Acting under the provisions of the Kansas Statutes Annotated 45-404 and 75-3504, the State Records Board met on October 13, 2005 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:

Citizens Utility Ratepayer Board (CURB)
Kansas Correctional Industries (KCI)
Real Estate Commission
Kansas State Department of Education
Kansas Housing Resource Corporation
University of Kansas
Kansas State Department of Revenue

In attendance were: Theresa Bush, chair, Kansas State Attorney General’s Office; Dr. Patricia Michaelis, State Archivist, Kansas State Historical Society; Duncan Friend, Department of Administration, DISC; Bill Sowers, Kansas State Library; Matt Veatch, Assistant State Archivist, representing Kansas State Historical Society Executive Director Jennie Chinn; Cynthia Laframboise, State Records Manager, Kansas State Historical Society; Justin Dragosani-Brantingham, Government Records Archivist, Kansas State Historical Society; Scott Leonard, Electronic Records Specialist, Kansas State Historical Society; Letha Johnson, Archivist, Kansas State Historical Society; Beth Runnebaum, Citizens Utility Ratepayer Board; and Steve Rarrick, Citizens Utility Ratepayer Board.

Ms. Bush called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. She had one correction to the minutes from the previous meeting regarding her comment on federal gun laws. It should read that cities and counties can make it harder to purchase guns but not easier. Ms. Bush asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. Dr. Michaelis said it should be noted that Ms. Bush arrived prior to the discussion regarding the Insurance Department schedule, that an “an” be added in front of additional under the Kansas State Insurance Department schedule and that “the clerk and” should be added before the work “county” in the fourth paragraph under the Local Government – County Election commissioner schedule. Mr. Veatch moved to approve minutes, Mr. Sowers seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved as amended.

Ms. Laframboise distributed a revised agenda for the meeting, a correction page for the Citizens Utility Ratepayer Board’s schedule, and the additional schedule for the Department of Revenue.
Citizens Utility Ratepayer Board (CURB)
The agency’s records officer, Beth Runnenbaum, contacted Ms. Laframboise after the agency conducted a review of their previously approved schedule. Ms. Bush questioned the restriction on the Administration Files. After a brief discussion, Steve Rarrick stated that the restriction does not apply to the entry. The restriction will be removed and placed on the Routine Correspondence entry. Dr. Michaelis asked about the disposition of the Working Papers – Consultants. Mr. Rarrick explained that the findings are summarized and contained in other documents which are retained. Ms. Bush asked if the series should be restricted due to trade secrets (K.S.A. 60-432). Mr. Rarrick stated that other State Corporation Commission regulations and statutes might restrict the series. Ms. Bush suggested that Mr. Rarrick send restrictions to Ms. Laframboise for inclusion on the entry. Mr. Rarrick pointed out that there were a couple of typos in the spelling of Citizens Utility Ratepayer Board throughout the schedule. Mr. Veatch said there was also an extra “5” in the comments field of entry 0012-122. Dr. Michaelis moved that the schedule be approved with the noted changes. Mr. Friend seconded the motion. The schedule was approved as amended.

Before moving to the Kansas Correctional Industries’ schedule, Mr. Friend asked how the series identification numbers were assigned to schedule entries. Ms. Laframboise explained that it was a way for her to know that records being transferred to state records center are actually scheduled. It is composed of the budget agency code and a four-digit prefix. Mr. Friend asked as to how it applied to the general schedule since that schedule was grouped by category. Ms. Laframboise explained that the general schedule numbers were assigned as the schedule was grouped, whereas for agency specific schedules, the numbers are just assigned sequentially. Mr. Veatch asked if Mr. Friend wanted to add another set of numbers to it for access reasons once series have been transferred to the state archives. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the current system would be maintained.

Kansas Correctional Industries (KCI)
Mr. Dragosani-Brantingham explained that this entry applies to solely to the items that KCI manufactures. Dr. Michaelis asked if it was similar to the entries on the KBI schedule regarding its laboratory. Mr. Dragosani-Brantingham confirmed that it was. Mr. Veatch made a motion to approve the schedule addition. Mr. Sowers seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

Real Estate Commission
Ms. Laframboise stated that these schedule revisions are to reflect changes as to how the Real Estate Commission is retaining certain records. The agency will be doing a recordkeeping plan in the future. Ms. Bush asked if the commission is still making Consent Agreements. Ms. Laframboise said yes, and Mr. Veatch clarified for Ms. Bush that the series is now retained as part of the Docket Files. Dr. Michaelis said that the wording in the description of the Examination Reports entry needed to be clarified. It should read “statute” instead of “statute.” Ms. Bush questioned the retention period of the Recovery Fund Files and asked if the agency’s attorney had reviewed the schedule.
Ms. Laframboise stated that the agency attorney did review the schedule prior to submission to the board. Ms. Bush also explained the purpose of the fund to the board. Mr. Sowers moved to approve the schedule. Dr. Michaelis seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

**Education**

Ms. Johnson stated that this entry was tabled at the April meeting for clarification of the restriction listed. She contacted the agency’s records officer and chief counsel, Rodney Bieker, and he agreed that the restriction be removed. Dr. Michaelis moved to approve the entry. Mr. Friend seconded the motion. The schedule addition was approved.

**Housing Resources Corporation**

Ms. Bush questioned the restriction on the entry. Mr. Dragosani-Brantingham explained that the end of the regulation states that it may be restricted under state or local laws. Dr. Michaelis asked if the staff considered the records closed. Mr. Dragosani-Brantingham said that they did due to personal information contained within the records. Mr. Veatch asked if more of the CFR should be sited - 24 CFR 92.508? Dr. Michaelis asked if the board felt that adding the “.508” would be enough or if the board wanted to examine that section. The board agreed it was sufficient. Mr. Veatch moved to approve the schedule with restriction clarification. Mr. Friend seconded the motion. The schedule was approved.

Ms. Laframboise asked to move the Department of Revenue schedule before the University of Kansas since more questions would be asked regarding that schedule due to the recordkeeping plan. The board agreed.

**Dept. of Revenue**

Ms. Bush questioned the length of the statutes sited. Mr. Dragosani-Brantingham explained that he left the commas out of the citation because he did not realize it was necessary. Ms. Bush said it was proper to include the commas and asked for a copy of the statute books. Ms. Bush stated that the first two citations should be removed from the restrictions field since they do not pertain to closing the records. Ms. Bush asked if anyone else had any changes? There were none. Mr. Veatch moved to approve the schedule as amended. Mr. Sowers seconded the motion. The schedule was approved as amended.

**University of Kansas**

Dr. Michaelis stated the cover sheet needed to be corrected. The “6” listed under number seven be removed and placed under number six. Ms. Laframboise explained that the University of Kansas started a records management taskforce near the time that the KSHS Records Management section started work on the Higher Education General Schedule. That schedule has yet to be completed so the university is submitting this schedule for the purpose of destroying some of the records listed. The university completed a recordkeeping plan for the electronic records, which was approved by the Electronic Records Committee (ERC) in September. The board
indicated that there was no reference in the schedule or the recordkeeping plan as to which entries are covered by the recordkeeping plan, as there was when the plan was originally submitted to the Electronic Records Committee. Mr. Friend asked if the schedule needed to reference the recordkeeping plan? Mr. Veatch stated that ideally, that would be the case and that the retention schedule would also be referenced within the recordkeeping plan. The board did not receive the spreadsheet that was attached to the recordkeeping plan.

Mr. Veatch questioned if the board was in a position to approve the schedule because of this? Ms. Bush proposed that the board meet in the interim before the next quarterly meeting, via telephone to approve the schedule. Mr. Friend agreed with this as long as it was clear to the board what was covered under the recordkeeping plan. Mr. Leonard asked if the board wanted to approve those entries that have a short-term retention as the board has previously stated that such series do not require a recordkeeping plan. Dr Michaelis stated that she preferred to wait to approve any of the schedule entries and suggested meeting in person. She moved that the schedule be tabled and a special meeting be held in the near future to approve the schedule. Ms. Bush agreed to hold the meeting in the conference room at the Attorney General's Office. Mr. Veatch moved to approve this motion. Mr. Sowers seconded the motion. The motion was approved. Mr. Friend asked if a notice for this meeting was need and Ms. Bush stated that such a notice was required.

Ms. Laframboise asked if the general schedule entries needed to be included in the schedule? Mr. Veatch stated that the general schedule entries need to be attached to the recordkeeping plan but not included in the schedule. Dr. Michaelis asked if the board members had any questions regarding the recordkeeping plan that may need to be clarified before the special meeting. Mr. Friend asked about the correlation between point C and E on page 7 of the recordkeeping plan. Mr. Leonard indicated that he asked the agency regarding that issue and it was clarified through email correspondence. Mr. Veatch stated that another sentence should be added to point C to reference point F. Dr. Michaelis explained that current records would be kept as permanent records and reflected as changes in systems occur.

Ms. Bush asked if a date for the special meeting could be set. The board agreed to set a tentative meeting date of Thursday, November 3. The board then decided to wait on setting a date due to the change needed in the recordkeeping plan.

The next quarterly meeting will be on Thursday, January 12, 2006. The meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Patricia Michaelis
State Archivist and Secretary, State Records Board