

**State Records Board Meeting
Quarterly Meeting
October 12, 2006**

Acting under the provisions of the Kansas Statutes Annotated 45-404 and 75-3504, the State Records Board met October 12, 2006 in the Executive Conference Room of the Kansas State Historical Society to consider requests for approval of retention and disposition schedules and of additions to or revisions of such schedules for the following agencies:

Johnson County Sheriff's Office
Department of Health and Environment
Insurance Department
Department on Aging
Kansas Commission on Veterans' Affairs
Racing and Gaming Commission
Kansas Department of Transportation

In attendance were: Matthew Veatch, State Archivist, Kansas State Historical Society, Dr. Patricia Michaelis, Director, Library and Archives Division, Kansas State Historical Society, Bill Sowers, State Library of Kansas, Brian Dowling, Records Custodian for the Central Records Unit of the Johnson County Sheriff's Office, Tim Mulcahy, IT Manager of the JIMS Imaging System, Cynthia Laframboise, State Records Manager, Kansas State Historical Society, Letha Johnson, Archivist, Kansas State Historical Society, Scott Leonard, Electronic Records Specialist, Kansas State Historical Society, Kirsten Hanna, Administrative Assistant, Kansas State Historical Society.

Mr. Veatch, acting as chair, called the meeting to order at 8:41 am. Ms. Laframboise suggested tabling the minutes from the July 13, 2006 meeting because the section regarding proposed changes in the by-laws was omitted.

The board then addressed the minutes from the April 13, 2006 meeting which had been tabled. Dr. Michaelis recommended moving a sentence from the bottom of the second page to the end of the section on the Department of Commerce on the third page. She also suggested changes to the last paragraph in the Local Government – County Attorney section on the last page of the minutes. Mr. Sowers moved that the minutes be accepted as amended. Dr. Michaelis seconded the motion. The minutes were accepted as amended.

**Johnson County Sheriff's Office
Electronic Record Keeping Plan**

Brian Dowling and Tim Mulcahy, both of the Johnson County Sheriff's Office, were present to discuss their Electronic Recordkeeping Plan. Mr. Dowling provided an overview of the plan. Dr. Michaelis suggested that if the agency amended the schedule, that will require the county commission to amend the schedule on their behalf. If the

department amends the schedule selectively, it could cause problems legally, so the general retention schedule should reflect any changes made in the electronic recordkeeping plan. She also suggested that the agency be specific on each record series instead of using the language "same as above" in case one record series gets separated from another. Dr. Michaelis and Mr. Sowers also wanted the Sheriff's Office to specify whether the schedule meant ten years after incarceration or after the sentence ended. Mr. Dowling said it was after the sentence was ended.

Mr. Veatch pointed out that the department was not planning to destroy any records immediately. Mr. Dowling confirmed that the department did not plan on destroying any records until everyone was comfortable with the process and the chain of command.

Ms. Laframboise commended the agency for putting together the plan as they had only discussed it a year ago. She said she has spoken with several agencies and the Johnson County Sheriff's Office is the first local government office to develop a plan.

Dr. Michaelis said that the plan did not require approval since it did not change the general schedule. Mr. Veatch agreed, saying it was more an addendum to the general retention schedule. Dr. Michaelis moved to accept the schedule. Mr. Sowers seconded the motion. The Electronic RecordKeeping Plan was accepted.

Kansas Department of Health and Environment

Ms. Laframboise said that this particular series was before the board again because the agency bureau chief who had recommended changing this record series to destruction had not discussed it with another bureau within the agency. This individual has since left the agency. The matter came to the attention of the other bureau chief that these records were going to be destroyed and he wanted the original retention restored. Dr. Michaelis moved that the schedule be approved. Mr. Sowers seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

Insurance Department

Ms. Laframboise asked that this schedule be tabled until more information could be gathered. The board agreed to table the schedule entry.

Department on Aging

Ms. Laframboise explained that the entry on this schedule was previously under the administration of the Insurance Department but was transferred to the Department on Aging. Mr. Sowers asked if the program was still alive and Ms. Laframboise responded that it is. Mr. Sowers moved to approve the schedule. Dr. Michaelis seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

Commission on Veterans' Affairs

Ms. Laframboise said that the Commission on Veteran's Affairs notified her that they did not want to retain the veterans' cards for 50 years in light of the fact that veterans' files were destroyed. Historical Society staff decided to recommend transfer the Veterans Case Card Files to the state archives because they contain information on veterans that may not exist anywhere else since the case files are destroyed. Dr. Michaelis moved to approve the schedule. Mr. Sowers seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

Racing and Gaming Commission

Ms. Laframboise said that Complaint Files had been tabled from a previous meeting for further information. The Racing and Gaming Commission sent a sample complaint form which Ms. Laframboise distributed to the board. The commission does a preliminary check on each complaint to see if there is merit or if it is something that can be handled quickly. If it is a more serious problem or violation, then the matter becomes a hearing file. Current archival practice had been to destroy complaint files but retain hearing files. The remaining record series listed had been transferred previously to the state records center but were not included on the agency retention and disposition schedule and this remedies the situation.

Mr. Sowers asked if the complaints happened frequently and Ms. Laframboise responded that they did not. Mr. Sowers moved that the schedule be approved. Dr. Michaelis seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

Kansas Department of Transportation

The record series before the board were from the Inspector General's office. Ms. Laframboise explained that the purpose of the audit is that any outside auditor would get the same results. Mr. Veatch said that the office is well organized. Ms. Laframboise noted that the office records are primarily paper-based but that there are one or two record series maintained electronically that would have to be addressed later. Dr. Michaelis asked if the Litigation Case Files were from the general schedule. Ms. Laframboise said yes and that the retention stated to retain the files five years after the case closed with the exception of precedent –setting cases. Dr. Michaelis moved to approve the schedule. Mr. Sowers seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

Other Business

Revision of Electronic Record Keeping Plan

Mr. Leonard said that the Kansas State Historical Society staff has been working with agencies to develop electronic recordkeeping plans for about two years and only a few have completed them. He proposes that rather than dealing with specific record series in the electronic recordkeeping plan, it would be easier for the agencies and for State Records Board to schedule systems which would streamline the scheduling process. Mr. Leonard distributed a copy of the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) plan as an example. Mr. Veatch said that every agency is required to submit a three-year Information Technology (IT) plan listing and describing all existing applications. He said KDOT described their systems thoroughly. Since the agencies are already making the investment to create the plans he suggested utilizing the plan then answering some questions regarding electronic records prior to submission to the board. Mr. Veatch continued his proposal saying preparing an electronic recordkeeping plan for 100 or so record series within systems seems fruitless.

Mr. Leonard said the Historical Society staff tried to make the process easier as they have tried to gather contextual information during the regular scheduling process. Mr. Veatch said that the Historical Society staff could use separate reports for paper and electronic records or arrange the retention/disposition schedule according to the board's pleasure. Ms. Laframboise said she liked the idea of separate reports. Mr. Sowers agreed.

Mr. Veatch said the staff might examine the Johnson County Sheriff's Office recordkeeping plan and compare it to a simplified version of the KDOT plan and see if additional data is required throughout the records survey process. Historical Society staff will probably have survey forms as they go through the process but questioned whether or not the board needed to see all of that information.

Ms. Laframboise voiced a concern that there had been resistance by state agencies to complete electronic recordkeeping plans and mentioned that one agency had been working for two years work on their plan. She said perhaps by streamlining the process the staff would be more successful in getting agencies to add electronic records to their schedules.

Dr. Michaelis said the current electronic recordkeeping plan was designed for record series that were already scheduled. Mr. Veatch said Historical Society staff could use the IT plan but it may not always be detailed sufficiently and if necessary rename that piece of metadata to something else, perhaps, the description of records. He said that Historical Society staff should schedule systems as a whole and if agencies want to identify record series within systems that would be acceptable. The board will have to make a determination on a system-by-system basis as to what historical value these systems have. Mr. Leonard suggested that file formats and their preservation methodology were important to include.

Mr. Sowers asked if there were some guarantee if someone requested information from a record that contained personal information that information could be blacked out electronically. Mr. Veatch said it could be done but people have to know how to do it properly.

Dr. Michaelis said that discussing issues such as file formats, how easy records will be to maintain long-term in systems and data conversion will prompt agency personnel to think about these issues. She added that there are differences between agencies. There are big agencies, like KDOT, that have a large IT staff who can spend time on these issues. Mr. Veatch said that if we can build on the three-year IT plan it would help the smaller agencies. He said it will also help staff to know what records need to be scheduled and it will be a way to monitor changes and new information.

Mr. Leonard said that the board would not need the section on the environment and Mr. Veatch agreed. He said Historical Society staff could provide the board with enough information in the description about the system.

Mr. Sowers asked if board members had technical questions would there be someone present at the meeting to answer them. Mr. Veatch responded that there would be.

Mr. Veatch said that if the Historical Society staff could develop a really good electronic records survey form it would help keep the information gathered consistent. He added that staff might find information they think is valuable for the records board. Dr. Michaelis said if the electronic recordkeeping plan correlates to the old record series, the legacy information should be included in the description.

The next Records Board meeting was scheduled for January 11, 2007 at 8:30 am.

Mr. Veatch asked for motion to adjourn. Mr. Sowers moved. Dr. Michaelis seconded. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Matthew B. Veatch
State Archivist and Secretary
State Records Board

