



**RECORDS COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

June 24, 2010  
10:00 a.m.

Village Green, 47 Hall Street

In attendance: George Kannapel, Debra Miller, Gene Hollins, Susie Ross, and Steve Lutz.

I. ONE-TIME DISPOSAL OF OBSOLETE RECORDS

Ms. Ross said this one-time disposal is needed to dispose of old records that are no longer generated by City departments.

Mr. Kannapel moved to approve the one-time disposal of obsolete records. Mr. Lutz seconded the motion. By unanimous consent, the motion carried.

II. PROPOSED RETENTION SCHEDULE REVISIONS FOR 2010

Ms. Ross said the current schedule was distributed to City Staff several weeks ago and revisions were based on suggestions from Staff and the City Clerk. She said a section was added for the CIC (Community Improvement Corporation) but the listing of records was not ready as of the time of this review. Mr. Lutz asked if the records of the CIC are under the authority of the City since the CIC is a 501(c) 3 corporation. Mr. Hollins said there is case law that indicates that it is in the best interest of the City to maintain the records for this corporation. It was suggested that this unit of the schedule be removed from this submission for approval. Ms. Ross agreed and stated she will contact all Staff members involved to advise them to keep all documents relating to the CIC until a proper schedule for those documents may be prepared in 2011. Ms. Miller said a separate folder on the "S" drive will be available for storage of electronic records for the CIC.

Ms. Miller said several items were added to address any records generated through CORMA (Central Ohio Risk Management Association). She said the association will send an updated listing of records and retention periods for use by the municipalities within the membership but the proposed changes will cover retention until the suggested changes can be incorporated at the time of the 2011 schedule review.

Mr. Kannapel moved to approve the Proposed Record Retention Schedule revisions for 2010. Mr. Lutz seconded the motion. By unanimous consent, the motion was approved.

III. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO RECORD REQUEST/DENIAL FORMS

Ms. Ross said after using these forms for the past 2 years it may be advisable to add some information for clarification purposes. She said the request form is not required of persons requesting information but Staff is requested to fill out a copy that notes the types of records produced and file it with the Clerk's office. She said the denial/redaction form is legally required whenever a record is denied or redacted.

Ms. Miller said the first reason for denial is one she uses because it indicates the requestor is looking at the wrong agency for the records requested. Mr. Lutz indicated it seems like a duplicate of one of the other reasons and could be removed. Mr. Hollins said he will check State statute to see if there is a detailed listing of the reasons or legal

authority that would be required on the form. He asked about the process completed when someone requests a public record. Ms. Ross described that the requestor typically goes to the department that would handle the document(s) and Staff copies it to her once they have furnished the request. She said Staff has been trained and she continues to provide training as new staff is hired and compliance issues are found.

Ms. Ross said there has been a difference of opinion among Staff members regarding the difference between providing "information" or "records" requested. She said she conferred with Ben Albrecht and he indicated that anytime a document is produced, it is considered a record request; if the request is for information that can be restated in an email or other correspondence it would not be a record request. The members of the Commission agreed.

Mr. Hollins suggested that all record request funnel to the City Clerk and are then answered by the City Clerk. He said that ensures compliance and protects the City from legal complications.

Mr. Kannapel suggested Staff use a system where each record request is given an identification number so it may be tracked as it goes through the system. Ms. Ross said they have a software module within the SIRE Electronic Document Management System that is called WorkFlow and it allows that type of tracking and documentation.

Mr. Hollins said he will provide information to Ms. Ross regarding the denial/redaction form.

Mr. Hollins moved for approval of the revisions to the Record Request and Denial/Redaction Forms, subject to the Law Director's review. Mr. Kannapel seconded the motion. By unanimous consent, the motion carried.

IV. OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was none.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. The next meeting will be scheduled in late fall 2010.