

Research Guide For Leaders



FACT PACK

RESEARCH GUIDE FOR LEADERS

Fact Pack

Center for Health, Environment and Justice
P. O. Box 6806
Falls Church, Virginia 22040

\$ 4.00

CHEJ continually updates our fact packs with information we receive from the grassroots. If you have any interesting articles to add to this fact pack, please send copies to our Science Department at the address above. This fact pack represents the most interesting, current articles and materials dealing with this issue.

You want to mobilize your community to deal with a hazardous waste problem: where do you start? One of the first things you need to do is translate that "problem" into an "issue." You need to find the answer to the questions "Who's responsible?" and "Who has the power to make the change we want?"

In any organizing effort, it is critically important to put names and faces on the issues. Part of the frustration of many people in trying to "fight City Hall" is that City Hall is a building. In "fighting the System" we often find ourselves flailing the air. On the other hand, mounting an organizing effort becomes a lot easier when you "target" the Mayor or identify some corporate magnate who (a) made the decision that caused your problem in the first place, and/or (b) has the power to fix it -- provided, of course, that you muster enough public support and turn out the troops to bring pressure to bear.

In the hazardous waste business, the entity responsible is usually some business, generally a corporation (and often a big one!). You need to get the company's name that did or wants to do the dumping. Check for permits issued by local authorities (or a state agency) for dumping. Check land ownership with the local Tax Assessor or Registrar of Deeds. HINT: the only true proof of land ownership is the deed. Though tax records are 90% reliable for establishing ownership, SOMETIMES a land owner may pay taxes through an agent, such as its lawyer, thus veiling the name of the actual land owner. There are other ways to veil ownership, such as buying land through agents, holding companies or relatives; but these are negatives that can be turned into positives, since they can lead you to "secondary targets."

Once you have the company's name, you want to find out what kind of business it is. Businesses generally take the following forms: (1) SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP -- single owner, unincorporated, minimal reporting requirements, but liability is easy to fix; the sole proprietor is also solely responsible; (2) PARTNERSHIP -- with two or more owners, unincorporated, often filed with the state under what they call a "fictitious business name," where the registration might read: "W. Sludge and B. Dreck, d.b.a. ('doing business as') S & D Associates," in which case, each partner is personally liable for what the business does; (3) CORPORATION -- where the owners are actually shareholders. Under U.S. Supreme Court rulings, the corporation itself is legally considered "a person." Under the law, shareholders and board members' liability is limited to exercising their "fiduciary responsibilities" under the rules of the corporation.

Regardless of the form of business, it should be registered with the state Secretary of State and often also with the County. Checking on the form of business is critical. Even corporations that are not headquartered in your state

must register if they are to do business in your state. In such cases, the corporation should be filed with the Secretary of State as a "foreign corporation."

Okay; now you know the name of the business and you've checked and found out that they are incorporated and registered as a "foreign corporation." Maybe it's a multi-national corporation, listing its corporate headquarters as somewhere in Delaware (where taxes are low and few questions are asked). Now what?

Corporations are generally either "closely held" (meaning that the four or five principal owners own just about all of the stock) or a "public company" (meaning that shares are openly sold to the public). Once a corporation begins using the sale of stock to the public as its means of accumulating business capital, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

To begin to develop a picture of the corporation, check with your library, where you should be able to find the following reference books:

- Funk and Scott's Index of Corporations and Industries.
- Standard and Poor's Corporation Register. (Note the names of directors and key executives.)
- Dun & Bradstreet's Million Dollar Directory.
- Moody's Manuals (Industrial, Public Utilities and Transportation).

One key reference book is the Directory of Companies Filing Annual Reports With the Securities and Exchange Commission. If your "target" is listed, you can then count on being able to gather even more information from the publicly-available, detailed reports such companies must file with the S.E.C.

In addition, check the Directory of Corporate Affiliations. In the Love Canal fight, it was vital to know that Hooker Chemical was a subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum. In the Clothing Workers Union battle with J. P. Stevens, being able to identify "corporate interlocks" (financial and Board connections) was a key part of strategy development.

One of the most important things you want to find out is money flow. What is the company's financial condition? Profit and loss? Borrowing and lending? Does it have vulnerable investments?

Next, you want to know about connections. Who owns the company? Who are the principal shareholders? Who sits on the Board? What other Boards do they sit on? Are key executives on the Boards of other companies? Is the company tied in any way to any other company? Has the company been the subject of any merger activity?

Next, you want to know about the people involved in the company. What are the names of Board members and executives? How many shares of stock do they own? How much are they paid? What are their connections with other enterprises?

Then, next, you want to find out what kind of trouble the company's been in. Has the company been involved in any major litigation? Administrative complaints? Is the company unionized? Are any parts of the company in financial trouble?

By law, public corporations are obliged to report all of the above information to the S.E.C. In fact, corporations are required to report any and all information that might have a material effect on the value of the company's stock. Here is a brief list of some of the documents companies must file and what's in them:

- 10-K report (annual). THE major document. Gives you a description of the business, properties, stock situation, major owners and directors, balance sheets, future plans, major problems (including reports on any pending material litigation, etc.).

- 10-Q report (quarterly). An updated report on the company's activities.

- 8-K report (unscheduled). Must be filed within 15 days of any major event that could affect the value of stock (e.g., changes in control of the company, acquisition or disposition of assets, changes in directors, etc.).

- Proxy Statement. In addition to being filed with the S.E.C., this statement is sent to all stockholders prior to the company's annual meeting. It gives a run-down on the meeting agenda, plus a fairly complete run-down on the Board (often with members' pictures); it notes their affiliations AND details Directors' fees and Officers' salaries, including "perks" (e.g., stock options, pensions, insurance, etc.). Some groups or leaders will buy one share of a company's stock to get these documents AND to get into shareholders' meetings.

- Forms 3 and 4. These detail the stock transactions involving directors and executives, as well as transactions involving 10% or more of the company's stock. It is from these forms that you find out EXACTLY how much of the company major figures own. You can also use these forms to track down the value of the company's stock (aside from what you can read in the newspaper).

These are all public documents. The S.E.C. contracts with a company called Disclosure, Inc. (5161 River Road, Bethesda, MD 20816; toll-free number -- 800-638-8241) for the public dissemination of these documents. Disclosure, Inc. has a handy little brochure that describes what's in each of these reports, as well as the many other reports I haven't listed here. They also distribute, free, the Directory of Companies Filing Annual Reports With the S.E.C.

Ironically, your organization may decide to go ahead and collect all of this information and then find yourself frozen in place, paralyzed by the enormity of trying to absorb and process all this data. Worse, you might find yourself addicted to the process of collecting information and using research as a substitute for action ("let's make sure we've got all the information before we make a plan"). These are two major pitfalls in the process of researching for organizing. One of the best ways to avoid these traps is to make research part of the organizing process; involve membership in the process of collection and use that information as quickly as possible in action. REMEMBER, information is not, in itself, power -- it's how you USE it that counts! We've all had experiences where we really believed that getting the truth out would win the battle, only to discover that nothing happened until people took the information and moved on it.

Additional Readings:

ACTION RESEARCH, Institute for Social Justice, 4415 San Jacinto, Dallas, TX 75204
\$4.50 + 50¢ postage & handling. (Continued)

(Additional Readings -- continued)

TACTICAL INVESTIGATIONS FOR PEOPLE'S STRUGGLES, by Barry Greever. TRAIN Institute, 10129 Thornwood Road, Kensington, MD 20895. \$1.75.

MANUAL OF CORPORATE INVESTIGATIONS, AFL-CIO, Food and Beverage Trades Dept., 815 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. \$10.00.

RESEARCH FOR ACTION. California Institute for Rural Studies, Box 530, Davis, CA 95616. \$7.50 + \$1.25 for postage & handling.

From the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115. Send for their brochure and publications list.

RESEARCH FOR ORGANIZING

Will Collette

What is Research?

Research is digging facts. Digging facts is as hard a job as mining coal. It means blowing them out from underground, cutting them, picking them, shoveling them, loading them, pushing them to the surface, weighing them, and then turning them loose on the public for fuel—for light and heat. Facts make a fire which cannot be put out.

To get coal requires miners.

To get facts requires miners, too—fact miners.

The owners know what they want and get it. The workers do not know what they want and get it in the neck.

John Brophy, Pennsylvania miner, introducing his plan for public ownership of resources at the 1921 Convention of the United Mine Workers of America.

Years later, when coal miners and their families in the famous Harlan County, Kentucky strike were finally able to prove that Judge F. Byrd Hogg was a coal operator, it gave them the will to win. Judge Hogg was on the verge of breaking their strike. He imposed injunctions limiting the number of picketers and the location of picket lines to the point where picketing was less than useless—it was dispiriting. He threw miners and their wives in jail for violating his orders. He abused the strikers in open court. He was a coal operator, the miners knew, because he looked like a coal operator, smelled like one, and certainly acted like one. To carry on, they had to prove it.

And they did, by searching property records and incorporation papers, and by talking to people in their own as well as neighboring counties. Finally, after weeks of digging, they discovered that Judge Hogg owned a mine several counties away. They secured copies of the incorporation papers and the next time they clashed with Judge Hogg in his Harlan County courtroom, they displayed the papers for all to see. Judge Hogg was excused from the case and was replaced by a more impartial magistrate.

Research for organizing is, indeed, a powerful force, creating a "fire which cannot be put out." When unemployed workers in Rhode Island

learned, during the height of the 1973-75 Recession, that there was a little-known and never-enforced law on the books that required most local hospitals to provide free health care to people who couldn't afford to pay, they got angry. Here was a solution to their problem at hand and it had been kept a secret. They proceeded to launch the first statewide organizing effort to enforce the Hill-Burton law and established Hill-Burton as a staple organizing issue for other groups around the country.

Of all of the tasks involved in community organizing, few are as crucial as research and fewer are handled as awkwardly. Research for organizing is not the same as the other kinds of research commonly seen and understood by most people. It is different from academic research, investigative reporting, or even public interest research. Still, it is one of the most rewarding tasks when done well.

Why Do Research?

Whenever you use a tool, you will always use it better when you have clear reasons for doing so. Research for organizing has the following uses:

- Gathering facts that support your position. As you gather and evaluate information, you can refine the way you present an issue, clarifying and sharpening the focus.
- Gathering facts that weaken your opponent's position.
- Dispelling fear and doubt.
- Building confidence.
- Getting people angry and, often, gaining the evidence you need to build public outrage.
- Clearly identifying and focusing sharply on the proper targets.
- Pinpointing your opponent's strengths and weaknesses and, in the process, identifying yours as well.
- Mapping out fruitful areas for recruitment of new members.
- Identifying areas of research that require further investigation.
- Building leadership and getting people involved. When organizing research is made a group project, participating members gain confidence and self-respect. They gain a greater sense of "ownership" of the issue and the manner in which the issue is handled when *they* have done the research themselves.

Types of Research

There are a number of parts to organizing research. Some are discrete but most overlap. Research is an ongoing process that occurs before you begin organizing, throughout each campaign, and after the campaign is over in the process called "monitoring."

The most important forms of organizing research are:

Community Analysis

This research involves the collection and analysis of details about the community in which you are organizing. Key items include: physical geography; population demographics; "mapping out" patterns of community services; identification of potential allies and resources; pinpointing leaders and potential leaders; spotting issues; dividing the community up according to such patterns as income, race, and ethnicity; identifying major business or industrial centers and so on. The list may be expanded or contracted according to conditions in your community.

Power Structure Analysis

The key to this analysis is gathering the information needed to graph the relationships of power in your community. It's essential to know who your community's power brokers are in general, and to do the same for every issue your group selects. For each issue, there are two key questions: (1) Who is responsible for causing the problem? and (2) Who has the power to solve the problem? These questions should be investigated separately, even though the answers, in many cases, may be the same. As part of this graphing process, power structure analysis involves drawing a picture of the "chain of command" among the policy makers. In addition to the formal, legislated lines of command, the researcher must also factor in informal power relationships. The bureaucrat you have targeted in your organizing may have a formal, legal responsibility to report to the next person within the agency, but may be far more under the sway of a powerful politician or businessman whose name will never appear in that agency's table of organization.

Targeting Research

This is a research form that is partly community analysis and mostly power structure analysis. When you select a "target," you are choosing the person your group will "attack." This choice is pure strategy and involves a number of questions: Can this person give us what we want? Do we have enough power or "leverage" to make this person do what we want? If we fail to "win" with this person, do we have any recourse? Can we find and reach this person effectively?

Fact Gathering and Analysis

This is an ongoing process. In organizing, this kind of research includes studying corporate annual reports or profit and loss statements, analyzing statistics, looking at budgets, reading newspapers and saving poten

tially useful news clips, and maintaining files on important programs, people, businesses, et cetera. Organizers and leaders must be constantly on the lookout for useful information. Volunteers should clip items from the paper and flag potentially useful intelligence.

Sometimes, we know what kind of fact gathering and analysis we need to do, such as obtaining information on laws, regulations, or budgets that relate to the ongoing campaign. Other times, however, our fact gathering is hardly more than a fishing expedition or insurance against some future need for information in a yet-to-be-launched campaign.

Monitoring

This is a form of fact gathering and analysis that occurs most commonly after, but sometimes before an organizing effort. Precampaign monitoring can help to establish whether or not a "target" is behaving badly as suspected and to decide when an issue is "ripe" enough to generate broad public interest. After the party's over, we know from experience that we can count on our opponents to "backslide," to renege on agreements and concessions they have made. If we are to maintain credibility with our friends, as well as our enemies, we must be able to determine when that happens and take action. We also conduct postcampaign monitoring for the benefit of leaders and membership who have a right to know that their work resulted in a lasting change.

Putting Research to Use

Each type of organizing research has practical, strategic applications. These are some common examples:

- You can use community analysis to target the best neighborhoods for organizing. You can spot potential issues that can be used to start discussions on the doorstep. (Example: "I noticed the closest fire station is three miles away across the river.")
- You can use power structure analysis to predict how and where your opponents will retaliate and plan countermeasures. (Example: The Leverage Company owns the bank that does most of the mortgage lending to your members.)
- You can determine what available sources of money your opponent has to finance your group's demands. You can also plan your answer for the inevitable response, "We just don't have the money for that." (Example: "You have \$375,000 in unspent discretionary funds.")
- You can establish the legal basis and precedents for what your group wants. You can be prepared to cite chapter and verse when your opponent resists. (Example: "According to the Hill-Burton Act, you must give \$100,000 in free care this year.")

- You can prepare comparisons between the conditions members of your group must endure in their lives and the way your opponents live. (Example: Joe Slumhausen has a stable with horses on his estate; his tenants have rats and roaches.)
- You can uncover past indiscretions and other embarrassments committed by your opponent and use them in your strategy. (Example: Bill Crackerbox's store has been sued and fined twelve times for consumer code violations in the past two years.)
- You can unearth the sources of financing and ownership behind your opponent and use these findings to go after a secondary target. (Example: Dave Dioxin is getting a loan from Contradictory Interest Bank to finance the development of a toxic waste landfill.)
- You can find people who share an interest in your group's issue. (Example: Nomeracy General Hospital is suing 500 people for nonpayment of bills; these people may be very interested in your group's campaign for free hospital care for the unemployed.)
- You can uncover hidden connections. (Example: All patronage jobs must be cleared by Boss Cigar, ward leader of the Second District, and most politicians are very reluctant to cross him.)
- You can counter scare tactics used by your opponent. (Example: According to company records included in their annual report, Achilles Company is so heavily invested in your county that in order to move, they'd have to shut down operations for six months.)

All of us bring our biases into the process of organizing research and these are among the first barriers that need to be overcome in order to approach the work in a way that is strategically and tactically useful. The most common error is to do little or no research. This is closely followed in frequency and seriousness by the error of doing too much research. The third most common error is to bureaucratize the task, making it a closely held staff function, thus devaluing the interests and talents of members.

Error #1: Little or No Research

Some organizers don't like to be bothered by the facts. Others figure, "I didn't drop out of Conformity State University to be a hell-raiser just to get my nose stuck in more books." Both classes of antiresearchers can argue, "We don't need a lot of research if we've got enough people." In fact, they're right! You need people more than facts to win and there are plenty of great stories about organizing campaigns that were won because the people were there and were strong, despite the fact that they were out to lunch on the research.

But they were also wasting a lot of energy and taking a terrible risk that need not have been taken. Suppose the opponent were to raise that fatal

"smoking pistol," that piece of information that totally contradicts your group's position? People can feel awfully stupid, demoralized, and angry (often at their organizers) when the basic homework is not done.

And wouldn't the group be stronger when armed with the correct information? Wouldn't it be easier to recruit more people and prepare them for stronger action when everyone has the confidence that comes from having the facts?

Error #2: Too Much Research

Shel Trapp of National People's Action characterizes this error as becoming "slaves to research." The danger signs include: delaying action until "we can gather just a little more research," letting the researchers call the shots and set the tempo for organizing, and thinking that "once this stuff gets in the paper, they'll have to give in." It is time for people in your group to reassess how research is done when you discover that you're producing more reports and exposés and giving more "facts" to the media than doing actions.

These two "errors" (too little and too much research) beg the question, How much research is enough? The answer is another question, How much research do you need to organize enough people to fight and win? Research is a tool, not an end product.

Error #3: Staff Does it All

Many organizers burn themselves out when they fail, for whatever reason, to delegate organizing jobs, or to motivate and train members to do them well. We often find it easier in the short run to do a job ourselves than to take the time and effort to recruit and prepare people to do it. And everytime we rush to "hustle" a leader to help us out with a task and they fail to carry out the chore according to our standards, it reinforces that perception that they "just don't have what it takes; they can't be trusted."

Involving leaders and members in research is one of the most common instances in which we commit the error of failing to delegate. This does not mean, however, that every time there is a research chore to do, you can and must get a leader or member to do it. As with all aspects of organizing, involving people in research work ought to be thought through and done according to a plan.

For instance, does it make sense to ask Ms. Smith, your local chapter chairperson, to head up a research team, when you're already asking her to lead planning meetings, chair the regular chapter meetings, lead actions, head up the fund raising committee, and be part of the planning committee for your annual convention? Does it make sense to ask Mr. Jones, a

new member who is still "testing" out the organization, to choose between going on actions or being part of the research committee? Though it depends on circumstances that only you, the member in question, and other leaders can decide, the answer in both instances is probably "no."

How you involve members in research is also a matter that requires careful consideration. Should you use members to test out potential "blind alleys" in research to save yourself time? Some community researchers would argue that you should only ask members to conduct investigations where the prospects of a good result *are* strong, so that members will not sour to the task and resent you for wasting their time. Others believe that members, like organizers, must learn to take the good with the bad and should know what *isn't* available, as well as what is.

Some Tips for Researchers

- "Only believe what you see with your own two eyes—and have your eyes examined regularly." In the journalism business, this is called "confirmation." In organizing research, much of what you can collect, mainly because of limitations of time and resources, may be rumor, hearsay, and other unsubstantiated information. While I am not making any apologies for this grim fact of life, *you* as the researcher must know the difference between proof and semi-intelligent opinion. And, if you want to be responsible, you ought to make sure that everyone else in the group knows what you have (and what you don't). Wherever possible, substantiate, and the best way to do that is get it in writing.

- Use the phone, but understand its limitations. The phone is a vital research tool, but a phone conversation is not proof. The phone is good for helping you to locate the whereabouts of information that you can then go and see, hopefully to confirm either in writing or by photograph. But telephone sources can lie, can hide their emotions so much better than when you can see them face-to-face, and you are not likely to get more than what you ask for. When you visit a source in person, you can get information just from papers lying on desks or on file cabinets, or written on bulletin boards or chalkboards. You might see a report or document you didn't even know existed.

- Develop sources and use them well. Honor confidentiality promises. Many good resources, such as reporters, academics, and others who do research for a living respond well to compliments. As you will discover when you do research, the researcher seldom gets many strokes. Keep a file of good research contacts. Ask them about their research resources and keep note of their answers.

My best "inside sources" were always lower-level bureaucrats, often people who have been passed over for promotion or who have other rea-

sons for wanting their bosses to look bad. When you find such a "Deep Throat," you *must* protect them. It is all right to ask them straight out if you can use their name. By so doing, you make them understand that you are sensitive to possible concerns about confidentiality.

- Know the rules for access to information. Generally, organizing researchers start with the resolve that the public has a right to information. And generally this is true, well-supported by law and established procedure. But understand that in most bureaucracies, the only power the lower-level bureaucrat has is the "power to obstruct." Added to that is a general suspicion of anyone out of the ordinary asking out of the ordinary questions. Courthouse records on just about all civil cases and most criminal actions are open to the public, for example, but the court house clerks are very leery of letting anyone other than lawyers or their employees use those records. I have seen court clerks make up their own rules for access and have gone through the internal debate over whether or not to argue for my rights under law. Usually, I play the game by their rules, within reason, and not make an issue of their lack of cooperation.

The same goes for invoking your rights under the Freedom of Information Act or state Open Records and Sunshine Laws. Sometimes you must weigh your feelings of indignation when your civil liberties are inhibited with how your action will affect the source. For example, playing the game with the court clerks a few times may bring them to loosen up and offer you invaluable aid, whereas if you were to get tough, you would get nothing but rote cooperation. Remember, your objective in research for organizing is not to expand the horizons of the First Amendment but to get useful information for your organization.

- Don't overlook or minimize routine sources of information. I have seen researchers puzzle over the problem of how to get a target's home address for hours when they could have found it in seconds just by looking in the phone book. Read the newspaper and keep a clippings file. You can combine organizing methods and the classic research method of the survey—you get to talk to people about an issue and gather valuable information. Talking to people will usually be the most effective way of collecting intelligence.

- Make a plan. Organizing research is not "pure" or academic research. What do you want to know? Why do you need to know it? Where will you find it? Don't lose sight of the issue for which the research is conducted. Your research is useless if it is (1) too complicated to be distilled into a simple fact sheet or given to leaders in briefing; (2) too late to be used in the organizing campaign; (3) unfocused or off the point; or (4) wrong.

- Finally, let people in on the fun. I once helped prepare a team of new leaders to go over to their County Building to investigate property owner-

ship records. This was the first time any of them had even set foot inside that building. Several hours later they returned not just with very useful information that was later used to organize, but with a new sense of confidence. "For the first time," said one of the leaders, "I felt like those people (in the County Building) worked for *me*!"

Don't underestimate people. The first time I taught leaders how to do budget analysis, I asked in advance that they bring a pocket calculator if they owned one. I was scolded by my colleagues who told me that, since this was the rural South and the leaders were poor, no one would have a calculator or would know how to use one. When the time came for people to pull out their calculators, nearly everyone in the group had one and was prepared to click away at the figures. When textile mill workers were assembled to research the holdings and power of J. P. Stevens in their South Carolina town, no one really believed they could do it. When residents in Appalachia were mobilized to study land ownership and use patterns in their regions, many outsiders had their doubts. No one really took the housewives of Love Canal seriously when they started an in-depth health study on the effects of toxic chemicals on their community.

In each case, the job was done, probably better than if it had been taken on by a team of Ph.D.'s, and the research helped build strong people's movements. In each case, the information was owned by the people who intended to use it to fight for their families, jobs, homes, and interests. It is amazing what you can do with a little common sense, some street smarts, and a determination to fight for what is yours.

References (Write to the source for the prices)

- AFL-CIO, Food and Beverage Trades Dept., 815 Sixteenth St. NW, Washington, DC 20006. *Manual of Corporate Investigation: Building Profits of Public and Private Companies*. 1981.
- California Institute for Rural Studies, Box 530, Davis, CA 95616. Villarejo, Donald. *Research for Action: A Guidebook to Public Records Investigation for Community Activists*.
- Disclosure, Inc., 5161 River Road, Bethesda, MD 20816. *SEC Filing Company*, 1982.
- Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115. "Corporate Examiner" (monthly) and other books.
- Institute for Local Self-Reliance, 1717 Eighteenth St. NW, Washington, DC 20009.
- Batko, William, *How to Research Your Local Bank*. 1976.
- Institute for Social Justice, 4415 San Jacinto, Dallas, TX 75204. Katz, Jim. *Action Research*.
- Midwest Academy, 600 W. Fullerton, Chicago, IL 60614. *Research Package: Open up the Books*.
- National Training and Information Center, 954 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago,

IL 60607. Trapp, Shel. *Researching Corporations: Developing Community/Corporate Partnerships; Me, a Researcher? Yes You!*

New England Training Center for Community Organizers, 295 Promenade St., Providence, RI 02908. Ryan, Ellen. *Housing Research Guide*.

TRAIN Institute, 10129 Thornwood Road, Kensington, MD 20895. Greever, Barry. *Tactical Investigations for Peoples Struggles*; Greever, Barry. *Checking on Elected Officials*; Greever, Barry, Collette, Will, and Beckwith, Dave. *Strategic and Tactical Research*.

APPENDIX I

State Laws on Freedom of Information/Open Records

All states with the exception of Mississippi have statutes governing what is and is not considered to be public information accessible to the public; Mississippi still operates on a common law basis (but see Mississippi General Statutes §25-53-53 on confidential versus public information). Below is the table, taken from an excellent review of state laws in Fordham Law Review, Volume 45, pp. 1104 et seq. (1977).

<u>State</u>	<u>Law Cite</u>
Alabama	Title 41 §§145-147
Alaska	Stat. §§09.25.110-.120
Arizona	R.S.A. §§39-121.01-.02
Arkansas	Stat. Ann. §§12-2801 to 2807
California	Govt. Code §§6250-61
Colorado	R.S.A. §§24-72-201 to -206
Connecticut	G.S.A. §§1-15 to -21k
Delaware	Code Ann. Title 29 §§10001-5
Florida	Stat. Ann. §§119.01-.12
Georgia	Code Ann. §§40-2700 to -2703
Hawaii	Rev. Stat. §§92-21,-50 to -52
Idaho	Code §§9-301 to -306, 59-1009
Illinois	Ann. Stat. ch. 116, §§43.4-.28, .101-103a;-113
Indiana	Ann. Stat. §§5-14-1-1 to -6
Iowa	Code Ann. §§68A.1-.9
Kansas	Stat. Ann. §45-201 to -208
Kentucky	Rev. Stat. Ann. §§61.870-.884
Louisiana	Rev. Stat. Ann. §§44:1-:7,:31-:39
Maine	Rev. Stat. Ann. Title 1, §§401-410
Maryland	Code Ann. Article 76A, §§1-6
Massachusetts	Gen. Laws ch. 4 §7, ch. 66 §10
Michigan	Comp. Laws Ann. §§24.201-.223, 750.492
Minnesota	Stat. Ann. §15.17
Missouri	Ann. Stat. §§109.180-190
Montana	Rev. Codes Ann. §§59-512, 93-1001-1 to -4

<u>State</u>	<u>Law Cite</u>
Nebraska	Rev. Stat. §§25-1280, 84-712 to 7.2.03
Nevada	Rev. Stat. §§239.10, .020, 600
New Hampshire	Rev. Stat. Ann. §§91-A:1-:8
New Jersey	Stat. Ann. §§47:1A-1 to -4
New Mexico	Stat. Ann. §§71-5-1 to -3
New York	Public Officers Law §§85-89
North Carolina	Gen. Stat. §§132-1 to -9
North Dakota	Cent. Code §44-04-18
Ohio	Rev. Code Ann. §§149.43, .99
Oklahoma	Stat. Ann. ch. 51 §24
Oregon	Rev. Stat. §§192.410-.500
Pennsylvania	Stat. Ann. Title 65 §§66.1-.4
South Carolina	Code Ann. §§1-20 to .20.6
South Dakota	Comp. Laws Ann. §§1-27-1 to -3
Rhode Island	Gen. Law §§38-2-1 to -12
Tennessee	Code Ann. §§15-305 to -308
Texas	Rev. Civ. Stat. Ann. art. 6252 <u>et seq.</u>
Utah	Code Ann. §§78-26-1 to -3
Vermont	Stat. Ann. Title 1, §§315-320; Title 3, §§801-802
Virginia	Code Ann. §§2.1-340 to -346
Washington	Rev. Code Ann. §§42.17.010-.020,.250-.3
West Virginia	Code Ann. §29A-2-2
Wisconsin	Stat. Ann. §§19.21, 59.14
Wyoming	Stat. Ann. §§9-692.1-.5

The National Freedom of Information Center has all of these state laws available in their most recently revised forms, together with comparisons of what is included and excluded by each act and costs for copying, etc. See footnote 3 of the Fordham Law Review article. Advocates should check the law cites above to find any recent revisions or reclassifications.