

Meeting #1 – 2023
Fairfield County Records Commission
January 10, 2023

Review

The Records Commission met at 8:30 a.m. in the Commissioners' Hearing Room located at 210 E. Main Street in Lancaster, OH to review material related to records retention and disposition. Commissioner Steve Davis called the meeting to order with the following members present: Steve Davis, Branden Meyer, Lisa McKenzie, Amy Brown-Thompson and Rachel Elsea. Also in attendance were Bennett Niceswanger, Dan Neeley, Steven Darnell, Dave Levacy, Jeff Porter, and Tony Vogel.

Roll Call

Commissioner Davis asked Records Commission Secretary, Bennett Niceswanger, to take roll call.

Old Business

Mr. Niceswanger stated he had received from the Ohio History Connection the approved RC-1 for the Clerk of Courts and the RC-2's for the Sheriff and Board of Elections. Each department had been notified of the approval and the updated RC-2's had been posted to the Records Commission page on the County website.

New Business

Commissioner Davis asked if the County generates more records than it destroys and if the department seeking destruction takes responsibility for the destruction of the records.

Mr. Niceswanger explained that the intake of records far exceeds the destruction rate of records, and the Records Center is tight on space. He added that he communicates with departments regularly on which records have reached their retention and should be destroyed, but the responsibility ultimately falls upon the department who owns the records as they are the ones who know what is contained within each box of records and are also the ones who requested the destruction.

Commissioner Davis asked if the Records Commission coordinates a recycling day to encourage entities to bring requests and dispose of records that are past their retention.

Mr. Niceswanger stated that all records destroyed by the Records Center are recycled by the Lancaster Fairfield Community Action Agency, but there is not an official "recycling day" arranged by the Commission.

Commissioner Davis asked the Records Commission to collectively give some thought towards promoting destruction via a coordinated day in order to heighten awareness for records retention and aide space management at the Records Center.

Branden Meyer, Clerk of Courts, stated there is opportunity to add additional shelving to some areas at the Records Center.

Meeting #1 – 2023
Fairfield County Records Commission
January 10, 2023

Mr. Niceswanger added that he encourages departments when revising their RC-2's to allow for electronic storage of records to cut down on the storage of paper records.

Voting Pattern

Approval of Meeting Minutes

On the motion of Amy Brown-Thompson and seconded by Branden Meyer, the Records Commission voted to approve the following:

- October 4, 2022 meeting minutes
- January 9, 2023 reorganization meeting minutes

Upon a voice vote, the motion was approved with 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

Review of an RC-2

Dan Neeley, Information Technology Director, stated the County General RC-2 reflected a change to the retention period for Surveillance Tapes/Videos, and added that he and Jon Kochis, Facilities & EMA Director, have been making adjustments to have more concise retention on surveillance tapes/videos.

Commissioner Davis asked what a request for surveillance data would look like.

Mr. Neeley stated the request would come to IT, who would then export that footage. He added that they would be able to keep the footage for the request for as long as needed.

Clerk Meyer asked what the current retention for surveillance tapes/videos is.

Mr. Neeley explained the current retention is to retain the footage for one cycle but is requesting to change it to 15 days in order to align with industry standards.

Amy Brown-Thompson offered her concerns for a retention period of only 15 days, stating that a longer retention might be appropriate.

Recorder McKenzie agreed that 15 days could prove too little a retention period especially if an investigation requiring that footage would be conducted.

Mr. Neeley offered tabling the item until the next meeting so he and Jon Kochis can reconvene and discuss extending the retention period.

Commissioner Davis asked if deleting the footage at the end of its retention period removes it forever and prevents it from ever being recovered.

Meeting #1 – 2023
Fairfield County Records Commission
January 10, 2023

Mr. Neeley confirmed that the footage would not be recoverable after it is deleted.

Without a motion or a second, the Records Commission took no action on the following:

- County General RC-2

Review of RC-3's

Mr. Niceswanger stated that all RC-3's for review before the Records Commission today had been reviewed and compared with each department's current RC-2 by himself prior to the meeting, and all appeared to comply with current retention schedules.

On the motion of Amy Brown-Thompson and seconded by Branden Meyer, the Records Commission voted to approve the following:

- Board of Commissioner RC-3 (Requiring further review by OHC)
- Sheriff RC-3 (requiring further review by OHC)
- Juvenile Court RC-3
- Probate Court RC-3
- Auditor – Settlement & Administration RC-3
- Juvenile Court RC-3 (Requiring further review by OHC)

Upon a voice vote, the motion was approved with 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Records Commission will be held on Tuesday, April 11, 2023, at 8:30 a.m. in the Commissioners' Hearing Room located at 210 E. Main Street in Lancaster, OH.

Adjourn

Commissioner Davis encouraged members of the Commission to contact Dan Neeley and Jon Kochis with their concerns regarding the retention period for surveillance tapes/videos so the meeting on April 11th can be a conclusion to that discussion. He also asked the Commission to give thought towards addressing the magnitude of records going into the Records Center and how to prevent the situation from reaching a critical point.

With no further business, on the motion of Branden Meyer and seconded by Lisa McKenzie, the Records Commission voted to adjourn at 8:53 a.m.

Upon a voice vote, the motion was approved with 5 in favor and 0 opposed.