

Records Management Committee Meeting

Monday, September 26, 2022

1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Utah Division of Archives and Records Service

346 S Rio Grande St

Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

[Google Hangouts Meet](#)

In Attendance:

Committee Members Present: Josh Bullough, Rebekkah Shaw (filling in for Ken Williams), Matthew LaPlante, Jacey Skinner, Veronica Solano Arangure, Drew Mingl (chair)

Committee Members Absent: Tracy Hansen was absent for the entire meeting

Others Present: Maren Peterson, Kendra Yates, Renee Wilson, Matt Pierce, Matthew Anderson, Cami Beach, Dorian Ashton, Whitney Phillips, Tonya Smith, and Mark Smith.

Business:

Drew Mingl called the meeting to order at 1:01pm

Approve the August 2022 minutes

- Drew Mingl asked for reflections or changes; there were no suggested changes.
- **Motion:** Jacey Skinner motioned to approve, seconded by Matthew LaPlante.
- **Roll Call Vote:** Josh Bullough, Matthew LaPlant, and Veronica Solano Arangure all approve. Rebekkah Shaw and Drew Mingl abstain, as they were not at the August meeting. Motion passes.

Whitney Phillips introduces herself as the privacy officer for the State. She works with more local governments.

Retention Schedule Review and Approval

Land Use Lease Agreements (GRS# TBD) —New schedule, Continued from last month. Submitted by Matt Pierce.

- Matthew explained that there are two state agencies that keep a lot of land use records, SITLA and DNR. Last time he had accidentally removed 'agricultural' from the

description, so he has added that back in. There is no general retention schedule for grazing leases; he did remove the phrase about grazing leases not following this schedule from the description.

- Drew Mingl asks for clarification on the grazing leases vs lease agreement and what the purpose of the schedule is. Matt explains the intention for this is to have a general retention for a lease agreement without needing to go through the whole approval process for a retention.
- Matthew LaPlante asks if there needs to be a GRS number in order to approve the schedule. Kendra clarifies that the GRS number will be assigned automatically when Matt puts the retention schedule into our system, and that the schedule can be referenced by its name for the purposes of approval.
- Jacey Skinner asks a question about the State Lands department and Universities may want to consult on the retention schedule as they also do land leases.
- Matthew LaPlante clarifies that if the committee creates the schedule then do we ask for feedback before we approve the retention and disposition. Matt Pierce clarifies that if there are other uses for the schedule from other agencies then the committee can revisit the schedule and modify it. He is hoping it is general enough to be approved.
- Matthew LaPlante wonders what the retention would be because he didn't see a timeline. Matt Pierce clarifies that it is permanent.
- **Motion:** Matthew LaPlante moves to approve the GRS for Land use lease agreements, as presented to the Committee. Joshua Bulloch seconds.
- **Roll Call Vote:** Jacey Skinner, Veronica, Rebekkah Shaw, Matthew LaPlante, Joshua Bullough, and Drew Mingl vote to approve the general retention schedule. The motion passes.

Department of Corrections Communication Records —Updated Agency-Specific GRS Schedule

3. Submitted by Matt Pierce

- Matt explains that these are the remainder of offender supervision records. There are a lot of postage-related records. There are two schedules that they would like to crosswalk into inmate mail and transitory tracking records, both of which are general retention schedules.
- Matthew Anderson, from the Department of Corrections, provided some context. They are in the process of cleaning up the Department of Correction's retention schedules. The records that they keep and create have changed significantly and they want to simplify their retention schedules. The Records Management Committee approved the updated GRS for inmate mail records earlier in the year. Now the Department is looking at all other inmate mail retention records and whether they should be crosswalked over to inmate mail records or the transitory tracking records retention schedules.
- GRS-2266 *Forwarded and returned to sender mail logs* this is a log that was created to track mail that came to offenders who were released and the mail was forwarded to them. This record is not currently created, but they wanted to keep a retention schedule in case someone wanted to create that in the future. Currently kept for 3 years, want to crosswalk to GRS-1720 which is "administrative need or up to 1 year."

- Matthew asks if there are questions on that one. Rebekkah clarifies that this is forwarded and returned mail, but does not apply to mail that an inmate has been denied, that those are separate records. Matthew confirms that is correct. Denials are under GRS-2269.
- GRS-2272 *Postage Logs* keep track of what percentage of post goes to different divisions of Corrections. Categorizes indigent mail, and they have a postage machine that creates records as well which can go under this schedule. Also want to crosswalk to GRS-1720, because it would not be useful to keep these for three years. They don't need them that long.
 - Drew asks questions about the records that the mail machine creates. The mail machine creates similar records.
- GRS-2273 *Privileged mail log* is used to track an inmate's legal records. When privileged mail is received or sent, the log is currently kept for three years. The propose crosswalking these to GRS-2269 to be kept for seven years to cover the statute of limitations.
 - Drew asks if the record is kept in two places, in O-track as well. Matthew Anderson clarifies that it is, and that this schedule is precautionary and would apply if someone decided to create this record in addition to what is in O-track.
- GRS-2271 *Inmate-to-inmate correspondence request log* is to track approval or denial of communication between inmates. Every year approvals need to be renewed. They are mentioned in GRS-2269 as well, so they want to cross walk it as current retention is only 2 years. There shouldn't be a conflict between two retention schedules.
 - Drew asks if that applies to inmates in other states as well. Matthew Anderson isn't sure, but he thinks it is a separate process where approval is needed between both wardens.
- GRS-2268 *Inmate forwarding address file* is to keep track of forwarding address if the inmate is released, or the declination to give an address. Current retention is 3 months, but want to crosswalk to GRS-1720, giving staff a little flexibility to keep more than 3 months if needed.
 - No questions.
- GRS-2270 *Inmate mail money receipts* track if an inmate gets a check from outside the institution. This refers to paychecks/ taxes etc., not family putting money into the inmate's account. The mail room tracks that they received that check and forwarded it on. Retain for 3 months currently; want to crosswalk to GRS-1720.
 - Matthew LaPlante says he appreciates the crosswalks and the amount of work that they are putting in.
 - Drew Mingl asks if these retention schedules apply to county jails, as they often house State inmates. Matthew Anderson says it would apply to the State inmates at least. County jail does input information into O-track for the State inmates.
 - Whitney Phillips asks if these changes are just for State inmates or general records regardless of state or county jails. Matthew Anderson says these schedules are specific to the agency of the Department of Corrections and have not been coordinating with the county jails. Drew notes that consistency would be helpful.

- Kendra Yates clarifies that this is an agency-specific general retention schedule. These schedules are for the Department of Corrections. They could be good guidelines for county jails, but the jails were not consulted in the process of updating these, as these are not regular general retention schedules. Rebekkah Shaw says these are updates to the Department of Corrections' schedules. Maybe in the future we can update county jails' schedules, but we don't want to slow down Correction's updates.
- **Motion:** Rebekkah Shaw makes a motion to approve the Schedule 3 Communication updates as presented. Matthew LaPlante seconds.
- **Roll Call Vote:** Joshua Bullough, Matthew LaPlante, Jacey Skinner, Veronica Solano Arangure, Rebekkah Shaw, and Drew Mingl vote to approve the motion.

Regulated system logs (SSRS 30407) —New series-specific retention schedule for the Department of Government Operations, Division of Technology Services (DTS). Submitted by Renee Wilson.

- Renee Wilson says DTS maintains numerous information systems for State agencies. Some of the data within those systems must follow federal regulations (such as HIPAA and FERPA) and/or other industry regulations. Systems which contain these types of data are referred to as "regulated systems." They have a lot of data logs for systems, and they have been using a general retention schedule—Transitory tracking records (GRS-1720)—for the data logs. That GRS has a retention of one year or shorter; data logs for regulated systems need to be kept longer. They would like to keep the data logs for their regulated systems for 7 years, and then destroy.
- Drew Mingl asks if there is a list of regulated vs non-regulated systems. Dorian, from the Division of Technology Services, clarifies that the Division does make that distinction.
- **Motion:** Jacey Skinner motions to approve the proposed schedule for regulated system logs. Rebekkah Shaw seconds.
- **Roll Call Vote:** Joshua Bullough, Matthew LaPlante, Jacey Skinner, Veronica Solano Arangure, Rebekkah Shaw, and Drew Mingl vote to approve the motion.

Schedule the next meeting:

- October 24th— everyone verified they would be able to attend; Rebekkah Shaw noted she would fill in for Ken again.

Drew Mingl ended the meeting at 2:01 p.m.