

SRC APPROVED
Date _____

State Records Committee Meeting

Division of Archives
Courtyard Meeting Room
November 13, 2014
Salt Lake City, Utah

- Members present: Patricia Smith-Mansfield, Chair, Governor's Designee
Doug Misner, History Designee
David Fleming, Private Sector Records Manager
Marie Cornwall, Citizen Representative
Tom Haraldsen, Media Representative
Holly Richardson, Citizen Representative
- Member not present: Ernest Rowley, Elected Official Representative
- Legal Counsel: Paul Tonks, Attorney General's Office
Nicole Alder, Attorney General's Office
- Executive Secretary: Nova Dubovik, Utah State Archives
- Attending via phone: Scott Gollaher
Laura Smith/*Truth in Advertising, Inc.*
- Others Attending: Rosemary Cundiff, Ombudsman
Daniel O'Bannon, Department of Commerce
Ché Arguello, Attorney General's Office
David J. Pierson, Department of Commerce
Blaine Ferguson, Attorney General's Office
Mayor Gary Gygi, Cedar Hills City
Jann Farris, Attorney, Morgan County
Catherine Taylor, Department of Human Services
Lorianne Ouderkirk, Archives staff
Rebekkah Shaw, Archives staff
Renée Wilson, Archives staff
Kendra Yates, Archives staff

Ms. Patricia Smith-Mansfield opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. and announced that the Committee did not have a quorum but could begin regular business. Ms. Smith-Mansfield introduced new members Mr. Tom Haraldsen, Media Representative, and Nicole Alder, Paralegal, to the Committee members.

Report on October/November Appeals and December 11, 2014, Appeals.

The executive secretary reported that Dan Harrie/*Salt Lake Tribune* vs. City of West Jordan and Chad Lambourne vs. Utah Department of Health, Forensic Toxicology Lab, have been resolved and canceled by both parties. The Jordanelle Special Service District (JSSD) vs. Office of the Utah State Auditor was postponed by the petitioner and rescheduled for December 11, 2014. At this time there are eight potential hearings

scheduled for December (See the attached documents on the Utah Public Notice website, [SRC Meeting Handouts November 13, 2014.pdf](#)).

Resume Hearing:

Mr. Doug Misner arrived to the meeting resulting in the needed to quorum to start the hearings. Mr. Scott Gollaher was contacted by phone and the hearing began at 9:15 a.m.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield introduced the parties: Mr. Scott Gollaher, Petitioner, and Mr. Jann Farris, Morgan County Attorney's Office. Ms. Smith-Mansfield explained the hearing procedures to the parties.

Hearing: Scott Gollaher vs. Morgan County Sheriff's Office

Opening-Petitioner

Mr. Gollaher identified himself as the petitioner in the case. He began by stating he petitioned the State Records Committee in relationship to a GRAMA request that was sent to Morgan County Attorney's Office for any subpoenas that were served on Detective William Z. Wentland, now a retired detective formerly with the Morgan County Sheriff's Department. The subpoenas were in relationship to Case No. 121500023 and/or Case No.131500006. He stated Morgan County did send a partial response to the GRAMA request for Case No. 121500023. The response which he is seeking is the full response to the GRAMA request, and it is the second subpoena for Case No. 131500006. Mr. Gollaher explains he did not receive responses for the initial GRAMA request from the Morgan County Attorney's Office nor from the chief administrative officer, nor from the Morgan County Council. Subsequently, he finally appealed to the State Records Committee.

Opening-Respondent

Mr. Farris, Morgan County Attorney, states it is Morgan County's position they have not denied any of the record requests that they received from Mr. Gollaher. Mr. Farris provides background on Mr. Gollaher's situation that currently he is incarcerated on two separate cases he is being prosecuted for and because of that he was found indigent by the district court judge and appointed a public defender, Mr. Ryan Bushell. During the course of the litigations in this prosecution the judge has advised all parties on several occasions that the case documents will go through Mr. Gollaher's public defender. Nevertheless, Mr. Gollaher has bombarded the office with multiple GRAMA requests for information that had already been turned over to his attorney under the discovery law. After his office had received the first couple of GRAMA requests they gave those to Mr. Gollaher's attorney and then eventually, because there were so many sent, began handing them over unopened to his attorney. It the position of Morgan County that officials have not denied any of the records that have been requested by Mr. Gollaher. They have made an attempt through his attorney to provide all the information requested. If there is anything else that he would like they are willing to provide it.

Testimony-Petitioner

Mr. Gollaher explained that the Morgan County governmental entities did not respond to his initial GRAMA requests. Mr. Gollaher continues that Mr. Farris stated in the opening

statement that he did not possess any more records pertaining to the two subpoenas. Mr. Gollaher explains that according to Mr. Farris, in open court on June 4, 2013, at Morgan's District 2nd District Court, there may be other records. Mr. Gollaher continues that Mr. Farris mentioned that Det. Wentland was subpoenaed for Case No. 131500006 and that he was available in the building during the hearing. Mr. Gollaher continues that Mr. Farris also stated that Det. Wentland was subpoenaed a total of seven times for that hearing. Those are the subpoenas that Mr. Gollaher seeks in the GRAMA request. Mr. Farris had told the ombudsman any record and subpoena would be filed with the court and be listed on the court docket. Mr. Gollaher states he does not find it recorded with the court. It was stated in open court by the prosecuting attorney that he had subpoenaed Det. Wentland but there is no documentation. In conclusion, Mr. Gollaher wants to know if the subpoena for Case No. 131500006 exists and if it does he wants the Morgan County Attorney's Office to turn it over in the spirit of GRAMA.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield interjects and asks about the two subpoenas, one being did he receive a copy of Case No. 121500023 and is he satisfied with the response to that request? Mr. Gollaher restates he would like to know if the subpoena was actually served on Det. Wentland and by whom or was it simply created in the office. The GRAMA request is for subpoenas that were served on Det. Wentland. Furthermore he will accept Mr. Farris's acknowledgement in this hearing if he is attesting to the fact that no other records exist for any other case or subpoena in relation to those two cases, and if that is the case then he believes Mr. Farris' has finally met and been responsive to the GRAMA request.

Ms. Marie Cornwall asks Mr. Gollaher for clarification that he is satisfied with the response. Mr. Gollaher states he wants it verified that no other subpoenas exist. Based on the evidence presented and the hearsay court communication he believes another subpoena might or might not exist, but if Mr. Farris insists there is no other record for Case No. 131500006 then Mr. Gollaher will accept that.

Testimony-Respondent

Ms. Smith-Mansfield requests Mr. Farris to address the subpoena for Case No. 131500006 on whether or not it exists. So as to whether at one time a subpoena existed but no longer exists or is not maintained by the attorney's office if he could clarify that portion of the hearing.

Mr. Farris presents to the Committee a copy of the subpoena for Case No. 121500023 and explains that in his office subpoenas are generated electronically and that he personally signs them all. The office is a bit informal when the deputies are served. Normally the clerk will run the document down to the deputy's mailboxes however, Det. Wentland had retired from the police department and in this case his subpoena was sent to his home address. Mr. Farris surmises that the subpoena is electrically saved but without signatures, however this is the only record that the office held. The office could create another subpoena but it will not do Mr. Gollaher any good because the system automatically creates a new date.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield questions that the current subpoena the attorney has is original because the detective turned it in for reimbursement. Mr. Farris's restates the reason his office possesses the record is because the detective turned in the subpoena to be paid for the three days in court. He does not know if they sent him three subpoenas but that is the only record the office or the court possesses because the court was checked with to ensure they did not have one on file.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield questions that if Mr. Farris understands GRAMA what was the reason for not responding to the petitioner? Mr. Farris responded that he did send a response letter and that it did go into detail and that he felt that Mr. Gollaher was harassing the office for records they did not keep, and had asked for extensive records that would take an office staff member hours to find. In the office there is an attorney and a paralegal and during the time Mr. Gollaher was drafting *pro se* motions and litigation on a daily basis, as was his attorney on weekly basis, and then Mr. Gollaher was sending out GRAMA requests that duplicated the earlier requests. Mr. Farris's office was getting hit with discovery from the attorney, discovery from Mr. Gollaher, and GRAMA requests and it had turned into a complete nightmare. It was easier to follow the judge's instructions to pass all case material through the defendant's attorney. It is still Morgan County's position that officials were responsive and did not hide any records from Mr. Gollaher. Ms. Smith-Mansfield states that GRAMA and discovery are separate and not conflicting.

Closing-Petitioner

Mr. Gollaher addressed the Records Committee and restates a few points Mr. Farris made during his testimony. Mr. Farris acknowledged that the subpoena for Case No. 121500023 was created electronically. The GRAMA response for an electronic verification was sent for those subpoenas that Mr. Farris claims were generated, and he would like that information as well. Mr. Gollaher continues that GRAMA is independent of all other things and this is not about harassing, this is a request for a single record and this is the first of many GRAMA requests that he has sent to Morgan County. A single response would have saved everyone time and taxpayer's money today. All he asks was a response to his request. As a citizen of Utah, not as a criminal defendant, he has the right to seek those records and he believes that those records expose dishonesty or honesty. It is a crime to obstruct GRAMA according to Utah Code § 63G-2-801 and he hopes it never happens again.

Closing-Respondent

Mr. Farris addresses the Committee and restates that Morgan County acted in good faith and will continue to cooperate.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield restates to the Committee that the petitioner is satisfied and questions whether or not the Committee should ask the petitioner to withdraw the appeal. Mr. Gollaher interjects that it not his intent to withdraw because Mr. Farris has not provided the full record and he just acknowledged in his testimony that he has electronic copies that he never provided.

Mr. Farris speaks up and states that when he met with Ms. Cundiff [ombudsman] at the mediation it was his understanding, from talking with the ombudsman, that Mr. Gollaher did not want printed fresh copies off the computer that were not signed. Mr. Gollaher wanted to see exactly what Det. Wentland was sent, and what he was sent exactly is the photocopied subpoena for Case No. 121500023. Mr. Farris explains he is unable to reproduce it by printing it off his computer and that Mr. Gollaher was not looking for an electronic copy.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield asks if the electronic system contains old subpoenas. Mr. Farris states it should. She continues the line of questioning, if there was one from June 6, 2013, then should it be in the database? Mr. Farris agrees it will be there, however it would print out the lines for him to sign, because none of them would be signed by him nor the court. If the electronic system would print out a fresh subpoena with the Case No. Ms. Smith-Mansfield asks would there also possibly be one with the Case No. 131500006, and would he be able to print it out and provide it to Mr. Gollaher? Mr. Farris restates that if it is in his system it can be printed out it though it will be unsigned, and it is unclear whether the system automatically adds a current date. Ms. Smith-Mansfield queries if it will have the current date but with the specific Case No. on it. Mr. Farris responds it may. Mr. Farris explains he had not been looking for one that was in electronic format only one that actually had been served on Det. Wentland because an electronic record was not part of the GRAMA request. But if it exists they will print it out and provide it to Mr. Gollaher.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield asks Mr. Gollaher if he would be satisfied with an unsigned and perhaps incorrectly dated subpoena from the electronic system for Case No. 131500006. Mr. Gollaher said no, because if Mr. Farris printed it in the original format with the correct date then it would show the original metadata to verify it was created back in June 2013. Mr. Gollaher emphasized that Mr. Farris acknowledged it was not served. Furthermore, Mr. Gollaher doesn't believe it even exists, but if Mr. Farris can produce one electronically and burn it on a CD so the creation date and metadata is captured then he will be satisfied.

Mr. David Fleming asks Mr. Farris about the system that produces the subpoena; is it an application other than Microsoft Word? Mr. Farris responds that the state prosecutors use a system to update the cases and print out information and also print out subpoenas. It is a statewide system that most prosecutors use, and whether when it prints one it also stores the original date and time he is uncertain. The office does not keep copies of each subpoena, only copies of those brought back for the officer to be paid.

Mr. Fleming does not see the subpoena as a record until it is printed and executed and the system that generates the paper document from is really a database.

Deliberation

Ms. Smith-Mansfield believes the subpoena is the official record but that in the database there is a trail and it is still a record. It may not be a signed subpoena it might be a draft record, but it is a record that shows a trail of intent. The system may not print what is

asked for but it might fulfil a portion and be responsive to the GRAMA request. The petitioner is interested in documenting an incident that happened and an electronic document will not show what happened but will produce some intent or some thought behind the action. Further deliberating is accomplished by the Committee on how the Morgan County Attorney's Office can produce a certified letter that indeed they did look for the metadata and the electronic record copy of the subpoena for Case No. 131500006.

A motion was made by Mr. Fleming to order Morgan County to search the relevant database from which subpoenas are created to find any record of a document creation relevant to this matter in Case No. 131500006. The Committee also notes that Morgan County Attorney's Office has already indicated it will provide the record in testimony before the Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Doug Misner. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

2 minute break

Resume Hearing:

Ms. Laura Smith was contacted by phone and the hearing began at 10:30 a.m.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield introduced the parties: Ms. Laura Smith representing *Truth in Advertising, Inc.*, petitioner, and Mr. Ché Arguello, Attorney General's Office, for the Department of Commerce. Ms. Smith-Mansfield explained the hearing procedures to the parties.

Hearing: Laura Smith/*Truth in Advertising, Inc.* vs. Department of Commerce, Division of Consumer Protection.

Opening-Petitioner

Ms. Laura Smith, Legal Director of *Truth in Advertising, Inc.*, (TINA) explained that *Truth in Advertising* is a nonprofit consumer advocacy organization that protects consumers from false advertising. Ms. Smith provided the background of the GRAMA request beginning on August 18, 2014, her organization requested copies of records of any investigations and consumer complaints relating to Utah company Wakeup Now. The Division denied the request citing two reasons: first, such records are classified as protected records under Utah Code § 63G-2-305(10), and second, such records are classified as private records under Utah Code § 63G-2-302(2)(d). *Truth in Advertising* appealed the decision, explaining that any responsive records that contain any identifying information of complaining consumers could be redacted to protect the consumer's identity and privacy. The Division again denied the request citing the Utah Consumer Sales Practices Act, Utah Code § 13-11-7(2), which prohibits the disclosure of "the identity of a person investigated unless his identity has become a matter of public record in an enforcement proceeding or he has consented to the public disclosure," because no disciplinary action has been taken against Wake Up Now.

Ms. Smith clarifies TINA is not asking the Division to tell them if Wake Up Now is under investigation because they understand that is confidential. They are simply asking for redacted copies of consumer complaints regarding the company. The disclosures of issues of encounters of consumers with prior dealing with Wake Up Now, even if an investigation has not been complete or even started, can only educate, warn, and ultimately protect other consumers as well as potentially prevent problematic dealing with the company. Also, releasing redacted copies of consumer complaints allows watchdog organizations to report on whether state agencies are responding appropriately to complaints and protecting consumers. And these reasons are exactly why TINA requested the records to arm consumers with critical information that is otherwise completely unobtainable and ensure appropriate measures are being taken to protect them.

Ms. Smith summarized her argument that the Division has taken the position that it will disclose consumer complaints only after an investigation, which could take months until it is complete. This procedure leaves no room for checks and balances of the agency's function and provides no means of alerting other consumers that there may be important issues that are worth considering when dealing with the company. Ms. Smith concluded, that for those reasons *Truth in Advertising, Inc.*, respectfully disagrees with the Division's reading of the Act, appeals its position and renews the request for a copies of consumer complaints relating to Wake Up Now, of course with the personal identifying information redacted.

Opening-Respondent

Mr. Ché Arguello is appearing on behalf of his client, the Division of Consumer Protections, Department of Commerce. The position of his client is that it can neither confirm nor deny the records even exist because it would put the Division in a situation where it would be violating another state statute, namely Utah Code § 13-11-7. The confidentiality provisions of Utah Code § 13-11-7 have sound public policy reasons behind them. As a government agency the Division is charged to protect the consumer, the same act that *Truth in Advertising* is performing, except the government is in charge of investigating consumer complaints.

The Utah State Legislation recognized, in creating this confidentially provision, that there are times complaints go nowhere and there has to be some level of protection, in addition to protecting the consumer, also protecting the businesses and individuals who may or may not be under investigation. The Division's position is that it should not be in a position to confirm or deny the existence of these records because it would be in violation of Utah Code § 13-11-7. Mr. Arguello concludes that if the public were to know whether a complaint was leveraged against a business simply knowing the complaint was filed and not knowing whether the company is investigated does not provide the information citizens need to make decision whether to patronize the business.

Testimony-Petitioner

Ms. Smith explains this is a very simple issue, consumers have a right know this information and who they are doing business with in the state. There may be a company

that has a thousand consumer complaints serious enough to bring it to the Division's attention but if the Division cannot get to it for another year or if the Division disagrees no one will know, which then contributes to the problem. Consumers continue doing business with a company even if only ten complaints have been filed without knowing that anyone has had a bad experience.

Ms. Smith concludes that TINA is not seeking to find out if a company is under investigation it is seeking copies of consumer complaints, the very same type of records that are collected by the consumer centennial network, which numerous states contribute to and which the Utah Division of Consumer Protection is a member of. She said TINA is not seeking the confidential fact of whether the company is under investigation. It is simply asking for redacted records of consumer complaints with all personal identifying information redacted and that is all they are seeking.

Testimony-Respondent

Mr. Arguello explains the Division's position is that it does not see this as a GRAMA issue. That there are various record disclosure issues that are carved out of GRAMA and the only real reference the Division looks to is in addressing whether this is a GRAMA request under Utah Code § 63G-2-201, which discusses what records are not public records and it specifically refers to records and information that is restricted by another statute, Utah Code § 13-11-7.

Mr. Arguello refers to Ms. Smith's statement about protecting consumers and unless the Division is obligated to disclose this kind of information consumers will not be protected. The Division is not Yelp, the Better Business Bureau, or Angie's List where complaints come in and they simply post them on a public forum. The Division is a government entity charged with investigating consumer complaints. Simply the existence of a complaint without the resolution of that complaint, meritorious or not, disclosing that could cause significant harm for legitimate businesses. The Legislature contemplated the protection of the consumers when they drafted Utah Code § 13-11-7. To force his client to disclose whether information does or does not exist could very well put legitimate business in risk of unfair public disclosure of complaints. It is not uncommon where people who complain against certain businesses are competing businesses who have specific intent to cause harm to a competitor. Let the agency in charge of investigating these complaints do its job and bring to light publically those investigations that are warranted under the law and that is what he, on behalf of his client, is asking the Committee to do.

Ms. Cornwall asks in terms of the complaints that Mr. Arguello received does he see the complaints substantially different in terms of substance than what would be found, for example, on an internet message board or that would go through the Better Business Bureau? Mr. Arguello responds that it is both and that he does not have enough familiarity with the overall substance of everything that comes into his client's office, but often times they are very similar and that an individual complainant has the ability to file the complaint in any number of public forums.

Mr. Fleming asks Mr. Arguello if there is no substantial difference can he restate the differencing between a complaint to the agency versus to any of these open forums. Mr. Arguello responds the difference is really the mandate of the government agency. The government agency is charged with enforcing various Utah statues including the Consumers Sales Practices Act and Business Opportunity Disclosure Act and there are several subsequent statutes, and when the client receives a complaint the Division is mandated under the law to review that complaint and bring appropriate enforcement actions under the state statues.

Closing-Petitioner:

Ms. Smith responded to a couple of points that were raised. Releasing records of complaints that the Division has received from consumers is just that, releasing complaints. It does not somehow have the stamp of approval or agreement or indication the Division agrees with the consumer, it is just copies of what a consumer has said about a company. In addition, the Division's interpretation of the statue would allow the Division to basically operate in secrecy. Consumers have the right to know all the information before entering into a transaction with a business or individual. Ms. Smith does not believe the legislature intended for the agency to either operate in secrecy, or determine on its own if it is a good piece of information for the consumer to obtain or not. And for those reasons the petitioner is not seeking personal identifying information or confidential facts of an investigation. The petitioner renews its request for redacted consumer complaints.

Closing Respondent:

Mr. Arguello states he has nothing else to submit.

Deliberation

The Committee goes into deliberation and Ms. Smith-Mansfield explains the provisions laid out in Utah Code § 63G-20201(3)(b) to the Committee. Mr. Tonks adds that the reason it is there is that GRAMA does not encompass everything restricting access and that the legislature sometimes inserts protections into parts of the code that is a catch all. GRAMA recognizes that other statutes may have issues specific to that legislation pertaining to that type of record. The Committee is charged with determining whether the inserted statute is true and trumps GRAMA, or whether in fact it does not and the records being requested are subject to GRAMA. The Committee continues to outline their jurisdiction on the matter and discuss public and nonpublic records and how the retention schedule is an umbrella for the entire series although portions of GRAMA may not be agreeable to all records series.

A motion was made by Ms. Cornwall that in accordance to Utah Code § 63G-2-201(3)(b) the complaints be classified as a nonpublic record and therefore subject to Utah Code § 13-11-7 and that the Committee deny the request for access. The motion was seconded by Mr. Doug Misner. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

Approval of October 9, 2014, Minutes

Ms. Smith-Mansfield announced that she submitted a change to page 4, paragraph 2 to read “*there is no action by the City Manager to make it a record, therefore it is a protected record*” instead it should read, “*There was no action taken by the City, therefore it is a protected record.*” A motion was made by Ms. Cornwall, to approve the October 9, 2014, Minutes with the corrections, and seconded by Mr. Fleming. The motion passed 4-0. There were two abstentions, Holly Richardson and Tom Haraldsen.

Approval of Retention Schedules

Utah State General Records Retention Schedule:

Ms. Rebekkah Shaw presented four Administrative Records Schedules.

-Item 7-12: Financial schedule, Bonds, Notes and Interest Paid.

-Item 11-65: Department of Human Resource Management, Employee Health and Medical Records.

-Item 11-62: Department of Human Resource Management, Employment History Records. Mr. Blaine Ferguson, Attorney General’s Office, suggests to amend “*actions taken*” to “*Final actions.*”

-Item 11-63: Department of Human Resource, Performance Plans and Evaluations.

(See the attached documents on the Public Notice website, [SRC General Schedule November 2014.pdf](#)).

A motion to approve with the amendments was made by Mr. Fleming and seconded by Ms. Richardson to approve the proposed retention schedule. A vote was unanimous, 6-0.

Public Guest Speakers

Ms. Smith-Mansfield announces there are two guest speakers who would like to provide public comment. She introduces Mayor Gary Gygi, from Cedar Hills City, and Blaine Ferguson, Attorney General’s Office and invites them to speak.

Mayor Gary Gygi, Cedar Hills, introduces himself and addresses the State Records Committee. He presents the problem of his small city which has a few vexatious litigants. Mayors of small cities would like more protection from these kind of litigants because the expense to small cities can be great. Although his city has handled the GRAMA requests properly the vexatious litigants continue to submit GRAMA requests which has cost the city over \$100,000. He questions the Committee as to how small cities should handle these vexatious litigants and whether the Committee would be willing to support legislation that would provide a safety net from litigants that continually submit GRAMA requests.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield states that at times the Records Committee has submitted changes to the legislation which has directly affected the business before it. It has never proposed to any specific legislator any specific action about the appeals process or the request process it. There have been times it has provided testimony or a letter for or against specific legislation that affects it, but has never proposed legislation. Ms. Smith-Mansfield continues that the committee can take no action on this matter. If there is

legislation that does come forward and is presented to the Committee and is publically noticed and publically debated, on whether the committee would like to provide its support that would be an appropriate forum for the Committee to address the problem.

Mr. Blaine Ferguson, Attorney General's Office, addressed the Committee and explains the reasoning behind the longer retention schedules to match the statute of limitations so records persevere until no longer needed. Longer retention schedules provides litigants time to file court cases prior to the retention schedule expiring.

State Agencies:

Ms. Kendra Yates presented four records series for the Health Department. These are existing series that the agency is cleaning up and requesting clarification on the terminology.

-80071 Resource hospital file to be phrased "until two designation cycles are complete." This would keep it in line with the most current rules.

-14081 Trauma center designation files-reduce the retention schedule from 10 years to 6 years.

-14111 Emergency medical services provider licensure records to be phrased "until two licensure cycles are complete."

-80115 Emergency medical service personnel certification records. The agency requested word cleanup so that it reads "retain 5 years after certification is renewed or lapses" and then "destroy." There is an administrative rule that outlines that if the certificates lapse they wait a certain amount of time before they renew before they have to do everything over again.

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

Cases in District Court

Mr. Tonks briefed committee members about the cases in District Court. (See the attached documents on the Public Notice website, [SRC Meeting Handouts November 13, 2014.pdf](#)).

Other Business

The next meeting is scheduled for December 11, 2014. The executive secretary queried if there will be a quorum present for the next meeting. There are no scheduled absences at this time. The Senate is to nominate one new member on November 19, 2014. Mr. Rowley has already stated he will not be available for the December 11, 2014, meeting.

Committee members wish Mr. Rowley all the best and offer a big "Thank You" for his years of volunteer service on the State Records Committee. He will be greatly missed.

Thank you cards for Mr. Hemphill and Mr. Rowley were passed around for the Committee members to sign.

SRC Minutes November 13, 2014

The November 13, 2014, State Records Committee meeting adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the November 13, 2014, SRC meeting minutes, which were approved on December 11, 2014. An audio recording of this meeting is available on the Utah Public Notice Website at

<http://www.archives.state.ut.us/public-notice.html>



Nova Dubovik

SRC Executive Secretary

APPROVED