

## COMMENTS RECEIVED IN OIP'S SERVICES SURVEY

The following comments were received from respondents regarding their overall satisfaction with OIP's services and their suggestions for improvements. "RN" refers to the respondent number and, if available, the person's self-described occupation is in the parenthetical.

### From "very satisfied" respondents:

RN 3 (public interest group representative): "I am satisfied with the minimized services they provide because they do much more than other agencies, with far less than other agencies in comparison, and they still manage to do it with a smile. They surely deserve at least 1 million a year to be able to fulfill all of their objectives."

RN 8: "When contacting OIP Attorney-of-the-Day, we were given quick replies to resolve our situations and answer our questions. When requesting a written opinion, OIP has given us a fair opinion."

RN 12 (government attorney): "Timely and responsive. Keep leveraging technology--make opinions more searchable"

RN 14 (government official): "OIP provides helpful information and has a wonderful and friendly staff."

RN 17 (government attorney): "Training was excellent. Creative and proactive, service oriented."

RN 20 (media representative): "Almost always helpful, well-reasoned, and effective. Without OIP, many government departments, boards or commissions would happily seal their actions away from public view. OIP's opinions have most often resolved an issue in the public's favor. No suggestions other than gather allies for more funding and staffing"

RN 48 (private individual): "Great information. Terrific knowledge. Fast response. Well advertised Maui conference with very knowledgeable information provided. Emphasize Attorney of the Day call number service."

RN 49 (government attorney): "Staff is very helpful. The advice and guidance given has always been promptly given and correct. I don't have a problem with the services provided. One way the opinions could be more helpful is if they were part of a searchable database."

From “satisfied” respondents:

RN 5 (government attorney): “OIP is generally very responsive to requests for informal opinions. However, I do believe OIP, like any other agency is not infallible, and the availability of an appeal is a necessary safety valve when it is necessary to balance sunshine and UIPA policies with other legal and professional mandates. I think OIP has been remarkably responsive and provided exceptional outreach and training given its staffing constraints. I can’t really think of any additional measures it can take.”

RN 6 (government attorney): “Satisfied. Very helpful and responsive.”

RN 11 (government attorney): “Great AOD service...useful for me as I advise a board and often times need quick advice.”

RN 13 (government attorney): “I have not used OIP’s services, but I would like to see OIP have the power, in the capacity of an administrative panel under a quasi-judicial setting, to hear complaints against agencies and boards re: open practices and make adjudicatory findings and orders. Agencies and/or complainants could then appeal through administrative process and the courts pending the satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the outcome of the hearing. Become active ‘amicus’ participants in cases in which boards and agencies violate open practice laws.”

RN 16 (government attorney): “Openline newsletter is informative and helpful in bringing current issues to my attention. AOD is a useful tool when faced with an open records issue.”

RN 18 (government attorney): “Helpful information; identification of applicable opinions. Quick, helpful service. Confine written and oral OIP opinions to strict construction of applicable statutes, leaving equity and policy to the court and legislature”

RN 22 (government attorney): “Attorneys and staff are always very responsive and helpful.”

RN 28 (government attorney): “Staff is friendly and responses were timely.”

RN 34 (government attorney): “trying your best with limited resources”

RN 37 (government attorney): “Kudos to OIP for the 9/28/11 presentation was informative, free, convenient, and provided one MCPE credit. Recommend publicizing the reasons and legal basis for OIP decisions”

RN 39 (government attorney): “staff knowledgeable and courteous”

RN 40: “Every time I have contacted OIP they have gotten back to me in a timely manner.”

RN 42 (government attorney): "The services available are sufficient for my needs."

RN 45 (member of the general public): "OIP needs to resolve complaints faster. Look for grant monies for increase funding and staff."

RN 53 (county government official): "Seems less absolutist and more realistic now. UIPA guidance is good, Sunshine Law statute is extremely vague, so OIP guidance needs overall administrative perspective, rather than case-by-case statements. E.g., the guidance on serial communications and one-way communications should be qualified to make them useable. It's tough enough to develop reasonable standards; leave enforcement to the courts since they will defer to reasonable administrative interpretations."

From "dissatisfied" respondent:

RN 7 (media representative): "OIP routinely accepts excuses made by government agencies about requests requiring excessive research. City and state agencies ask for thousands of dollars for info that's free and accessible online in other states. There must be a better way to make public records public in Hawaii."