the general statutes, more than 25 years ago. That section permitted public agencies not to disclose the home addresses of an enumerated list of certain "at risk" public officials such as police officers, judges and others directly involved in the criminal justice system. But every year, it seems, another agency or another profession attempts to have the addresses of its employees included in Section 1-217, without really understanding the limited scope of the statute, which should not be viewed as a cure for safety and privacy concerns.

In March 2012, the General Assembly limited Section 1-217 (Public Act 12-3), and basically eliminated the idea of restricting any address on a voter registration list. This was done in recognition of the reality that a complete prohibition on disclosure of certain residential addresses is unworkable, impossible and ignores the public policy behind numerous provisions within Title 9 that require the disclosure of residential addresses.

Section 1-217 is not the panacea that many believe it to be. Subsection (a) of the statute prohibits public agencies from releasing the residential addresses of certain covered persons from the agencies' personnel, medical, or similar files, only. Subsection (d) of the statute provides that the residential addresses of certain covered persons may not be removed from land records, voter records, and grand lists. And subsection (c) establishes a process whereby a covered employee can request that public records other than personnel files, voter records, land records, and grand lists, which might contain his or her residential address, be altered to substitute a business address. However, the public agency only needs to do its best efforts to accommodate such a request. Thus, Section 1-217 only protects the residential addresses of protected employees in personnel, medical, or similar files. Moreover, providing special protections to certain classes of employees while not providing them to others may give rise to constitutional questions.

Finally, the reality is that times have changed since the initial enactment of Section 1-217. For better or worse, the fact is that the residential addresses of most people are now readily available for free, or for a nominal charge, on the Internet and through other commercial services.

For all the reasons stated above, the Freedom of Information Commission urges the rejection of Section 1 of Senate Bill 325.

Section 2

Section 2 of Senate Bill 325 would create a task force to study the issue of individuals using artificial intelligence ("AI") to develop mass requests of information under the Freedom of Information Act, and whether any changes in law are necessary to assist public agencies in handling such requests. Notably, the issue of mass requests generated by AI has not been the subject of an appeal before the FOI Commission.

The Commission is open to discussions on this topic and appreciates being included in the proposed task force.

For further information contact: Paula S. Pearlman, Managing Director and General Counsel or Russell Blair, Director of Education and Communications, at (860) 566-5682.