

Records Management Committee

Meeting Minutes

25 August 2025, 1 PM

Utah Division of Archives and Records Service ("State Archives")

346 South Rio Grande Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84101

<https://meet.google.com/grz-puve-sqw>

Committee members present

- **Veronica Solano Arangure**, Utah Historical Society director or designee
- **Ken Williams**, Director, Division of Archives and Records Service (Utah Department of Government Operations)
- **Daniel Schoenfeld**, Public finance representative
- **David Fleming**, Private sector records manager representative
- **Tracy Hansen**, Political subdivision representative
- **Matthew LaPlante**, News media representative
- **Steve Garside**, Utah State Bar representative [Note: Mr. Garside was a newly appointed member, this was his first meeting since being appointed. He was not able to take his oath of office before or during the meeting, so he attended to observe only. He did not vote on agenda items.]

Others present

- Amy Arnn, Tax Commission
- Arnold Qin, Tax Commission
- Bobette Phillips, Tax Commission
- Brandon Leedy, Davis Technical College
- Colby Callahan, Utah Valley University
- Emma Keske, Utah Valley University
- Jim Kichas, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service
- Nicole Ferguson, Utah Valley University
- Jamie Brooks, Taylorsville City
- Jessica Priskos, Tax Commission
- Jodi Shegrud, Utah Department of Government Operations
- Maren Peterson, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service
- Matthew Pierce, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service

- Melanie Jorgensen, American Preparatory Academy
- Nathan Dopp, Department of Workforce Services ("DWS")
- Paul Tonks, Utah Attorney General's Office
- Rebecca Chadburn, Department of Workforce Services
- Rebekkah Shaw, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service
- Renée Wilson, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service
- Sam Anderson, Utah Department of Health and Human Services

Business

Ken Williams calls the meeting to order at 1:04 PM.

New committee members

New committee members: David Fleming and Steve Garside

David Fleming is the new private sector representative. Steve Garside will be the new State Bar representative.

Maren Peterson administers an oath of office to David Fleming, who attended in person.

The committee facilitator, Kendra Yates, is still seeking to fill the media representative and local government representative seats.

Approval of June 2025 meeting minutes

- Matthew LaPlante moves to approve the June 2025 minutes; David Fleming seconds.
- Tracy Hansen recuses herself.
- David Fleming and Veronica Solano Arangure abstain.
- All others vote unanimously in the affirmative.

Retention Schedule Review and Approval

Background check records (SSRS-31284)-New

Submitted by Maren Peterson on behalf of Utah Valley University (UVU)

Maren Peterson introduces guests from UVU and explains that UVU is seeking a different retention than [GRS-1970: Verification of employment eligibility](#) for series 31284.

Verification of employment eligibility (GRS-1970)

Description

This background documentation is used to verify employment eligibility. Information may include background checks, fingerprints and requirements under the Immigration Reform and Control Act. The resume and application of hired individuals are part of the Employee History Records.

Retention and Disposition

Only when an employee stops working for you should you calculate how much longer you must keep their Form I-9. Federal regulations state you must retain a Form I-9 for each person you hire for three years after the date of hire, or one year after the date employment ends, whichever is later.

UVU is requesting a retention period of 5 years, then destroy, since they are following the US Fair Credit Reporting Act, which has a minimum of 5 years from when the background check was completed.

Matthew LaPlante asks whether a new general retention schedule (GRS) should be created to accommodate other universities with similar needs. Maren Peterson confirms this is on State Archives' list to review.

Committee members discuss the general retention schedule creation process.

Steve Garside asks whether the records include applicants or are exclusive to hired employees. Emma Keske clarifies that it includes records of anyone undergoing a background check for employment.

David Fleming asks whether the background check is part of the employee record or whether it's managed separately. Emma says the background check is kept separate from the employee file.

Committee members discuss the suggested retention. A longer retention is not needed due to the time-sensitive nature of background checks and the statute of limitations.

Matthew LaPlante asks for clarification on the current GRS, which Maren Peterson provides.

Matthew LaPlante questions the need for a new series-specific retention schedule for UVU if the GRS would eventually be updated to accommodate the federal law, citing the desire to "not [create] more rules than we need to and more work for our staff than we need to." Maren Peterson explains that no extraneous work is sustained by approving this retention schedule today, since a series-specific retention schedule is needed whether or not a GRS is used, and that work has already been accomplished.

Matthew LaPlante suggests that a new or updated GRS include the phrase "or until administrative need ends."

There is additional discussion around the potential retention options of a future GRS. Maren Peterson reminds the committee that the task at hand is to approve UVU's series-specific retention schedule.

Tracy Hansen expresses concern about approving a new series-specific schedule that might be similar to a future GRS that is approved. Maren Peterson points out that UVU is currently out of compliance with the existing GRS and needs a legally-approved series-specific retention schedule so they won't be out of compliance.

Matthew LaPlante asks further questions about why the current GRS is not being adopted. Nicole Ferguson gives specific examples of how the current GRS does not meet UVU's need to retain the records for five years. David Fleming also points out that the current GRS only applies to hired employees, whereas UVU's schedule applies to all background checks, whether the person was hired or not, so there's no current GRS which fits their need.

Ken Williams asks for clarification on Tracy Hansen's concern, and she reiterates her concern of record series existing which could be using a GRS but aren't. Maren Peterson points out that when a GRS is created, this record series could adopt that GRS.

- David Fleming moves to approve the retention schedule as written, and Ken Williams seconds.
- The motion passes unanimously.

Matthew LaPlante mentions "for the record" that when the background check GRS is updated, it needs to be linked to this schedule so we don't have a "floating" series under UVU that isn't linked to a GRS.

[Assessor training record for USPAP \(SSRS-31283\)-New](#)

Submitted by Matt Pierce on behalf of Utah State Tax Commission

Matthew Pierce introduces the visitors from the Utah State Tax Commission, which is updating all record series within all Tax Commission divisions; series 31283 is the first series which has a retention need which falls outside of a GRS.

Matthew Pierce explains that there's a group within the Property Tax Division of the Tax Commission which oversees training for county assessors, and one type of training offered is overseen by the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP); the Tax Commission group receives training materials from USPAP to administer that training. Matthew Pierce explains that the subject matter expert (SME) for these records, who was unable to attend, identified 15 years as an appropriate retention, since the Tax Commission sometimes needs to review older records, and the 6-year retention of [GRS-150: Training administration records](#) would not suffice.

David Fleming asks what the USPAP audits. Bobette Phillips clarifies that the USPAP audits that the Property Tax Division is training county assessors according to USPAP requirements.

David Fleming asks why these training records need to be kept within their own series, separate from other training administration records. Jessica Priskos explains that the USPAP standards are more strict, and Matthew Pierce explains that the SME specified 15 years as the most appropriate retention in order to meet the agency's legal and administrative needs.

The committee briefly discusses the creation of record series not following general retention schedules.

- David Fleming moves to approve the retention schedule; Daniel Schoenfeld seconds.
- The motion passes unanimously.

[Arise Attendance web application \(SSRS-31272\)-New](#)

Submitted by Renee Wilson on behalf of Dept. of Workforce Services

Renée Wilson notes that there are hundreds of record series which do not follow general retention schedules, and State Archives records and information management (RIM) specialists seek to update those as they work with agencies.

Nathan Dopp explains that the records in series 31272 are sign-in/out sheets for children utilizing childcare providers receiving subsidies from the state.

Renée Wilson notes that existing general retention schedules do not fit these records. The requested retention is 3 years or until administrative value has been met. Administrative value remains if the records are being used in conjunction with an audit or in cases of overpayment or fraud.

Nathan Dopp clarifies that the personally-identifiable information (PII) in the records applies to both the children and childcare employees.

Ken Williams asks about possible applicable general retention schedules. Renée Wilson references [GRS-1036: Attendance rolls](#) and [GRS-649: Recreation registration records](#) but states that neither fits these records.

David Fleming wonders about the term "until administrative need ends" and the potential risks to child safety if records are retained over a long period of time.

Ken Williams asks about experiences when these records are kept longer. Nathan Dopp explains that audits, overpayment, and fraud may require retaining the records longer, at least 6 years.

David Fleming and Ken Williams discuss records retention and privacy.

- Ken Williams moves to approve the retention schedule; David Fleming seconds.
- The motion passes unanimously.

Homelessness personal data (SSRS-31279)-New

Submitted by Renee Wilson on behalf of Dept. of Workforce Services

Nathan Dopp explains that this series is data collected about homeless individuals in order to meet various federal and state regulations. The information is shared with other agencies according to MOUs (Memoranda of Understanding) and contracts.

Renée Wilson states the requested retention is 7 years and destroy.

Steve Garside asks if the retention period starts after last contact with the homeless person. Nathan Dopp confirms.

David Fleming asks the justification for the 7 year retention. Renée Wilson explains that the closest GRS is [Patient and client case files \(GRS-1706\)](#), which has a retention of 7 years.

- David Fleming moves to approve the retention schedule; Matthew LaPlante seconds.
- The motion passes unanimously.

Wage and new hire records (SSRS-31280)-New

Submitted by Renee Wilson on behalf of Dept. of Workforce Services

Renée Wilson explains that these are records of new hires, but not of DWS employees; the information comes from agencies which report their new hires to DWS as required by law. Nathan Dopp adds that these records are used to determine unemployment insurance benefit claim amounts.

Renée Wilson explains that the requested retention is 8 years or until administrative value is met, and reads the statement in the series description stating what constitutes the agency's administrative need.

David Fleming asks why 8-year-old records are relevant to eligibility. Nathan Dopp explains that while not relevant for current eligibility, the data fulfills federal requirements and supports historical tracking, and that extracted data for specific administrative needs is stored in a separate data warehouse.

- Ken Williams moves to approve the retention schedule; Tracy Hansen seconds.
- The motion passes unanimously.

Other Business

Personal Data Within a Record Series discussion

Presented by Renee Wilson

Renée Wilson explains that some agencies are interested in deleting personally-identifiable data sooner than the related data, and State Archives would like the Committee's opinion on how best to approach this matter, in terms of record series creation. One option for accommodating this practice is to create a separate record series for personal data, while another approach is to include a note in the description of the record series, stating the personal data may be deleted before retention of the series as a whole.

David Fleming supports the second option, explaining that due to privacy laws, agencies need to have the flexibility to anonymize data and delete personal elements when requested.

The other committee members concur.

Next meeting scheduled: September 22, 2025

Committee members' attendance is polled for next meeting, to be held on September 22, 2025. All committee members confirm their availability.

- Tracy Hansen moves to adjourn the meeting; David Fleming seconds.
- There is no opposition to the motion.