

WES MOORE
GOVERNOR

ARUNA MILLER
LT. GOVERNOR



SAREESH RAWAT, CHAIR
SAMUEL G. ENCARNACION
DEBRA LYNN GARDNER
NIVEK M. JOHNSON
VACANT

STATE OF MARYLAND
PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT COMPLIANCE BOARD

PIACB 26-57

June 10, 2026

Maryland State Retirement & Pension System, Custodian
Lowen Crusan, Complainant

This complaint concerns complainant Lowen Crusan's Public Information Act ("PIA") request to the Maryland State Retirement and Pension System ("MSRPS"), initially asking for all email records from the email accounts assigned to him during his employment with MSRPS, which included a span of about twenty months. MSRPS advised the complainant that the response to his PIA request would generate a fee between \$38,184.48 and \$50,766.48. The complainant then narrowed his request, which resulted in a fee estimate between \$939.87 and \$1,222.02. Later, that fee was reduced again to \$351.14 to \$442.35. The complainant alleges that this fee estimate is unreasonable under the PIA, particularly with respect to the time charged for anticipated legal review. In response to the complaint, counsel for MSRPS maintains that the fee is reasonable under § 4-206¹ of the PIA. As explained below, we find the estimated fee unreasonable to the extent that it charges attorney time to conduct the entire review of records.

Background

On September 2, 2025, the complainant sent a PIA request to MSRPS seeking "[a]ll email communications and electronic messages sent from, received by, or stored in the email account(s) assigned to [him] during [his] employment with [MSRPS] from 01/01/24 through 8/27/25." The complainant advised that his request included "[a]ll emails in all email folders," "[a]ll email attachments," "[c]alendar entries and meeting invitations," "[a]ny archived or backed-up email data," and "[d]eleted emails that can be recovered." The complainant provided his employment details, including his job position and employee ID number. In addition, the complainant stated that he was a "person in interest" under §§ 4-101(g) and 4-311(b) of the PIA.² After receipt of his PIA request, MSRPS sent the

¹ Statutory citations are to the General Provisions Article of Maryland's Annotated Code unless otherwise specified.

² Under § 4-101(g)(1), a "person in interest" is "a person or governmental unit that is the subject of a public record." In some instances, a person in interest has a greater right of access to public records. For example, § 4-311(a) normally forbids disclosure of individuals' personnel records, but under § 4-311(b)(1), the person in interest has a right to inspect their own personnel records.

complainant a ten-day letter³ explaining that a preliminary search returned over 113,000 potentially responsive records. MSRPS advised that it anticipated that its IT department would need eight hours to compile the records, which would require between 600 and 800 hours of legal review, resulting in an estimated fee between \$38,184.48 and \$50,766.48. MSRPS stated that the complainant would be “required to pay the low end of this estimate” before work would begin. MSRPS also advised that narrowing the scope of the PIA request might significantly reduce the estimated fee.

In response to the ten-day letter, the complainant asked that responsive records be defined as meeting at least two out of three specific conditions, namely that the emails: (1) reference the complainant’s name or employee ID number; (2) contain “employment status or action key words in the subject line or body,” e.g., “performance,” “appeal,” or “human resources”; or (3) have been sent to, from, or between five specific individuals or “other individuals acting in a supervisory, HR, or personnel capacity regarding [the complainant’s] employment.” On September 15, 2025, after exchanging emails with MSRPS in an effort to clarify the scope of his amended request, the complainant sent a new “revised records request.” That PIA request sought “all email communications and electronic messages in Agency custody, from January 1, 2025 through today’s date” that: (1) referenced the complainant’s name or employee ID number; (2) discussed, proposed, or related to “any changes in employment status,” including, e.g., “disciplinary action” or “performance reviews”; (3) were sent to, from, or between five specific individuals or others acting in a supervisory or personnel capacity as to the complainant; and (4) included certain keywords in the subject line or body, e.g., “discipline,” “evaluation,” “human resources,” or “reassignment.” The complainant asked MSRPS to “exclude routine administrative communications (such as payroll or IT helpdesk messages) unless they specifically reference [his] name, employee ID, or any of the keywords listed above.”

After receipt of his revised PIA request, MSRPS sent the complainant another letter advising that it expected that “the review process will take 16-20 hours for IT to compile the responsive records, and 1-2 hours for a complete legal review.” MSRPS thus estimated that the fee would be between \$939.87 and \$1,222.02, and again asked the complainant to pay the low end of the fee estimate (\$939.87) before MSRPS would commence work on the response. After learning of the new estimated fees, the complainant requested a fee waiver “based on the compelling public benefits that will result from disclosure of these records.” MSRPS denied the complainant’s fee waiver request.⁴

³ See § 4-203(b)(2), which requires a custodian who “reasonably believes that it will take more than 10 working days to produce the public record” to advise of such in writing and provide certain information, including the reason for the delay and an estimate of any fees that might be associated with production.

⁴ The complainant and MSRPS exchanged several in-depth emails regarding the complainant’s fee waiver request. We do not detail them here, as we lack jurisdiction over a custodian’s decision to deny a fee waiver.

On October 6, 2025, the complainant sent another revised PIA request, stating that he was “seeking records pertaining to [his] employment as former Director of Systems Development.” The complainant asked for “electronic copies from June 15, 2025 through today’s date of”:

1. **The original document files** in native format (Word/PDF) with complete file metadata (creation date, last modified date, author, application) for:
 - “LCrusan Jun 30 2025 PEP EOC – Signed” (or similar filename)
 - “LCrusan Jun 30 2025 PEP Attachment” (or similar filename)
 - Any other versions or drafts of these documents
2. **Email communications** sent to, from, or between Chandra Puranam, HR staff, or DBM personnel regarding:
 - Submission of these documents to DBM or Workday
 - Creation, completion, or processing of my PEP for the 30 Jun 2025 cycle

The complainant asked MSRPS to “exclude routine administrative communications unless they specifically reference the PEP document or its submission to DBM/Workday.” Noting that he was facing a filing deadline related to an appeal, the complainant asked that the records be produced within ten business days. The complainant also asked that fees be waived, stating that disclosure of the records was in the public interest for multiple reasons. On October 14, 2025, MSRPS produced responsive records, noting that one record had been redacted to shield personnel information of another individual. In addition, MSRPS advised that responsive records were in PDF format, as “a custodian is not required under the PIA to provide documents in native format and is permitted to remove metadata.” Finally, MSRPS stated that the response “exhausted the two hours of preparation free of charge”⁵ to which the complainant was entitled, and thus “any subsequent request pertaining to [the complainant’s] personnel records [would] be aggregated into this request,” resulting in a fee.

On October 7, 2025, before receiving the records from MSRPS, the complainant contacted the Public Access Ombudsman to request dispute resolution assistance.⁶ The complainant disputed both MSRPS’s \$939.87 to \$1,222.02 fee estimate and the denial of his request for a fee waiver. New search parameters were developed through the mediation

⁵ See § 4-206(c).

⁶ The PIA directs the Public Access Ombudsman to “make reasonable attempts to resolve disputes between applicants and custodians relating to requests for public records.” § 4-1B-04(a). Before submitting a complaint to our Board, a complainant must attempt to resolve a dispute through the Ombudsman and receive a final determination that the dispute was not resolved. § 4-1A-05(a).

process, resulting in a new estimated fee range of \$351.14 to \$442.35. The new range reflected 3.25 hours of IT work and 2.75 to four hours of legal review. On January 13, 2026, the Ombudsman issued a final determination stating that the disputes were not resolved and the complainant filed this complaint with our Board.⁷

The complaint alleges that MSRPS's estimated fees are unreasonable and arbitrary. The complainant asserts that the "fee calculation history demonstrates a lack of consistent methodology or reliance on actual costs," noting that "[o]ver the course of three estimates, [MSRPS's] calculations for 'legal review' have fluctuated wildly in ways that do not correlate to the volume of records." The complainant also questions the legitimacy of MSRPS's use of a "price range," suggesting that this "demonstrates that [MSRPS] has not identified the specific employee or salary grade required for the work." Finally, the complainant argues that the fees have been "calculated to evade scrutiny," as the reduced fee amount "sits exactly \$1.14 above the Board's \$350 jurisdictional threshold" and "raises questions about whether the calculation reflects actual costs or was designed to deter [him] while attempting to avoid Board review."

In response to the complaint, counsel for MSRPS defends MSRPS's fee estimate, maintaining that it is reasonable under the PIA. Counsel explains that the \$351.14 to \$442.35 estimated fee was based on the new search parameters, which sought email records from January 1, 2025, through September 15, 2025, that referenced the complainant's name or employee ID number and were sent to, from, or between five specific individuals and *either* (1) discussed, proposed, or related to any changes in the complainant's employment status *or* (2) included certain keywords, such as "disciplinary action" or "role reassignment." Counsel represents that MSRPS's IT staff "created and validated multiple [search] queries based on these parameters over the course of 3.25 hours, ultimately producing 334 responsive records." Counsel for MSRPS states that the \$351.14 to \$442.35 fee estimate is "based on IT's actual production time and counsel's anticipated time for legal review," which was expected to take 2.75 to four hours and "assum[ed] a review time of 30 to 45 seconds per record."

Counsel for MSRPS asserts that the fee estimate complies with § 4-206 of the PIA, as it "incorporates both the actual hours of work already completed by IT and the anticipated time needed for counsel to perform a complete legal review." Counsel states that, in the interests of minimizing legal review costs, "IT spent 3.25 hours writing and validating a series of detailed and targeted search queries." Counsel argues that close legal review is necessary given the nature and subject-matter of the records. According to counsel, there is a "high potential" that the records contain information protected by the attorney-client privilege. In addition, counsel states, the records may contain personnel

⁷ The complainant sent a new PIA request to MSRPS on November 1, 2025, asking for an email he sent to a specific individual "on the morning of August 27th." MSRPS produced that email to the complainant on November 6, 2025, at no cost.

information of other individuals, and confidential commercial information, financial information, and/or trade secrets subject to § 4-335's mandatory exemption. As to the estimated time for review—thirty to forty-five seconds per record—counsel suggests that this is a reasonable and “conservative estimate.”

Turning to the hourly rates charged, counsel for MSRPS states that MSRPS has “consistently calculated these estimates using a rate of \$54.81 per hour for any work completed by IT and \$62.91 per hour for all legal review by counsel.” Counsel represents that the rates are “based on the prorated hourly rate, excluding benefits, of the two individuals working on the request,” and that the individuals “also constitute the lowest-paid available employees capable of producing the response.” Counsel stresses that MSRPS has advised the complainant that “if the actual cost is the product of less than the required deposit of \$351.14, [MSRPS] will refund the difference to the complainant.”

As for the time needed for review—and, specifically, the complainant's allegation that the fee estimates are arbitrary given the different estimations of time needed for that review—counsel for MSRPS argues that the “claim ignores the obvious fact that estimates as to legal review are not made in isolation but are directly dependent upon the time needed by IT to provide the responsive records.” As example, counsel points out that the complainant's first PIA request was “so broad that it required little time for IT to develop a search query but nevertheless resulted in a yield of over 113,000 records and thus hundreds of hours of legal review.”

Counsel defends MSRPS's provision of a range of fees by noting that § 4-203(b)(2) specifically requires a custodian to provide an estimate of the range of fees, if the custodian is unable to produce records within ten working days. Counsel maintains that an estimate “cannot include the literal actual costs.” Counsel also questions the complainant's assertion that, in quoting a fee just above this Board's jurisdictional threshold, MSRPS is attempting to deter his requests and evade review of their fees. Counsel states that, if MSRPS was “selecting an arbitrary figure meant to evade the scrutiny of the Board . . . it stands to reason that it would have generated a fee estimate *under the jurisdictional threshold*, not over.”

In his reply, the complainant describes the dispute about legal review time as “the core issue before the Board,” and asserts that MSRPS has failed to adequately address that issue. The complainant rejects MSRPS's explanation for the varying amounts of estimated legal review time. In particular, the complainant argues that MSRPS's estimate that it will take counsel thirty to forty-five seconds to review each of the 344 records is “unsubstantiated,” noting that the records consist of emails, some of which may be very short. In addition, the complainant accuses MSRPS of an “arithmetic discrepancy” as to how it calculated the rates, stating that the high-end rate should be \$429.77. The complainant challenges MSRPS's decision to “aggregate” future PIA requests for records

concerning the complainant's employment, contending that MSRPS should have and did not account for the two free hours of labor it must provide under § 4-206(c).

Finally, although the complainant acknowledges that the potential exemptions involved “may justify *some* legal review time,” the complainant argues that the PIA does not permit MSRPS to charge for an attorney to conduct the entire review of all 334 records. The complainant asserts that the records have been “pre-filtered” to include only emails that reference to him by name or employee ID number, sent between five “named supervisors,” that “discuss employment actions or contain specific employment-related keywords.” The complainant suggests that the records present review tasks “routinely performed by paralegals and trained staff in document review,” and that legal review of the entire production is not necessary. The complainant also questions whether it actually did—or should have—taken IT staff 3.25 hours to write and validate the search queries, stating that the search parameters used “translate to a compound query combining name/ID terms, custodian filters, employment keywords, and a date range.” According to the complainant, “[t]his is a standard search operation,” and MSRPS's assertion that it took IT 3.25 hours of work “suggests either that [MSRPS's] search infrastructure is unusually limited or that IT performed substantially more work than a straightforward keyword search requires.” The complainant argues that he should not have to “bear the cost of operational inefficiency.”

Analysis

The PIA directs us to review and resolve complaints that allege certain violations of its provisions, including that a custodian charged an unreasonable fee higher than \$350 to produce public records. § 4-1A-04(a)(1)(ii). When we receive a complaint concerning an alleged unreasonable fee, we forward it to the relevant custodian for a written response. § 4-1A-06(a). After review of the parties' submissions, if we determine that the fee is unreasonable under the PIA, we must issue a written decision and order the custodian to “reduce the fee to an amount determined by the Board to be reasonable and refund the difference,” if applicable. § 4-1A-04(a)(2) and (3)(ii).

The PIA requires that custodians of public records allow inspection and copying of those records, unless an exemption from disclosure applies. §§ 4-201(a), 4-205(b). To inspect public records, a requester ordinarily must submit a written request to the custodian. § 4-202(a). Upon receipt of a written PIA request, a custodian must “conduct a search in good faith that is reasonably designed to capture all responsive records.” *Glass v. Anne Arundel*, 453 Md. 201, 232 (2017). Normally, a custodian must “grant or deny” a PIA request “promptly,” and no more than thirty days after receipt of the request. § 4-203(a). While the PIA favors disclosure, § 4-103(b), not all public records are subject to inspection. Instead, the PIA contains both mandatory and discretionary disclosure exemptions. *See, e.g.*, § 4-311 (mandatory exemption for individuals' personnel records); § 4-336

(mandatory exemption for individuals' financial information); § 4-351 (discretionary exemption for certain law enforcement records).

Although generally the PIA must be interpreted to favor of disclosure of public records with “the least cost and least delay,” § 4-103(b), the PIA also permits custodians to charge a “reasonable fee” for the work associated with responding to a PIA request, § 4-206(b). A “reasonable fee” is a fee that bears a “reasonable relationship to the recovery of actual costs incurred by a governmental unit” when responding to a PIA request. § 4-206(a)(3). Actual costs may include the costs of searching for, preparing, and reproducing the responsive records. § 4-206(b)(1). To calculate the cost of staff and attorney time, the PIA directs custodians to use the individual's prorated salary and the “actual time attributable to the search for and preparation of a public record.” § 4-206(b)(2). A custodian may not charge a fee for the first two hours of labor “needed to search for a public record and prepare it for inspection.” § 4-206(c).

We start by identifying the fee at issue here. Though MSRPS has estimated that the fee may range from \$351.14 to \$442.35, MSRPS has asked the complainant to “pay the low end of this estimate, \$351.14.” Thus, under § 4-206(b), MSRPS has “charged” the complainant a fee of \$351.14. *See* PIACB 22-07, at 4-5 (Feb. 3, 2022) (discussing authority to review estimated fees). MSRPS must, in turn, demonstrate that the \$351.14 estimated fee that it charged is reasonably related to the actual costs it anticipates incurring as it responds to the complainant's PIA request. *See* PIACB 23-33, at 4, (Oct. 5, 2023) (noting that the “operative word” in § 4-206(b) is “charged,” and that “it does not matter whether the fee represents an actual fee for work already performed or an estimated fee for work anticipated”). To resolve this complaint, we needed additional information from MSRPS. *See* § 4-1A-06(b)(2)(iii) (allowing our Board to request information about “the basis for the fee that was charged”). We asked MSRPS to provide an affidavit from a person with knowledge stating the tasks IT staff performed to search for records responsive to the modified search parameters and the amount of time taken to complete those tasks. In addition, we asked MSRPS to confirm the annual salaries, without benefits, for the IT staff and attorney assigned to work on the PIA response, as well as the annual salary of MSRPS's Public Information Act Representative.

MSRPS's \$351.14 estimated fee reflects 3.25 hours of IT work, charged at \$54.81 per hour, and 2.75 hours of review work (for 334 responsive records), all performed by an attorney, charged at \$62.91 per hour.⁸ We start with time charged for IT work. MSRPS has provided an affidavit from Jeffrey Eickelberger, a Network Systems Administrator for MSRPS. (“Eickelberger Affidavit”). Mr. Eickelberger's job responsibilities include working with MSRPS's PIA representative to “support [MSRPS's] compliance by developing custom solutions to address complex document requests.” According to the

⁸ Based on the salary information provided by MSRPS, the hourly rates appear to comply with § 4-206(b)(2).

affidavit, Mr. Eickelberger “worked to develop search parameters and search queries to gather documents responsive to [the complainant’s] various PIA requests,” including the narrower modified search parameters. Mr. Eickelberger states that, over the course of the iterations of the complainant’s PIA request, he spent time on tasks such as developing “test parameters,” providing a “comprehensive assessment” of what would be required to search for responsive records, and developing and testing “logic” for the searches. The Eickelberger Affidavit asserts that Mr. Eickelberger spent a total of four hours and twenty-five minutes working on the complainant’s PIA request. Three hours and forty-five minutes were spent “assessing plain language requests, developing and testing search parameters,” and forty minutes were spent “providing a detailed explanation of the search terms and parameters.” We thus find that the \$351.14 estimated fee complies with § 4-206(b) with regard to the time spent by IT staff,⁹ and that that portion of the estimated fee (\$178.13) is therefore reasonable.

Next, we turn to the 2.75 hours that MSRPS anticipates an attorney will spend reviewing the 334 responsive records for disclosure exemptions.¹⁰ Counsel for MSRPS states that the estimated range of 2.75 to 4 hours is based on “an estimated review time of 30 to 45 seconds per record.” MSRPS has charged the complainant for the low end of this range, 2.75 hours, which, for 334 records, works out to about thirty seconds per record. Counsel stresses that, given the records’ subject matter, careful review is necessary. According to counsel, MSRPS expects that the records have a “high potential for containing information protected by the attorney client privilege,” as well as information subject to other mandatory exemptions.

⁹ The complainant appears to question whether it should have taken IT this amount of time to complete the tasks it did, suggesting that he should not be required to bear any costs of “operational inefficiency.” We are not IT experts and will not speculate on whether the IT staff could have performed its functions more efficiently, especially in the absence of specific evidence or allegations. *Cf.* PIACB 21-16, at 5 (July 30, 2021) (explaining that it is “not our role to second-guess how [a custodian] chose to organize and manage these records or to speculate as to how a different management system might possibly have produced a lower fee”). Section 4-206(b) is concerned with “actual costs,” which must be based in part on the “actual time attributable to the search for and preparation of a public record.” § 4-206(b)(2). Based on the Eickelberger Affidavit, we are satisfied that the fee for IT work complies with § 4-206(b).

¹⁰ We briefly address the complainant’s assertion that the fee estimate is unreasonable because, over the course of corresponding about the PIA request, MSRPS has provided estimates for legal review that “arbitrarily fluctuate[] and increase[] despite scope narrowing.” In short, we tend to agree with MSRPS’s point that those estimates were “not made in isolation but are directly dependent upon the time needed by IT to provide responsive records.” Thus, though the preliminary search in the second iteration of the complainant’s PIA request apparently produced fewer responsive records needing review (100-200), the time spent by IT was estimated to be more significant, at sixteen to twenty hours. Thus, that estimated fee was higher. For the modified search parameters at issue here, IT spent less time but its effort resulted in more records.

While we do not necessarily quarrel with MSRPS's position that it is reasonable to anticipate an average of thirty seconds of review per record, we do not think MSRPS has justified having an attorney perform all of that review. *See* PIACB 24-23, at 10-11 (Feb. 14, 2024) (reaching a similar conclusion regarding attorney review). Rather, MSRPS should have a lower-compensated employee perform the review, and flag any questionable records that may need further legal expertise to determine disclosure.¹¹ *See* PIACB 21-15, at 5-6 (July 7, 2021) (finding that a custodian should "use its staff time to perform the bulk of the review and send only those responsive records that genuinely present a question of whether or not an exemption applies to its attorney for legal review"). Judging from the submissions, which include several thorough and well-written letters from MSRPS's PIA Representative, we are confident that, e.g., the PIA Representative is capable of performing the review, and can be instructed as to what records to flag—e.g., email records for which MSRPS's attorney was either the sender or the recipient. Of course, if there is a lower-compensated employee available and competent to perform this sort of review, then MSRPS must assign that employee to the task. We thus find MSRPS's fee estimate unreasonable to the extent that it anticipates that an attorney will perform the entire review of records. As a starting point, we therefore direct MSRPS to calculate review time based on the PIA Representative's hourly rate of \$36.69, which results in an estimated fee of \$100.90 for 2.75 hours of review. Should a lower-compensated employee be available, we direct MSRPS to use that employee's prorated annual salary in the fee calculation.

Together with the fee of \$178.13 for the IT work already performed, we have determined that the ceiling for a reasonable estimated fee in this matter is \$279.03, at least for purposes of requiring pre-payment. However, we have not yet addressed the parties' arguments about fee aggregation. As noted above, a custodian "may not charge a fee for the first 2 hours that are needed to search for a public record and prepare it for inspection." § 4-206(c). In the past, we have found it reasonable for a custodian to aggregate PIA requests for purposes of § 4-206(c) when, for instance, "the requests were all made on the same day to the same agency," and when the requests are "interrelated," e.g., seeking records of a similar nature. PIACB 21-12, at 4 (May 27, 2021); *see also*, e.g., PIACB 22-05, at 6 (Dec. 10, 2021) (finding it reasonable for a custodian to aggregate PIA requests sent "over a period of less than three weeks" that sought "records that are substantively the same").

In this case, the complainant sent, in September 2025, a broad PIA request that he later narrowed such that MSRPS was able to process the request within two hours and

¹¹ Of course, MSRPS is free to have its counsel perform the entirety of the review but it may not charge the attorney's rate for that entire review. We simply do not think that charging a PIA requester the attorney's hourly rate for that review is reasonable, or compliant with the spirit of the PIA. *See* § 4-103(b) (PIA is to be interpreted in favor of disclosure "with the least cost and least delay"); *see also* PIACB 26-14, at 7-8 (Dec. 11, 2025) (concerning time charged for an attorney to search for and review text messages).

produce records, in October 2025. In the letter sent with its response, MSRPS advised the complainant that it had “exhausted the two hours of preparation free of charge,” and that “any subsequent request pertaining to [the complainant’s] personnel records will be aggregated into this request,” and the complainant would be charged a fee. We do not think MSRPS’s broad position is permissible under the PIA, to the extent that *any* future PIA request from the complainant for his personnel-related records should be treated as a continuation of this request. When a PIA request is narrowed, often to avoid overburdening a custodian and/or the assessment of costly fees, it is all but inevitable that fewer records will be produced. It may be the case that, in working in good faith to narrow a PIA request, *see Glass*, 453 Md. at 233, a requester might receive records that trigger another targeted PIA request. Under those circumstances, that new PIA request should be treated as a separate request for purposes of § 4-206(c).

However, here, the modified search parameters grew out of the complainant’s wish to have MSRPS respond further to his original PIA request, made in September 2025. Thus, in this specific instance, we find it reasonable for MSRPS to treat the modified search parameters as a continuation of the original request, and thus it was not required to provide another two free hours of labor in working to fulfill the request. That said, MSRPS must carefully track the amount of time staff spends reviewing the records. Should the time fall below the estimate, then MSRPS must refund the complainant the difference. And, if MSRPS spends more time than estimated on review of the records, MSRPS may charge the complainant for any overage, so long as the overage reflects the “actual costs incurred.” § 4-206(a)(3).

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, we have determined that MSRPS’s \$351.14 estimated fee is unreasonable under the PIA because it charges the complainant for an attorney’s time to conduct the entire review of records. In turn, we find that \$279.03 is a reasonable starting point for an estimated fee, for purposes of requiring advance payment from the complainant. That estimated fee reflects review by MSRPS’s PIA Representative, rather than the attorney. If there is a lower-compensated employee available and competent to perform the review, then MSRPS must utilize that employee and reduce the estimated fee further. To the extent that the final fee differs—e.g., because the review takes less time or because an attorney spends time reviewing certain records flagged by the PIA Representative—then MSRPS may adjust the fee once production is complete. If the fee is less than \$279.03, MSRPS must refund the complainant the difference. If the final fee is higher, it may charge the overage.

Public Information Act Compliance Board

Sareesh Rawat, Chair

Samuel G. Encarnacion

Debra Lynn Gardner
Nivek M. Johnson