

David Crowley Response

Question 1

If elected, what concrete actions will you take to ensure your office and all agencies under your control comply with both the letter and the spirit of the public records and open meetings laws?

As Governor, I will be committed to honoring Wisconsin's long history of recognizing the importance of open government. As County Executive, I've worked to ensure openness within my office and across Milwaukee County departments. The bottom line: public records and open meetings laws should be treated as a floor, not a ceiling.

To that end, I will make commonly requested data and information readily available on agency websites, mandate public records and open meetings law training for every appointee, designate a point person in my office to monitor the records process across agencies, and direct agency legal counsel to review their records request procedures at least annually.

Most significantly, I will make Legislative documents and correspondence public records, ensuring records cannot be deleted before they are requested and closing the contractor loophole Vos and Gableman tried to use to hide public records from the courts, journalists and the public.

Question 2

In 2016, Gov. Scott Walker issued an [executive order](#) requiring state agencies to adopt best practices promoting access to public records. What do you think of this policy and will you do the same?

I think it is important to implement public records best practices to ensure transparency and responsiveness in state government and I will adopt a policy promoting ease of access (including clear information regarding how to request records), excellent customer service, robust training, and continuous improvement. As noted above, I will take action to make commonly requested data and information readily available on agency websites, mandate public records and open meetings law training for state workers, designate a point person in my office to monitor the records

process across agencies, and direct agency legal counsel to review their records request procedures at least annually.

Question 3

What if any changes should the state make to the public records and open meetings laws? Why?

There's real room for both statutory and practical reform in this space. First, I support eliminating the exemption that allows state lawmakers to avoid records retention requirements — Wisconsinites deserve the same transparency and accountability from their legislators that they expect from every other level of government. Second, I support raising the public records location fee threshold, which has sat at \$50 since 1981; that figure is long overdue for an update to ensure cost doesn't stand between the public and the records they're entitled to. Third, I'll make sure the agencies responsible for public records and open meetings compliance have the funding and staffing they need to do that work well. And finally, I'll look at broader ways to modernize our public records and open meetings laws so they keep pace with the technological and institutional changes we've seen since the 1980s.

Question 4

To what extent do you support any taxpayer funding of WisconsinEye? Why or why not?

WisconsinEye provides a vital public-transparency service, and I support providing it with taxpayer dollars. Milwaukee County offers something similar: a taxpayer-supported Legislative Information Center that gives residents real-time and archived access to committee hearings and full County Board sessions. Having served in the State Legislature and now as County Executive, I've seen firsthand how important it is for Wisconsinites to have direct access to their government — it strengthens both transparency and public participation.

Question 5

Do you support closing the [loophole](#) in Wisconsin law that exempts state legislators from record retention requirements? Why or why not?

Yes. Transparency shouldn't be something elected officials can opt out of (particularly the ones writing the law!), and records of members of the legislature should not be exempt from retention requirements. Exempting one of the three branches of government undermines public trust in the transparency of government as a whole.

Question 6

The state Assembly in February passed a proposed anti-SLAPP law, but it [died](#) in the Senate. Do you support passing an anti-SLAPP law in Wisconsin? Why or why not?

Yes. Wisconsin should join the majority of states who have passed anti-SLAPP laws and adopt the Uniform Public Expression Protection Act. Wisconsinites should not face financial ruin defending speech the Constitution already protects.