STATE RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING

Location: Courtyard Meeting Room, 346 S. Rio Grande Str., SLC, UT 84101
Date: August 13, 2015
Time: 9:05 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.

Committee Members Present:
Patricia Smith-Mansfield, Chair, Governor's Designee
Marie Cornwall, Citizen Representative
Tom Haraldsen, Media Representative
Blaine Breshears, Elected Official Representative
Doug Misner, History Designee
Holly Richardson, Citizen Representative
Absent: David Fleming, *Chair Pro Tem*, Private Sector Records Manager

Legal Counsel:
Paul Tonks, Attorney General's Office
Nicole Alder, Paralegal, Attorney General's Office

Executive Secretary: Nova Dubovik, Utah State Archives

Telephonic Attendance:
Petitioner, Jamis Johnson

Others Present:
Joan Andrews, Attorney, SLC School District
Matthew Anderson, Attorney, UDC
Steve Turley, UDC
Jeralyn Zimmerman, UDC
Michael Clára, Petitioner
Rosemary Cundiff, Ombudsman
Lorianne Ouderkirk, State Archives
Susan Mumford, State Archives
Renée Wilson, State Archives
Kendra Yates, State Archives
Cameron Mansen, State Archives
Rebekkah Shaw, State Archives

APPROVED

Agenda:

- Two Hearings Scheduled
- Approval of Retention Schedules
- Approval of July 9, 2015, Minutes
- Report on Appeals Received
- Report on Cases in District Court
- Other Business
    - Discuss Attorney General's Office vs. Nate Carlisle, Salt Lake Tribune, Waiver of Summons, Case No. 15-17

I. Call to Order:

The Chair, Ms. Patricia Smith-Mansfield, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

The Chair introduced the parties for the first hearing: Mr. Jamis Johnson, Petitioner, and Mr. Matthew Anderson, representing Attorney for Utah Department of Corrections (UDC). The Chair explained procedures and asked the Committee members to introduce themselves to the Petitioner.

II. Jamis Johnson vs. Utah Department of Corrections (UDC)

Opening-Petitioner

Mr. Johnson explained he is legally blind and that the disability hinders his ability to read and comply with all the regulations and policies. He is appealing the fee waiver denial for records that are a vital importance to his liberty. The state has denied the fee waiver based on its determination he is not impecunious. To support its decision, the state has produced his inmate account, commissary purchases, and phone logs listing expenditures that Corrections considers luxury items. It is Corrections' position that because he is an inmate, and a burden to society, the records will not be provided without a fee. Mr. Johnson believes he meets the requirements of being impecunious.

Opening-Respondent

Mr. Anderson, Attorney for Utah Department of Corrections, stated the case is similar to *Patrick Sullivan vs. UDC*, Case No. 15-19. Patrick Sullivan had requested a fee waiver, and like Mr. Johnson, had money in his account that could have been used to pay for the record(s); however, he chose to use it at the commissary on similar luxury items. The statute, regarding fee waivers, allows an agency to implement policy and it has been determined Corrections has a reasonable policy. In this case, initially, and at the appeal stage, Mr. Johnson did not claim that he was impecunious. Instead, Mr. Johnson claimed he was automatically entitled to a fee waiver because of being the subject of the records. The department disagreed because Mr. Johnson had money in his inmate account at the time of the request. Mr. Anderson asked the Committee to uphold Corrections denial of the fee waiver as being reasonable.

Testimony-Petitioner

Mr. Johnson agreed that the standard is reasonableness, and the question is whether or not if he is impecunious so the fee can be waived. Mr. Johnson stated he was deficit in not

APPROVED

claiming impecuniosity initially, but also there is some deficiency by the state for not providing its statement of facts, reasons, and legal authority in support of their position to him five days prior to the hearing. Mr. Johnson summarized Corrections' policy of when an inmate is considered indigent status by meeting specific monetary thresholds. He also explained that because he is legally blind he barters for assistance and has to compensate those that help, with items bought at the commissary, in trade for services. Mr. Johnson is unable to work which means he relies on money received from family members, specifically his son.

He continued to explain the funds in his account are mainly used for calling his pro bono attorney, and just because there is money in the account does not mean he can afford to pay for records. Phone calls are very expensive; a call within Salt Lake City is $1.80 to $2.00, and calls made outside Salt Lake City can be $6.00 to $7.00. The state receives 55-70 percent of the call charge, which is an extremely high in Mr. Johnson's opinion. Although the state provides all inmates immediate needs, contact with others outside the prison is expensive and the ability to communicate is very important. Mr. Johnson requested the Committee to recommend to Corrections to notify inmates an estimated number of records responsive to the GRAMA instead of responding only that the inmate is not impecunious and to submit a money transfer slip. He offered to pay for a portion of the records; however, Mr. Johnson does not believe his fee waiver request is unreasonable.

Testimony-Respondent
Mr. Anderson commented that Mr. Johnson's telephone calls, paper, and pens are legitimate expenses and will be removed from the state's argument. However, Mr. Johnson claimed impecuniosity only after UDC examined his commissary purchases and compared it to the time line of the GRAMA request. Corrections observed that Mr. Johnson had money in his account and could have paid for the records. On April 21, 2015, a week prior to submitting the initial GRAMA request $12.95 was spent on miscellaneous food items. The week after the GRAMA submission $15.51 was spent at the commissary. The week he submitted the appeal to UDC $34.14 was spent on snacks. When he appealed to the executive secretary, claiming he was impecunious, "and lacked the funds to pay for the records," that week he had spent $33.81. Mr. Anderson explained that during this period Mr. Johnson could have paid for 135 pages of records. The number of records responsive to his GRAMA request is only 94 pages, a cost of $23.50. There are legitimate impecunious inmates who are provided fee waivers. Mr. Johnson is not impecunious; he had money in his account to pay for the responsive records.

Mr. Anderson discussed the UDC's policies regarding impecunious and indigent inmates. Bottom-line, if an inmate is not impecunious then they are expected to pay for the records. Typically, a fee waiver is not granted but there are exceptions. He requested the Committee to uphold UDC's decision.

The Committee discussed with Mr. Anderson if UDC could provide inmates with an estimate of responsive records, if the inmate is not impecunious, this would provide

awareness of how much will be charged and to ensure there is money in their accounts. Mr. Anderson commented it is something that UDC can take in to consideration. The discussion continued around the amount of time UDC spent reviewing Mr. Johnson's itemized commissary purchases. Mr. Anderson explained it was not until Mr. Johnson appealed that the commissary purchases were itemized to determine what he had been spending money on during the GRAMA request and appeal process. The Committee asked when is an inmate identified as being impecunious or indigent. Mr. Anderson called his witness, Mr. Steve Turley, to respond.

Mr. Turley was sworn in.

Mr. Turley responded that if an inmate's account is under $9.00 for 45-days they become indigent. The reason for the 45-day period is that when an inmate has a job and is paid $13.00 dollars he is not indigent. If inmates have a form of income that provides them more than $9.00 of income over a 45-day period, then they are no longer indigent. Inmates are able to check out the policy in the Library to read.

The Chair commented on GRAMA requests and the indigent status is a bit different in GRAMA from Corrections' policy. It is not just that they are indigent it also requires that one's legal rights also must be affected. UDC only considers the indigent portion of GRAMA. Mr. Anderson explained that most of the time inmates are requesting records that relate to housing and supervision in the community. Typically, the requests involve legal rights and the legal rights portion of the GRAMA request is satisfied per UDC policy.

Mr. Johnson posed a few questions to Mr. Turley as to what formula is used if someone asked for a fee waiver and is impecunious. Does the state have another formula besides under $9.00 that qualifies one as indigent? Is there consideration as to how the money is provided whether family or job contributes it? Mr. Turley responded that there is no other formula and the source of the money is not relevant to the consideration of impecunious status.

Closing-Petitioner

Mr. Johnson stated that one of the problems in the prison is communication. He did propose some sort of resolution to pay for the records, but he had the understanding that the first 100 pages would be provided free. However even in his uncertain financial position he could not have paid the fee. One of the concerns of inmates is that when they send a money order slip it disrupts their economic situation. Inmates pay for haircuts, mail, and other incidentals, and if the money is not in the account, the money slip transfer will bounce for insufficient funds. In his situation, the funds received are from one of his children because of being disable and the inability to work. Mr. Johnson expressed that the Committee consider the restraints the inmates incur and that the documents they seek are usually of legal impact and fee waiver is reasonable. He would like policy change to eliminate having to go in front of the Committee. He believes he has presented a case of being impecunious and asked the Committee to waive his fees.

APPROVED

The Chair asked for clarification that the 100 free pages are for indigent inmates. Mr. Anderson confirmed and explained the 100 free pages are for qualified indigent inmates. Typically, other fee waiver requests go through the deputy director to review on individual inmate circumstances. It is a broad policy to manage the mass quantity of GRAMA requests submitted weekly by inmates. The director considers even the inmates that do not technically qualify as indigent, and determines whether they pay or receive 100 free copies. Fee waivers are routinely provided to inmates based on individual circumstances.

Closing-Respondent
Mr. Anderson continued the closing statement, adding comments pertaining to fee waiver requests being specifically considered on merit and not a hard and fast formula decision. The director determines whether an inmate is indigent, impecunious, or whether the inmates are can afford copies. The itemized commissary records were used to determine if Mr. Johnson managed his money correctly, and based on the information, the director felt Mr. Johnson did not properly manage his money. Therefore, he could have purchased the records. The notion to split the cost and the inmates only pay partial fee waivers, the UDC would be inundated with "subject of the record," requests for emails and financial accounts. It is important not to set precedence because the 6700 inmates will all claim subject of record and request partial fee waiver.

The Committee was concerned UDC's process is not consistent with GRAMA, specifically U.C.A. 63G-2-203(8). A governmental entity may require payment to begin a process if fees exceed $50.00. The expectation to sign off a money transfer slip without knowing the amount is a violation of the section. The attorney explained that GRAMA provides authority of efficiency in manner and they are incompliance with the statute. UDC has the leeway to adopt policy that is stricter than the statute. In UDC's administrative rule, it is required for the inmate to submit a money transfer order. This particular portion of the administrative rule had been challenged in court, *Crist v. Kendal, et al.,* Utah Third District, Case No. 110912524. The reason for the money order is to streamline the process because the records officers receives over 100 GRAMA requests a week and does not have time to contact each inmate individually. Ms. Cornwall interjected, and pointed out, that communication is important. Inmates are required to send a money transfer slip, without knowing the cost of the records, a better solution would be to provide more communication to inform the inmates what the cost of records will be when it has been determined they are not impecunious. Opening up communication might prevent these types of appeals coming in front of the Committee.

Deliberation:
The Committee discussed the issues on Corrections' administrative rule, statute, and GRAMA policy and recommended to the entity to add more information to the GRAMA request form for better communication between administration and inmates. Identifying a cost amount that does not exceed $25.00 and notifying the inmates of the cost might reduce the amount of hearings on the matter.

Motion: A motion was made by Mr. Misner that the governmental entity fee waiver denial was not unreasonable pursuant to U.C.A. 63G-2-203(6). Mr. Breshears seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-2. Two dissenting votes by Ms. Cornwall and Mr. Haraldsen.

5-Minute Break

The Chair introduced the parties for the second hearing: Mr. Michael Clára, Petitioner, and Ms. Joan Andrews, representing Attorney for Salt Lake City School District. The Chair explained the hearing procedures. She also commented on the extra documents provided by the Respondent and Petitioner that should have been provided 5-business day prior to the hearing. The Chair explained the members will take them in consideration, but had not been able to read the material.

III. Michael Clára vs. Salt Lake City School District

Opening-Petitioner

Mr. Clára, member of the Board of Education in Salt Lake City, explained the contents of the two additional documents presented to the Committee prior to the hearing. One document is a response from a complaint he filed with the U.S. Department of Education and Office of Civil Rights, the other document addressed an issue in the school district. The Salt Lake City Police Department had been deployed full time in schools that have a majority ethnic minority population, but the District did not impose this policy in other parts of the District. The third document is a picture of Mr. Clára in the *Salt Lake Tribune* dressed as bandito. Earlier in the year, the school board president had assigned a police officer to guard him because she was offended by a phone conversation between them. The police officer guarded Mr. Clára and then after three meetings the police officer was no longer there. Mr. Clára asked the school administration why the police officer was no longer at the meetings to guard him and the district would not answer.

Mr. Clára submitted a GRAMA requests on April 29, 2015, it was in reference to the deployment of the Salt Lake City Police Officers and subsequent removal after three meetings by the Board of Education. On May 12, 2015, he was given a partial denial. The response from League of Counsel detailed the records were not provided because they were protected under U.C.A. 63G-2-305, attorney client privilege.

When Mr. Clara appealed to the chief administrative officer (CAO), he was given the same explanation. Mr. Clára summarized the CAO's responsive letter to the Committee. He explained that the CAO was asked whom the attorney client privilege was between, and he was told the communication was between the school board attorney and the administration. Mr. Clara stated he is an elected official empowered to have oversight of the school district. The school district employees cannot claim attorney client privilege, to keep information from him that hinders the ability to create policy and make decisions on budgetary issues, as he is elected to do.

On August 8, 2015, he was sent two letters from different attorneys providing him a document and requesting him to drop the hearing. The sent document was an email from

APPROVED

school district's attorney to another board member. Mr. Clára explained that the board has its own attorney and this particular attorney is not the one hired to represent the school board. However, the email that the attorney is claiming to be responsive to his request cannot be the same because she is not the board's attorney, negating attorney client privilege. He is asking for the email that was referred to in the denial letter by the chief administrative officer that stated it was a communication between the attorney and the administration.

The Chair clarified the petitioners appeal and argument that he believes the record provided on August 8, 2015, is not the record denied on May 12, 2015, because the record was classified protected (U.C.A. 63G-2-305), attorney client privilege, and the record provided was between the attorney and school board member which is not considered attorney client privilege.

Opening-Respondent
Ms. Joan Andrews, on behalf of the Salt Lake City School District, stated the fundamental position is that the appeal is moot. Ms. Kindl, Director, Policy & Legal Services for the district, sent correspondence to Mr. Clára along with the one record previously held that had been classified attorney client privilege. Ms. Andrews provided Ms. Kindl's sworn affidavit that stated the record provided on August 8, 2015, is the sole record withheld and has been provided to Mr. Clára. Therefore, there is no longer any case or controversy for adjudication. The Salt Lake City School Districts position is the appeal is moot and the District respectfully requests it be dismissed.

The Chair consults with Mr. Tonks about the Respondents motion to dismiss. Counsel states the petitioner must provide evidence that another record exists that is responsive to his appeal. The petitioner must keep it specific to that record he is seeking.

Testimony-Petitioner
Mr. Clára explained that the record mentioned in the affidavit does not match the explanation and description by Ms. Kindl, on May 12, 2015. Accordingly, the justification for not providing the record(s) was that privilege protects a disclosure of any communication that she had with district administrators and employees. He argues the document that was provided to him on August 8, 2015, is not between her and an administrator that she claimed privilege. The document provided on August 8, 2015, is from her to another board member. The attorney could never have claimed privilege because the Board of Education has its own attorney and she is not the representing attorney.

The affidavit provided by Ms. Andrews does not match the explanation provided by Ms. Kindl as to why the email in question was classified U.C.A. 63G-2-305, attorney client privilege. He believes there is another document, or that Ms. Kindl was deceptive on May 12, 2015, and tried to use it as a way to withhold information from him.

The Committee members discussed and questioned if there was evidence that another document, other than the one provided to Mr. Clára on August 8, 2015, existed. The

assumption by the Committee was the disputed record was initially misclassified, the language describing the record was changed, and there is no other responsive record available.

Testimony-Respondent
Ms. Andrews clarified that the email that was provided to Mr. Clára was between the Ms. Kindl, the board president, business administrator, the assistant administrator of Human Resources, and the board's outside counsel. There were a host of administrators and two attorneys both of whom act in attorney capacity for the district and the board. Often the attorneys have a shared privilege and common interest privilege even though they might be classified as separate entities. There was no misrepresentation by Ms. Kindl in her May 12, 2015, explanation; she originally classified the record protected, attorney client privilege, based on the members carbon copied on the email. The record has been turned over and the point is moot and no case for cause.

Closing-Petitioner
Mr. Clára acknowledged the email, that was produced on August 8, 2015, is from Ms. Kindl to Heather, a board member. He commented that there were 1000 emails between the school district attorney, board members, and the administration and none had been classified as attorney client privilege.

The Chair asked who else besides Heather was carbon copied on the email. Mr. Clára stated there are multiple people on the email.

Ms. Cornwall stated there the Committee does not have jurisdiction to fine anyone. It is the Committee's job to ensure that the records eventually become known, and they have, and moved to dismiss the case.

Closing-Respondent
No further comment provided by Respondent.

Deliberation:

Motion: A motion was made by Ms. Cornwall to dismiss there is no record to be provided the Committee is convinced based on the evidence presented that all records have been provided pursuant to U.C.A. 63G-2-403(12). Motion seconded by Ms. Richardson. The motion passed 6-0.

IV. Approval of July 9, 2015, Minutes:

A motion was made by Mr. Haraldsen to approve the July 9, 2015, minutes and seconded Mr. Breshears. The motion passed 5-0. One abstention, Ms. Richardson (see the attached documents on the Utah Public Notice Website, SRC Minutes July 9, 2015.pdf).

APPROVED

V. Approval of Retention Schedules:

Utah State General Records Retention Schedule:
Ms. Rebekkah Shaw presented six series for Purchasing records, Special Education records, Law enforcement 13, 16, and 17.

(Item 13-18) Contract purchasing files (2nd one)
(Item 16-5) Special Education Records
(Item 17-6) Arrest records
(Item 17-8) Criminal history records
(Item 17-5) Dispatch and patrol records
(Item 17-7) Mug shot records

Motion-A motion was made by Mr. Breshears and seconded by Ms. Cornwall to approve the proposed retention schedules. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

State Agency: Mr. Cameron Mansen presented two schedules for Department of Public Safety, State Bureau of Investigations and Human Services, Office of Administrative Hearings.

84416- Law enforcement intelligence unit files-Retain 5 years.

Motion-A motion was made by Ms. Cornwall and seconded by Mr. Breshears to approve the proposed retention schedule. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

28733-Information administrative hearing audio recordings-Retain 1 year after the order is issued.

Motion-A motion was made by Ms. Cornwall and seconded by Mr. Haraldsen to approve the proposed retention schedule. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

Local government: Lorianne Ouderkirk presented one schedule for Davis County.

28731-Internal Audit files-Retain 10 years after completion of audit.

Motion-A motion was made by Mr. Haraldsen and seconded by Mr. Breshears to approve the proposed retention schedule. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

VI. Report on July and August Appeals:

The executive secretary briefed the following withdrawn, denial, and incomplete appeals:

-Patrick Sullivan vs. University of Utah: The petitioner and respondent resolved the records dispute through mediation. The petitioner withdrew the appeal.
-Anthony Prater vs. Utah Department of Corrections: The Chair and Committee member, Mr. Breshears, declined hearing based on the petitioner had the records and agreed to the redaction of protected information.

APPROVED

-Reginald Williams vs. DHRM, Division of Corrections: The Chair and Committee member, Mr. Fleming, declined hearing based on the issue is moot. The petitioner received the records and the untimeliness of the governmental entity is outside the SRC's jurisdiction.
-Tom Bradfield vs. Utah Department of Corrections: The petitioner is appealing the denial of his Mental Health Records; however, the appeal is missing original request and governmental entity's denial letters.
-Ramon Somoza vs. Utah County Attorney's Office: The petitioner was under the impression the Board of Commissioners had not been responsive to his appeal. In actuality, the Board of Commissioners had scheduled a hearing for August 18, 2015, and the notice was sent the same time Mr. Somoza appealed to the Records Committee. The appeal is outside Committee's jurisdiction.
-Richard Parks vs. Department of Commerce: The petitioner is appealing partial access denial of a Consumer Protection Complaint #83905.
-Patrick Sullivan vs. Utah Department of Corrections: The petitioner withdrew the appeal.
-Richie Harvey vs. Utah Department of Corrections: Mr. Harvey is appealing partial denial of mental health records (medical and/or physiological records) classified as controlled from May 1, 2013, until June 10, 2015. Subject of appeal was been found in a previous hearing pursuant 63G-2-403(4)(b)(i). Charles Watkins vs. UDC, Case No. 99-02. The Chair and Committee member, Mr. Misner, reviewed and declined hearing.
-Lemus vs. Department of Human Services: The petitioner withdrew the appeal.
-Patrick Sullivan vs. Utah County Jail & Utah County Attorney's Office: He is appealing redactions by the Utah County Jail/Attorney's Office. This is outside Record Committee's jurisdiction; it needed to be appealed to the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners. Utah County Attorney's Office had been contacted and the petitioner notified to send the appeal to the office.
- Joshua Montoya vs. Salt Lake Legal Defender Association: Mr. Montoya is appealing the denial of interviews, audio, video, investigative reports, emails sent and received by employees and representatives of the SL Legal Defenders Association that he is the subject or connection to case number 101901835. This is outside the Committee's jurisdiction.
- Joshua Montoya vs. Salt Lake County District Attorney's Office: Appealing partial denial of emails sent between attorneys in connection with Case No. 1019011835. This is outside Committee's jurisdiction; petitioner was redirected to SL County to appeal within 30 days of its response to the Salt Lake County Council.
- William Sherratt vs. Board of Pardons and Parole: Mr. Sherratt is appealing access denial of dissenting opinions of board members; who filed court documents in his file; answer and memo for case #060907262; identity of person in hearing; and the investigative reports from Iron County. Appeal is missing three to four initial GRAMA requests.
- Judy Fitzgerald vs. Utah Population Estimates Committee: Ms. Fitzgerald is appealing the partial grant in part of records used to project Utah population growth. The appeal is incomplete.
-Paul Amann vs. Attorney General's Office: Appeal is being processed.

-Chris McDaniel, *BuzzFeed* vs. Utah Department of Corrections: *BuzzFeed* is appealing partial denial access for public interest records referring to the UDC Execution Policy and the execution protocol that law enforcement followed for Ronnie Lee Gardner's execution. The appeal is untimely by 2 days; nevertheless, the Committee's decision is to hear the appeal.

At this time, there are nine potential hearings scheduled for September 10, 2015, and five hearings scheduled on October 8, 2015 (see the attached documents on the Utah Public Notice Website, SRC Meeting Handouts August 13, 2015.pdf).

VII. Report on Cases in District Court:

Mr. Tonks briefed to the Committee members on the *Utah Dept. of Human Resources v. Paul Amann* is basically two appeals put together because there has been two different hearings. In one hearing, the Committee granted records request and in the second one, he was denied. It is determined that both district court cases will be combined.

The *Utah Attorney General v. Salt Lake Tribune* needs to be discussed as to how the Committee wants to respond; because Sheriff Noel's representing attorney has contacted Mr. Tonks's asking what the Committee will do in this case. The Sheriff did not make an appearance in front of the Committee during the hearing, instead he filed a motion for reconsideration, and it was denied. The Utah Attorney General's Office has filed its appeal and it was served on the executive secretary. The reason for the appeal is because the Committee granted the petitioner access to some of the records and those are the ones in dispute. Mr. Tonks suggested the Committee go *in camera* to discuss the question of what the Committee should do when Sheriff Noel files a motion to intervene and become part of the case.

The *Daniel Rivera Jr. v. Utah Dept. of Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services* a motion to dismiss was granted (see the attached documents on the Utah Public Notice Website, SRC Meeting Handouts August 13, 2015.pdf).

Motion-A motion was made by Mr. Misner and seconded by Mr. Haraldsen to go *in camera*. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

Committee went *in camera*

Motion-A motion was made by Mr. Misner and seconded by Mr. Haraldsen to go back in session. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

Mr. Tonks summarized why the Committee went *in camera.* The Committee went into closed session to discuss reasonably pending litigation involving a case the State Records Committee is a party to. The close session was to determine what legal avenues the Committee will take if a motion is filed in *AGO vs. Salt Lake Tribune,* Case No. 150904266. The closed session was to discuss legal options and consult with Committee's counsel on what action the Committee will take. All decisions will be voted in open meeting.

APPROVED

Motion-A motion was made by Ms. Richardson that the Committee accepts Sheriff Noel as an amicus curiae to the case, but oppose him entering as a party. Based on the statutory limitation to appeal in 30 days. Ms. Cornwall seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-0. One abstention by Mr. Breshears due to possible conflict of interest.

Mr. Tonks stated he would contact Sheriff Noel's attorney and provide the Committee's decision in open meeting and respond to any pleading filed in the case accordingly.

VIII. Other Business:

The next meeting is scheduled for September 10, 2015. The executive secretary queried if there will be a quorum present for the next meeting, no anticipated absences.

The August 13, 2015, State Records Committee meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the August 13, 2015, SRC meeting minutes, which were approved on September 10, 2015. An audio recording of this meeting is available on the Utah Public Notice Website at http://www.archives.state.ut.us/public-notice.html.

APPROVED

X

Nova Dubovik
Executive Secretary