

RECORDS COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

July 16, 2009

1:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

President, Board of Commissioners, Tim Bubb called the Licking County Records Commission meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. in the Donald D. Hill County Administration Building, Meeting Room D, 20 South Second Street, Newark, Ohio.

Commissioner Bubb welcomed everyone.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Tim Bubb, J. Terry Evans, Ken Oswald, Bryan Long, & Gary Walters

Members Absent: None

Records Commission Secretary: Katy Klettlinger

Others Present:

Jennifer Donegan

Angela Spray

Barb Luce

Robert Smith

Brad Feightner

Laurie Pitchford

Angie Koontz

Chad Shutts

Pam Jones

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Bubb asked for corrections to the February 2, 2009 minutes.

Being none, Mr. Evans made a motion to approve the minutes, Mr. Walters seconded. All were in favor. Motion carried.

INTRODUCTION OF CONSULTANT, ROBERT SMITH

Ms. Klettlinger introduced Robert Smith to the commission and meeting attendees. Mr. Smith previously served as the Records Manager for Montgomery County and currently teaches archival courses at Wright State University. Mr. Smith assisted the county last year with the hiring of the Records and Archives Coordinator. Ms. Klettlinger stated she requested Mr. Smith's presence today to discuss the benefits of creating a countywide imaging and microfilm program.

INTRODUCTION OF RECORDS AND ARCHIVES DEPARTMENT STAFF

Ms. Klettlinger introduced the department's two staff members who transferred from the Recorder's Office in May. Ms. Klettlinger introduced Records Clerk, Jennifer Donegan, and explained her duties to those present. She also introduced Imaging Technician, Angela Spray, and informed the group of her duties.

SCHEDULE OF RECORDS RETENTION AND DISPOSITION (RC-2)

1. Licking County Records and Archives Department– New- Submitted by Angela Spray

Ms. Spray told commission members this was the department's first retention schedule as a new department.

Mr. Long made a motion to approve the new RC-2 Form for the Licking County Records and Archives Department.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion.

All were in favor. Motion carried.

2. General retention schedule for Board of County Commissioners and offices under its supervision- New- Submitted by Katy Klettlinger

Ms. Klettlinger explained to the group general retention schedules are important documents for effective records management. The schedule, which lists records commonly created by all departments, will only be for the Board of County Commissioners and offices serving under it. Ms. Klettlinger encouraged the adoption of this schedule for use by elected officials. She worked with Human Resources, the Chief Deputy Auditor, and the Prosecuting Attorney to ensure the schedule was legally compliant.

Mr. Oswalt explained two changes made to the schedule upon meeting with Ms. Klettlinger. One change was to organize correspondence by content and place it with the appropriate records series. Another change was to retain records that could possibly be audited for twice the amount of time of the stated retention period if an audit on those records never occurs.

Mr. Bubb asked if it was recommended for elected officials to adopt this schedule. Ms. Klettlinger stated adoption is highly recommended.

Mr. Oswalt asked if elected officials had to adopt the schedule as is if there are records series on the form not made by their office. Ms. Klettlinger said she would personally meet with elected officials to change the retention schedule as appropriate to their office's needs and have the altered schedule adopted as their own.

Mr. Oswalt requested a motion be made to for the Board of County Commissioners to adopt a general retention schedule for itself and departments under its supervision with the authorization of the Records Commission.

Mr. Oswalt made a motion to authorize the Board of County Commissioners to adopt the general retention schedule for itself and offices under its supervision.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion.

All members were in favor. Motion carried.

REQUESTS FOR ONE-TIME RECORDS DISPOSAL (RC-1)

1) None

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Archiving E-mail for Records Retention Requirements

Ms. Klettlinger informed the group that some member's of the records commission wished to discuss the proposed email policy to retain all emails created in county for five years in more detail.

Mr. Long stated that he was a concerned member. He expressed that he was concerned with the proposed policy as it is read because he believes elected officials should have the option to opt

out of the retention software program because they are all responsible for following their own department's retention schedules.

Ms. Klettlinger asked IS staff members, Angie Koontz and Chad Shutts if the program would allow for departments to opt out. Mr. Shutts explained that retention schedules were reviewed during the project to determine an appropriate retention period. He met with Eric Fox to discuss records request on email. The current legal opinion is that IS is only the holder of the email. If a public records request was ever made, IS is responsible for forwarding the request to the appropriate department head. The head could then determine which emails are to be given to the requestor in the event of a public records request.

Mr. Oswalt added that emails are only retained by content, not as a records series. Ms. Koontz stated that when records retention schedules were reviewed, all records series were reviewed to come to conclusion that 5 years was an appropriate retention period for email. Mr. Shutts added that five years was chosen because an estimated 80% of county employees do not manage their email accounts per their department's retention schedule. He expressed an appreciation that Ms. Klettlinger was recently hired to educate employees on email use.

Mr. Bubb stated that the extended retention period has assisted his office. Mr. Shutts advised Mr. Long to at least maintain the email for 1-2 years with the software program versus opting out of the program all together.

Mr. Oswalt proposed that a set period of time for all emails in electronic format be implemented, but five years was too long. He would prefer a retention period between 18 and 24 months for emails that qualify as a public record and reiterate to employees to retain the email in another format if it is needed beyond the retention period.

Ms. Klettlinger stated that she would meet with IS to discuss the setup of the software program and then meet with Mr. Oswalt to create a suitable retention period.

2. Creation of a Countywide Imaging/Microfilm Program

Consultant, Bob Smith, briefly spoke about the benefits of creating a county imaging program and how it benefited Montgomery County Government. Smith stated that imaging saves time and money. Also, electronic records imaging increases access for county employees and the public on and off-site.

Four phases of the study will include:

- 1) Collect data to determine what could be digitized
- 2) Determine equipment/software needs
- 3) Present a cost benefit study
- 4) Work with consultant to train staff

Mr. Smith suggested that office holders with the biggest need for this project pitch in non-general funding and have their records digitized first.

Ms. Klettlinger stated an imaging program would be cost effective, provide accountability to citizens, improve access, save money through staffing, and help the government perform vital services to citizens in the event of a disaster.

Mr. Oswalt asked what records would be scanned first. It was his impression that records from the courthouse attic were the current focus. Ms. Klettlinger said a staff increase of two since May now allows for time to be spent on the attic, as well as, other needed projects. She would prefer to digitally image elected officials records first because of their high legal and fiscal value, and offices with permanent records in electronic format only.

Mr. Oswalt asked about the benefit for his records because his records to be digitized are closed after being used frequently at the beginning of their creation. Are those records cost effective to scan? Mr. Smith stated Mr. Oswalt and Ms. Klettlinger will need to speak in detail to decide what would be best for the Prosecuting Attorney's Office. Ms. Klettlinger agreed and said that current records practices and storage issues may make the records a possibility to scan.

Mr. Oswalt asked how much scanning and microfilm costs. Mr. Smith stated Ms. Klettlinger has already purchased the \$30,000+ piece of equipment for \$4,000. Mr. Smith also added that Ms. Klettlinger could outsource her services to other local governments. \$300,000 in outsourcing revenue was collected by Montgomery County in their program last year.

Ms. Klettlinger requested a motion to create a study for imaging and microfilming to present to the Records Commission.

Mr. Evans asked how much it costs Mr. Smith to start his program. Mr. Smith started with a budget of \$130,000 because he had no equipment already purchased. Mr. Smith stated Ms. Klettlinger will need about \$20,000-\$25,000 because she already has some equipment

Mr. Evans made a motion for Ms. Klettlinger to create an imaging study proposal with cost analysis to present to the Records Commission in two months.

Mr. Long seconded the motion.

All were in favor. Motion carried.

3. Amend Commission Rules, Article IV (C) to allow Records & Archives Coordinator to review all RC-3 forms before forwarded to Ohio Historical Society.

Ms. Klettlinger stated the authorization would be beneficial in ensuring RC-3 forms are filled out correctly, nothing is being disposed of by accident, and to ensure that records forms are reviewed according to law.

Mr. Bubb called for changing Commission Rules, Article IV (C) by a voice vote.

All were in favor. Rule changed was approved.

4. Amend Commission Rules, Article IV (G) to change term "Commission" to "Records & Archives Coordinator"

Ms. Klettlinger stated that this change was being requested to reflect the recent change in Article IV (C).

*Mr. Bubb called for changing Commission Rules, Article IV (G) by a voice vote.
All were in favor. Rule changed was approved.*

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Katy Klettlinger, Records/Archives Coordinator
Secretary-Licking County Records Commission