

# June 2022 Records Management Committee Meeting

Monday, June 27, 2022, 1–1:50 PM

Utah Division of Archives and Records Service  
346 S Rio Grande St, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

[Google Hangouts Meet](#)

## Present

### Committee Members

Drew Mingl (chair)	Public finance representative
Josh Bullough	Private sector representative
Ken Williams	Director, Division of Archives and Records Service
Matthew LaPlante	News media representative
Tracy Hansen	Political subdivisions representative

### Others

Cami Beach	Department of Corrections
Matthew Anderson	Department of Corrections
Matt Pierce	RIM Specialist, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service
Renée Wilson	RIM Specialist, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service
Susan Mumford	Administrative assistant, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service
Kendra Yates	Chief Records Officer, Utah Division of Archives and Records Service

## Business

**Call to Order** at 1:03 PM by Drew Mingl.

### Approval of May 2022 meeting minutes

- Ken moved to approve the minutes; Tracy seconded
- Roll call vote: all approved

## Retention Schedule Review and Approval

### **Inmate mail control files (UDC 3-5)--Updated**

<https://axaemarchives.utah.gov/grsdetail.php?fq=grsItemRecordId:21512>

Submitted by Matt Pierce

This is an agency-specific general schedule whose retention period is changing from "3 years after release of inmate, then destroy" to "7 years, then destroy."

Cami Beach explained that the retention change is to better match the statute of limitations, particularly in the case of a grievance or civil rights claim. The old retention could be too short if an inmate has a very short stay in prison, or could be too long if the inmate is a "lifer."

The Utah Department of Corrections (UDC) reviewed this change internally and with their Assistant Attorney General, and all were comfortable with the update. A civil rights lawsuit statute of limitations is 4 years, so 7 years covers that plus some; 7 years would also cover any federal lawsuit. UDC is unaware of any federal requirements to keep the records longer than that, and the records have no operational value after that 7-year time period.

Ken asked if this schedule tracks any contraband that comes in, but Cami explained that other than a "denied" form, such records would be kept in an investigative case file. Likewise, disciplinary information and reports are kept elsewhere. Matt Anderson from UDC also explained that they do not keep a copy of inmate correspondence as a general rule, only if it is relevant to an investigation or to intelligence.

- Matthew LaPlante moved to approve the schedule; Tracy seconded
- Roll call vote: all approved

### **Elected or appointed officials register (GRS-254)--Updated**

<https://axaemarchives.utah.gov/grsdetail.php?fq=grsItemRecordId:21511>

Submitted by Matt Pierce

This general retention schedule (GRS) is being expanded to apply to additional types of government agencies besides just counties. The need for this update occurred because some old registers of elected officials from Provo City would have been a good fit in this GRS except for the wording specific to counties.

This GRS update had a one-month feedback period, which resulted in two comments. Commenters seemed concerned that they were being asked to keep a new record; they did not understand that a GRS applies only to records which are already being created. There were also concerns about including an elected official's residence in the register, so the GRS description includes the residence as information

that the records "may" include. Adherence to GRAMA would also preclude any non-public information from being released.

Matthew LaPlante suggested a potential solution to help agencies understand that the general retention schedules apply to records already being created: update the wording of the GRS to include "Records that would fall under this schedule contain..."

A discussion ensued regarding various ways of rewording GRS (in general) to be more helpful to both records officers and the lay person/member of the public. Kendra mentioned "This type of record may contain..." as a potential revision, while Matthew LaPlante mentioned "Records of this nature..."

Tracy pointed out that municipal records officers receive GRAMA training each year in which it's made clear they don't have to have the records of each GRS. The certification test also reaffirms this. Tracy hasn't had a member of the public approach her requesting a record based on a general schedule.

Kendra pointed out there's a difference in including language which would indicate the hypothetical possibility of the records' existence, versus language which states what information/records "may" be covered by the schedule.

Matt Pierce suggested that an explanation about an agency's use of GRS may not belong in the GRS description, but rather on the Archives website. Tracy agreed that including a statement with every GRS might be useful. Josh gave an example statement: "No schedule mandates that any agency produces any records."

Josh said that with a GRS there's no assumption that an agency has records, but with a series-specific retention schedule, that means the agency has that record. Kendra said that while it's not unreasonable to expect agencies to have a particular record based on their series-specific retention schedules, those schedules are not always up to date, so that's not always true.

Matthew LaPlante suggested that in future GRS schedules, clarifying language could be helpful, and a statement on the website wouldn't hurt to remind people either.

Ken asked about the "1 year" in the retention, which was carried over from the original GRS, but which seems to contradict "permanent." Tracy agreed that the retention should just say "Permanent. Records may be transferred to Archives."

- Matthew LaPlante moved to change GRS-254 as proposed, but with the following language in place of "These are complete registers or lists...": "Records that would follow under this schedule contain registers or lists..." Additionally, the retention should be changed to "Permanent. Records may be transferred to Archives."
- Josh seconded
- Roll call vote: all approved

Matthew LaPlante shared a bit of standard meeting protocol: usually when a committee member makes or seconds a motion, they're going to vote for that motion as well, but not always. A roll call vote should include people who made and seconded the motion.

## Other Business

**Next meeting scheduled** for Monday, 22 August 2022, 1:00 PM. This meeting will also include training on the Open and Public Meetings Act ([Utah Code 52-4](#)), as mandated in [Utah Code 52-4-104\(1\)](#).

- Tracy moved to adjourn

**Dismissal** at 1:50 PM.

Approved