

Amendment: Vacant committee member moved from “present” to “not present”.

State Records Committee Meeting

Location: Courtyard Meeting Room, 346 S. Rio Grande St., SLC, UT 84101

Date: February 21, 2020

Time: 11:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present:

Kenneth Williams, State Archivist

David Fleming, Private Sector Records Manager

Holly Richardson, Citizen Representative

Patricia Smith-Mansfield, Citizen Representative

Tom Haraldsen, Chair, Media Representative

Committee Members Not Present:

Vacant, Electronic Records and Databases Representative

Vacant, Political Subdivision Representative

Legal Counsel:

Paul Tonks, Assistant Attorney General, Attorney General’s Office

Nicole Alder, Paralegal, Attorney General’s Office

Executive Secretary:

Rebekkah Shaw, Utah State Archives

Telephonic participation:

Patrick Sullivan

Rodger Worthen, Riverdale City

Others Present:

Justin Anderson, Assistant Attorney General

Jennifer Korb, Assistant Attorney General

Thomas Kessinger, Assistant Attorney General

Stuart Peay (Magnum)

Ai Ning Hsu

Jana Tibbitts

Kathryn Steffey (Saltitude)

John Bloom

Alyssa Black

Deborah Wood, Assistant Attorney General

Rodger Worthen

Richard Taylor (Manager of community center)

Steve Onysko

Kent Singleton

Eric Peterson
Trinity Jordan
Greg Hansen, Assistant Attorney General
Rosemary Cundiff, Government Records Ombudsman

Agenda:

- Seven Hearings Scheduled
 - Paul Amann v. Unified Police Department of Greater Salt Lake
 - Patrick Sullivan v. Utah Department of Corrections
 - Raymond Fitzgerald (Day Pacer LLC) v. Division of Consumer Protection
 - John G. Bloom v. Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining
 - Jana Tibbitts (for Ai Ning Hsu) v. Department of Human Services
 - Kent Singleton v. Riverdale City
 - Eric Peterson (Utah Investigative Journalism Project) v. Department of Natural
- Business:
- Approval of January 9, 2020, minutes, action item
- Appointment of new Executive Secretary
- SRC appeals received and declined, notices of compliance, and related action items
- Cases in District Court, report
- Other Business
 - Nomination of Chair Pro-tem
 - Introduction of new member representing political subdivisions, action item
 - Next meeting scheduled for March 19, 2020, 9 a.m. - 4 p.m.
 - Committee member's attendance polled for next meeting to verify the attendance of a quorum.

Call to Order

The State Records Committee Chair, Patricia Smith-Mansfield, called the meeting to order.

1. Paul Amann v. Unified Police Department

Ms. Smith-Mansfield announced that the hearing is postponed with the intent to withdraw.

Motion by Ms. Richardson to accept the Petitioner's request to postpone was seconded by Mr. Haraldsen.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The hearing is concluded.

2. Patrick Sullivan v. Utah Department of Corrections (Continuance)

Patrick Sullivan was connected telephonically to the hearing. Ms. Smith-Mansfield announced the hearing. The Committee members introduced themselves. Justin Anderson, legal counsel for the Utah Department of Corrections (UDC), introduced himself. The Chair provided instructions and reviewed the procedures. The Chair asked the respondent if they brought records to be reviewed in camera.

Motion by Mr. Williams to go in camera to review the records. Seconded by Mr. Fleming.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The records reviewed in camera are designated Document 1 (emails) and Document 2 (the draft policy).

Deliberation

Motion by Mr. Fleming: Document 1 is a public record per Utah Code 63G-2-203(2). Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Discussion on the motion

The Committee discussed the email mentions the draft, but does not reveal material of the draft.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Motion by Mr. Fleming: Document 2 is a protected record per Utah Code 63G-2-305(22). Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The hearing is concluded. An order will be issued within seven business days and both parties will receive a copy of the order. Each party has 30 days to appeal the Committee's decision to district court.

3. Raymond Fitzgerald (Day Pacer LLC) v. Division of Consumer Protection

The Chair announced the hearing. The Chair provided instructions and reviewed the procedures. The Chair reminded the parties that mediation discussions are not allowed to be referenced in their testimony and asked the parties to acknowledge the restrictions on discussions of mediation. Both parties acknowledged the restrictions.

Petitioner's Statements

Mr. Fitzgerald stated his request is related to a complaint made in 2016. He wanted to know who filed the complaint. He stated everyone has heard of the FTC, so the respondent cannot say the source is not generally known per 63G-2-305(10)(d). Mr. Fitzgerald stated there is not an invasion of privacy in this context and requests the redactions be removed from the provided records.

Respondent Statements

Ms. Korb stated the document at issue is a one page complaint filed with the division. The petitioner already has a redacted version. She stated they redacted as little as possible to protect the individual.

Ms. Korb stated the document is from an investigation file which is protected under 63G-2-305(10)(d). The complainant provided information as part of the investigation and told investigators they feared retaliation. Complainant identity being private is important to the division to encourage future cooperators. They believe they have satisfied the request.

Questions from the Committee

The Committee asked if only the name of the complainant was redacted. Ms. Korb said other material was redacted that could be used to determine the person's identity. The Committee asked if providing a redacted complaint is general practice for the division. Ms. Korb responded that initially no. They deny these requests for the same reasons.

Petitioner Closing

Mr. Fitzgerald stated the Committee should ask for the unredacted complaint. He stated there are three people at the FTC who were there in 2016. If those three names aren't on the complaint, then there needs to be an explanation on what the invasion of privacy is. Mr. Fitzgerald stated DayPacer is entitled to find the basis of the accusations.

Respondent Closing

Ms. Korb stated she is in favor of the committee reviewing the complaint. Protecting the complainant is important to the division and the Committee should deny the appeal.

Deliberation

Motion by Mr. Fleming to go in camera and review the records. Seconded by Mr. Haraldsen. Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Motion by Ms. Richardson to go back in session. Seconded by Mr. Fleming. Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Motion by Mr. Williams: the records are properly classified as protected per 63G-2-305(d). Seconded by Ms. Richardson.

Discussion on the motion

The Committee discussed for the petitioner's benefit their authority comes from GRAMA so their decisions must be based on GRAMA. He has a remedy to depose witnesses in court.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The hearing is concluded. An order will be issued within seven business days and both parties will receive a copy of the order. Each party has 30 days to appeal the decision of the State Records Committee to district court.

4. John G. Bloom v. Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining

Ms. Smith-Mansfield announced the hearing, provided instructions, and reviewed the procedures. The Chair reminded the parties that mediation discussions are not allowed to be referenced in their testimony and asked the parties to acknowledge the restrictions on discussions of mediation. Both parties acknowledged the restrictions.

Two parties have motions to intervene. The Chair reviewed the procedures and reminded the interested parties to limit their testimony to what has not already been provided.

Petitioner Statements

Mr. Bloom stated that he is seeking two technical reports sent to the Division. One is the May 2008 Western Energy Hub Project Area, Structural Interpretation. The other is the August 2016 Location and Character of Faults in the Vicinity of the Magnum Energy Facility. Both address topics specific to geology.

Mr. Bloom stated the information in these reports have the location and extent of faults in the area. They would document the style of movement, time of rupture and magnitude of earthquake capable. The reports would put the faults in a larger context. He stated these reports are not trade secrets under 63G-2-305(1) because scientific reports are not mentioned. He states they do not fall under unfair competition in 63G-2-305(2) because competitors would do their own study as due diligence. He stated it is common practice for fault reports to be available to the public through the Utah Geological data system without consideration of cost to the client.

Respondent Statements

Mr. Kessinger stated the Division's role is to ensure safe use of the state's resources. They keep a close working relationship with the industries it regulates. The ultimate issue to be resolved is whether the interest in maintaining confidentiality is outweighed by public interest. He stated public interest is minimal, the records are properly classified under 63G-2-305(1) and (2), and no public funds were used. The records were provided to the Division with the understanding they would be protected under GRAMA.

Mr. Kessinger stated the public interest was served by a formal evidentiary hearing in 2014. In 2019 there was a six month review to include refined products used for the Salt Dome. SITLA, DEQ, and other state entities were involved. A hearing was held in September 2019 and testimony regarding the reports was given. The petitioner attended the meeting and provided comments.

Questions from Committee

The Committee asked if the reports' contents were discussed in the 2019 public meeting. Mr. Kessinger stated contents weren't discussed in full, but the experts were there to provide testimony.

The Committee asked if any of the data was entered in the Utah Geological Survey system. Mr. Kessinger stated to the best of his knowledge, they weren't.

Petitioner Closing

Mr. Bloom stated that the reports are geology reports, not trade secrets, and should be accessible. Their disclosure would not cause competitive injury.

Respondent Closing

Mr. Kessinger stated the records are protected under 63G-2-305(1) and (2). He stated the reports would give competitors a huge competitive advantage. He stated seismic data are used to make calculated business decisions.

Interested Party

Magnum stated the information is protected because of the millions of dollars they spent to determine what's there, where the salt is, and where the fault lines are. This information isn't available without spending the money to get it. Magnum and Saltitude split parts of the cavern. The studies were done to build a business.

Saltitude stated trade secrets means information including formula, patterns, and computations. The purchase agreement signed in 2015 had an extensive confidentiality agreement regarding the reports. Saltitude replied on the reports and did not hire anyone to complete the studies separately.

Questions from Committee

The Committee asked if either report is copyrighted. The respondent said no.

Deliberation

Motion by Mr. Haraldsen to go in camera and review the records. Seconded by Ms. Richardson.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Motion by Mr. Fleming to open then the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Ms. Richardson voting in favor of the motion.

The Committee asked if either exhibits were part of public presentations. Mr. Kessinger says the reports were never presented. The Committee discussed the board and qualifications of those on the board. The Committee discussed 63G-2-305(1) & (2).

Motion by Mr. Fleming to open then the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Discussion on the motion

Ms. Smith-Mansfield expressed disappointment that a lot of scientific inquiry is done by business and kept secret. She stated she doesn't believe public funds used in creating reports matters. Mr. Williams concurs with the motions. He stated the public has been served and the entities did their due diligence. Ms. Richardson found both arguments compelling. She stated big tech companies hire researchers and their work is proprietary. Mr. Haraldsen stated the respondent is a regulatory agency and must depend on mechanisms in place.

Vote: Aye: 4 Nay: 1. Motion carries 4-1. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion. Ms. Smith-Mansfield voting against the motion.

The hearing is concluded. An order will be issued within seven business days and both parties will receive a copy of the order. Each party has 30 days to appeal the decision of the State Records Committee to district court.

5. Jana Tibbitts (for Ai Ning Hsu) v. Department of Human Services

Ms. Smith-Mansfield announced the hearing. The Chair provided instructions and reviewed the procedures. The Chair reminded the parties that mediation discussions are not allowed to be referenced in their testimony and asked the parties to acknowledge the restrictions on discussions of mediation. Both parties acknowledged the restrictions.

Motion to dismiss from the respondent. The Chair gave each party 5 minutes.

Respondent Statements

Ms. Wood stated access is held by DCFS and filed a motion to dismiss on timeliness. The CAO made a decision regarding foster care records September 4, 2019. The appeal wasn't done until October 16th, 2019. The CAO made a decision regarding text messages September 10, 2019. The appeal was filed October 11, 2019. Notice was not served until October 16th. She stated both appeals exceed 30 days therefore only the third part of the request, the emails, can be before the Committee.

Petitioner's Statements

Ms. Tibbitts stated she requested a timeline from the Executive Secretary. She stated she did not know what was decided until records were received. Her timeline is from when she got the records, not the appeal.

Questions from the Committee

The Committee asked the petitioner if they knew some information would be redacted. She did, but did not know what additional documents would be included. The Committee asked when records were received. Ms. Tibbitts stated the appeal letter was received on the 11th, and records were received on the 13th. She stated her 30 days to appeal started when they knew what the decision was and it took time to review the records.

Motion by Mr. Fleming: deny the motion to dismiss. Seconded by Ms. Richardson.

Vote: Aye: 4 Nay: 1. Motion carries 4-1. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion. Ms. Smith-Mansfield voting against the motion.

Petitioner's Statements

Ms. Tibbitts stated that she is with Ai Ning Hsu and her victim's advocate. Andy Tran is available by phone. She requested they be sworn in.

The Chair delivered the oath. Both witnesses were sworn in.

Ms. Tibbitts discussed the background to this request. She stated they stopped getting access to the records in 2019. Records were supposed to be given to her client unredacted through the court case. She stated they filed the GRAMA request when that didn't happen. She stated a victim advocate was hired to help get the records. Ms. Tibbitts states the records are important to her client's safety. Ms. Tibbitts stated they are seeking what is private, not protected. She stated her client should be granted access as the guardian of the subject of the record.

Respondent Statements

Ms. Wood stated the division's position is that the mother has received the records that pertain to her and her child. She stated the redacted information has to do with third party supervisors, the father, and others. There is also attorney-client privilege involved.

She stated the texts and email are in three different accounts. All three were accessed in Google Vault by DTS using search terms created based on the request. She stated the division erred on the side of caution for privacy rights when redacting. When the CAO reviewed the appeal, more records were released. She stated nothing in statute waives the father's privacy interest.

Ms. Wood stated these records can be protected under 63G-2-305. She stated the division has made a diligent effort to satisfy the request.

Questions from Committee

The Committee asked what private classification the respondent is relying on. Ms. Wood said 63G-2-202(2)(d) and 63G-2-304(1)(b).

Petitioner Closing

Ms. Tibbitts stated her client is authorized to private records involving the father under 62A-4a-412. She stated the records should have been provided to law enforcement. She stated there is more information in the redactions that law enforcement can use to connect the dots of the father's conduct.

Respondent Closing

Ms. Wood stated they did not hide any criminal activity. She stated the Committee has to look at who the subject of the record is.

Deliberation

Motion by Mr. Fleming to go in camera. Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Motion by Mr. Fleming to open the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The Committee discussed 62A-4a-412, 63G-2-201(3), and 63G-2-203(10).

Motion by Ms. Richardson: grant the request under 62A-4a-412(1) subject to 63G-2-202(10). Seconded by Mr. Fleming.

Discussion on the motion

The Committee expressed a need for clarity in the law regarding classification.

Vote: Aye: 3 Nay: 2. Motion carries 3-2. Mr. Fleming, Mr. Haraldsen, Ms. Richardson voting in favor of the motion. Ms. Smith-Mansfield and Mr. Williams voting against the motion.

Substitute Motion by Ms. Richardson: clarifies the motion excludes records involving parties not related to the case. Seconded by Mr. Fleming.

Vote: Aye: 3 Nay: 2. Motion carries 3-2. Mr. Fleming, Mr. Haraldsen, Ms. Richardson voting in favor of the motion. Ms. Smith-Mansfield and Mr. Williams voting against the motion.

The hearing is concluded. An order will be issued within seven business days and both parties will receive a copy of the order. Each party has 30 days to appeal the decision of the State Records Committee to district court.

6. Kent Singleton v. Riverdale City

Ms. Smith-Mansfield announced the hearing, provided instructions, and reviewed the procedures. The Chair reminded the parties that mediation discussions are not allowed to be referenced in their testimony and asked the parties to acknowledge the restrictions on discussions of mediation. Both parties acknowledged the restrictions.

Motion to dismiss from the respondent.

Respondent Statements

Mr. Worthen states all records have been provided.

The Chair explained the appeal was cancelled by the previous Executive Secretary, but the Committee determined the appeal should be heard if the petitioner believes records are still outstanding.

The Chair delivered the oath. Mr. Onysko was sworn in.

Petitioner Statements

Mr. Onysko stated that there are records outstanding. He stated the respondents letter stating all available records were provided presumes there are records unavailable. He stated the respondent did not tell Mr. Singleton the policy does not exist and the Committee cannot assume it does not exist.

Questions from the Committee

The Committee asked the petitioner if he believes there is a policy specific to computer use. Mr. Singleton stated he received an email stating there was a policy.

Respondent Statements

Mr. Worthen objected to Mr. Onysko doing the petitioner's presentation. He stated the request did not go to the proper party, but when they got the request they responded. He stated the Committee cannot order a record be created. He called a witness.

Mr. Taylor stated he is the manager of the community center. He explained the code of conduct is the only record they have related to this request. He stated there are no written policies for activities and operations.

Questions from Committee

The Committee determined there are rules posted on the door, but not policies regarding the computers.

Petitioner Closing

Mr. Onysko stated the respondent needs to present evidence to prove the record does not exist. He stated the citizens of Riverdale have a right to know if there is corruption in their government.

Respondent Closing

Mr. Worthen stated corruption is not before the Committee. He stated evidence is clear there are no records and he does not know what the Committee can order them to do.

Deliberation

Motion by Mr. Williams: deny the appeal as all responsive records have been provided. Seconded by Mr. Fleming.

Discussion to the motion

The Committee stated they cannot verify if records do not exist and cannot compel records to be created.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, Ms. Smith-Mansfield, and Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The hearing is concluded. An order will be issued within seven business days and both parties will receive a copy of the order. Each party has 30 days to appeal the decision of the State Records Committee to district court.

7. Eric Peterson (Utah Investigative Journalism Project) v. Department of Natural Resources

Ms. Smith-Mansfield announced the hearing, provided instructions, and reviewed the procedures. The Chair reminded the parties that mediation discussions are not allowed to be referenced in their testimony and asked the parties to acknowledge the restrictions on discussions of mediation. Both parties acknowledged the restrictions.

Petitioner Statements

Mr. Peterson stated Big Game Forever has claimed business confidentiality to keep subcontractor names secret. He explained he does not believe contractors are trade secrets because people who might keep secrets are not secrets. He stated he is not seeking special information or techniques the subcontractors use. He explained expenditure reports do not have an hourly rate of each contractor per project.

Mr. Peterson stated a false dichotomy is presented by asking the Committee to support transparency of public projects or protect private interests. He explains both can be accomplished. He stated privacy of customer lists is not the same and subcontractors and the public has a right to know the names of the people doing this work.

Respondent Statement

Mr. Hansen thanked the Committee for their service. He stated an annual report of activities and accomplishments of Big Game Forever is published unredacted online. He stated it includes generalized expense disclosure. He explained they directed the petitioner to the online reports and gave redacted versions of some reports. He stated they only redacted the names of subcontractors as there would be competitive injury to Big Game Forever in seeking future subcontractors.

Petitioner Closing

Mr. Peterson stated he does not believe this kind of confidentiality is good for anyone. He stated if there are concerns with former employees leaving and starting a business, there are well established legal remedies.

Respondent Closing

Mr. Hansen stated based on the overwhelming public information available, the small redactions did not warrant public disclosure.

Interested Party

Trinity Jordan from Big Game Forever stated they entered a contract with DNR with the understanding this was protected information. She stated they are marked specifically trade secrets because of competitive injury. She stated the courts went through six steps to decide if something is a trade secret and this fits that list. She stated subcontractors do not know who all

the other subcontractors are. She stated the information is protected because people who deal in wildlife and environment are passionate on both sides of the fence.

Questions from the Committee

The Committee asked if these are subcontractors. Ms. Jordan stated they are subcontractors, vendors, and employees. The Committee asked how often reports are published. Mr. Hansen stated there are six annual reports and two semi-annual reports since an amendment to the contract.

Deliberation

The Committee discussed 63G-2-301(3), and 63G-2-305(1) and (2). The Committee stated Big Game Forever is a lobbying organization and the respondent has not proven their interest in non-disclosure is greater than public interest.

Motion by Ms. Richardson: The Committee finds names are not trade secrets protected under 63G-2-305(1) and (2). Seconded by Mr. Fleming.

Discussion to the motion

The Committee stated there is less expectation of privacy when you as an advocacy group. The Committee stated 63G-2-305(2) says "and" therefore all must be met to be protected.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The hearing is concluded. An order will be issued within seven business days and both parties will receive a copy of the order. Each party has 30 days to appeal the decision of the State Records Committee to district court.

BUSINESS

Motion to Approve January 9, 2020, Minutes

The motion to approve the minutes was made by Ms. Richardson. Seconded by Mr. Fleming.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Appointment of new Executive Secretary

Motion by Mr. Williams to approve Rebekkah Shaw as the new Executive Secretary. Seconded by Ms. Richardson.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Introduction of new member of the Committee representing political subdivisions, action item

Mr. Williams explained ULCT submitted a name awaiting Senate confirmation. There are two applicants for the IT position. Ms. Richardson stated September will be her last meeting.

Report on Appeals received, report

Ms. Shaw, the executive secretary, reviewed the status of appeals received and the declined appeals.

Report on Cases in District Court: Paul Tonks, Assistant Attorney General, provided updates on the current appeal cases under judicial review.

Nomination of Chair pro-tem action item

Motion by Ms. Richardson to nominate Mr. Williams Chair pro-tem. Seconded by Mr. Fleming.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

Motion by Mr. Fleming to move the next meeting from March 12th to the 19th. Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Vote: Aye: 5 Nay: 0. Motion carries 5-0. Mr. Williams, Mr. Fleming, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Smith-Mansfield, Mr. Haraldsen voting in favor of the motion.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 19, 2020, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Motion to Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the February 21, 2020, State Records Committee meeting at 4:23 p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the February 21, 2020, SRC meeting minutes, which was approved on April 9, 2020. An audio recording of this meeting is available on the Utah Public Notice Website at <https://archives.utah.gov>.

X

Executive Secretary