

## **Records Management Committee Meeting**

Monday, January 23, 2023

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

[Google Hangouts Meet](#)

**Board members in attendance:** Drew Mingl, Matthew LaPlante, Tracy Hansen, Rebekkah Shaw (State Archivist Designee), and Jacey Skinner. **Absent:** Veronica Arangure and Josh Bullough.

**Others Present:** Matt Pierce, Kendra Yates, Maren Peterson, Heidi Steed, Renee Willson, Brian Swan (Attorney General's office), Stephanie Barber-Renteria (SITLA), Lisa Wells (SITLA), Rachel Boyak (SITLA), Cami Beach (Department of Corrections).

**Chair Drew Mingl called meeting to order at 1:02pm**

### ***Business:***

#### **Approval of October 2022 meeting minutes**

Board member Rebekkah Shaw motioned to approve meeting minutes. Board member Jacey Skinner seconded. Matthew LaPlante, Rebekkah Shaw and Tracy Hansen abstained from voting because they were not present at the October meeting. Drew Mingl and Jacey Skinner voted in favor of approval of the minutes.

Drew Mingl expressed appreciation for the level of detail provided by the RIM Specialists in the creation of the board's preparation materials.

### ***Retention Schedule Review and Approval:***

#### **Bond records (SSRS 30447, School and Institutional Trust Land Administration, aka SITLA) —New retention schedule**

State Government Records and Information Management Specialist Renee Wilson introduced the SITLA team and paraphrased the proposed series specific retention schedule 30447. Renee shared retention justification by noting the precedent in series specific retention schedule 8424 which was approved for use by the Department of Natural Resources. Drew Mingl opened up the floor for board discussion.

Matthew LaPlante asked the SITLA staff to confirm if the bond is forfeited, for example when the land is damaged, is another record created to document any reclamation processes. Lisa confirmed that yes, that process is documented in another records series, as noted in the description of the series.

Drew Mingl asked about the format of the records and if they were primarily in paper or electronic. SITLA confirmed the records consist mostly of paper records, but that is largely due to the fact that the agency is moving, and the series is meant to help them clean up paper records that they have in storage.

Drew also asked if this State process was separate and unrelated to records and processes created to manage land at the Federal level, and asked if anything from the records was shared with Federal agencies. SITLA confirmed that this was an independent process and no records were shared with the Federal Government.

Matthew LaPlante motioned to approve the series 30447 as written. Tracy Hansen seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

**Department of Corrections Schedule 9 (Agency-specific GRS) —Discontinue 6 schedules: GRS 2367, GRS 2374, GRS 2387, GRS 2388, GRS 2389 and GRS 2361**

General Records Retention Specialist Matt Pierce introduced Cami Beach, the records officer from the Department of Corrections, who presented to the board the six agency specific general retention from Schedule 9 for the Department of Correction, that are being proposed for discontinuation: GRS 2367, GRS 2374, GRS 2387, GRS 2388, GRS 2389 and GRS 2361. Cami noted that most of the schedules were being proposed for discontinuation because the formats are obsolete and no longer being created or managed by the department, and can be created as needed or queried in the departments electronic data system, or in the case of GRS 2361 are being maintained by a separate department, the Board of Pardons and Parole, which uses a different retention schedule. Cami and Matt opened the floor for board discussion.

Drew Mingl asked for clarification about whether or not the agency was actively using the general records retention schedules that were created for the department's use. Cami mentioned that she did her due diligence to find staff members who were around when the schedules were created 20 years ago, to determine their creation and purpose. Finding no one in the department actively using the general retention schedules. Cami determined that due to the fact that most of the retention schedules had very short retentions, and that most of the formats were obsolete, it would seem most of the related records had been destroyed according to the schedules, and that different schedules were needed to reflect the department's current processes.

Drew Mingl asked for confirmation that the vote was for the discontinuation of the schedules. Matt Pierce confirmed.

Matthew LaPlante motioned to approve the discontinuation of the GRS 2367, GRS 2374, GRS 2387, GRS 2388, GRS 2389 and GRS 2361 as recommended by the Department of Corrections. Tracy Hansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Employment history records (GRS-1965 and GRS-1905) —Updated, proposed consolidation**

Matt Pierce presented to the board a proposed consolidation of general records retention schedule GRS-1965, Employment history records, with general records retention schedule GRS-1905, Employee wage history records, due to their similarities in function and retention justification, to avoid confusion by users.

Tracy Hansen had a question about how the 65-year retention for these two schedules was determined. Rebekkah Shaw confirmed that retention was determined through state code, which specifies that the records be kept 65 years after date of hire or 3 years after retirement or death. And Kendra Yates provided the board with a link to the relevant statute: Utah Code 49-11-602. Rebekkah asked about how the retention will be read on the website, and expressed that she liked the re-wording provided by Matt Pierce.

Tracy commented about the difficulty of managing these records, the large volume of records and need to reorganize them in order to manage the retention trigger. Matthew LaPlante asked if there was a possibility that records might be destroyed before a person is done working with a department, if they have a career that lasts longer than 65 years. It was noted that could be a possibility, but would be a rare occurrence. Tracy said that if Utah Code requires that they be retained 65 years after date of hire or 3 years after retirement or death, then the proposed general retention schedule was good; she liked the consolidation, but she had questions about whether a determination could be made about the intent of the law for keeping them 65 years. The main thing the older records are used for at her agency is to confirm retirement dates for Utah Retirement Systems.

Jacey asked if it would be appropriate for the Records Management Committee to recommend looking at the statute to see if it could be changed to something more reasonable.

Drew and Tracy brought up the difficulty of maintaining the electronic records for 65 years, to migrate them into new databases as systems get updated or changed.

Matthew LaPlante motioned to approve GRS Update Proposal 2212 (consolidation of general records retention schedule GRS-1965, Employment history records, with general records retention schedule GRS-1905, Employee wage history records) as written, and Rebekkah Shaw seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Drew Mingl posed a question to the committee about making considerations for a future discussion about blockchain and its impacts on government records in future.

### ***Other Business:***

The next Records Management Board meeting was scheduled for February 27, 2023 at 1pm. Committee members' attendance was polled for the next meeting. Jacey Skinner noted she may not be able to attend due to the ongoing Legislative Session. No quorum was verified.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:47pm**

Approved