



City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
53202

Meeting Minutes

CITY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ALD. NIK KOVAC, CHAIR

David Henke, Vice-Chair

Timothy Richter, Karen Dettmer, James Klajbor, Jennifer Meyer, James Owczarski, Jeffrey Madison, Judy Pinger, David Klein, Richard Watt, and Jeffrey Larson.

**Staff Assistant, Chris Lee, 286-2232, Fax:286-3456,
clee@milwaukee.gov**

Thursday, June 10, 2021

10:00 AM

Virtual Meeting

This will be a virtual meeting conducted via GoToMeeting. Should you wish to join this meeting from your phone, tablet, or computer you may go to <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/286291685>. You can also dial in using your phone United States: +1 (571) 317-3122 and Access Code: 286-291-685.

1. Call to order.

Meeting called to order at 10:01 a.m.

Vice-chair Henke chaired the meeting.

2. Roll call.

*Present 8 - Henke, Dettmer, Meyer-Stearns, Owczarski, Pinger, Klein, Watt, Larson
Excused 3 - Kovac, Richter, Klajbor
Absent 1 - Madison*

Also present:

*Brad Houston, City Records Center
Atty. Peter Block, City Attorney's Office*

3. Review and approval of the previous minutes from March 18, 2021.

Meeting minutes from March 18, 2021 were approved without objection.

4. Records Retention.

A. Proposed departmental record schedules for approval

Mr. Houston commented There were 45 schedules for review with the majority being obsolete or consolidated schedules. Some schedules were from the 1960s, had not been updated, were cleaned up, and made more descriptive in language. DER had

many records in JobApps. There was discussion with DER to move remaining DER records into E-Vault. Home Environmental Health schedules regarding radiography records were made to match the State retention schedule for risk management and could be made global if other departments were to have radiography equipment and records.

Member Watt moved approval, seconded by member Klein of the proposed departmental record schedules. There were no objections.

B. State Records Board approval of previous schedules

Mr. Houston commented. All previously approved schedules were approved by the State Records Board except one, the Comptroller's Office IT schedule number 210004. The global schedule had a 1-year retention schedule, which the State was reluctant to approve a schedule below its own retention period. A change was made to the global schedule to extend the retention period, and the State would review again the revised schedule.

Member Klein said that the Comptroller's Office had no objections with the change.

C. Microsoft 365 (Teams, SharePoint, Onedrive) data retention policy for approval

Mr. Houston gave an overview of the Data Retention Policy for Microsoft 365. The general statement of policy stated that documents, recordings, activity feeds, message or chat logs, and other evidence of transaction or decision making either created by the Teams application or stored within the Teams/Sharepoint/OneDrive storage infrastructure were legally records as defined in Wis. Stats. 19.32 and were subject to retention and disclosure requirements under Wis. Stats. 19.21, 19.35, and others.

Mr. Houston and members discussed in-depth section 2, Retention of Teams-Generated Records (definition, official custodian, exceptions, default retention and disposition, and exceptions to default retention).

Mr. Houston said that ITMD would have the authority to destroy unnecessary records, departments would have to designate someone to administratively deal with retention, official records made under 365 would have to be retained the same way as regular records, the policy would give guidance, Google had reduced its unlimited storage for institutions, and there was concern about Microsoft also possibly reducing storage allocation in the future.

Atty. Block said that he would work offline to clean up the policy since some aspects were not legally accurate and the policy needed further clarification to require ITMD obtain departmental permission prior to destroying records.

Vice-chair Henke said that storage reduction for Microsoft would likely happen, planning should be done to address storage, ITMD could destroy records if needed, ITMD would need permission from departments to destroy records, and the policy looked good.

Judy Siettmann, ITMD, appeared and said that the policy should be incorporated into the data governance plan that her team was working on, the data governance plan as a whole would be submitted to the Common Council, and custodians would need to flag

and tag sensitive records.

Member Watt moved to hold review and approval of the policy to the next meeting. Seconded by member Klein. There were no objections.

D. DocuSign records management and retention policy for review

Mr. Houston gave an overview on Records Maintenance and Retention Best Practices for DocuSign. The goal would be to eventually adopt a policy. Critical areas of the policy included General Principles (Statement of Policy, Non-Official Records Retention and Disposition, Retention of Electronic Records, Composition of DocuSign Record, Composition of Form Master, Records Storage for DocuSign envelopes, Storage on DocuSign Platform, Storage on Department Information Systems, Storage on E-Vault) and Responsibilities of User Departments (Official DocuSign Records Custodian and Onboarding for new series on DocuSign). The composition of a DocuSign record would include its envelope components: form itself, Certificate of Completion, comments history file, any attachments, and any forms data collected during submission. There were concerns with sensitive forms data associated with personnel and disciplinary files, which would contain names of individuals. Also of concern were incomplete, draft, working, voided, or declined envelopes. Official records were strongly encouraged to be maintained outside of the DocuSign platform for a variety of reasons. He was working with ITMD to create connection to API, E-Vault, or a secure storage platform. Departments would need a records custodian to maintain official/authoritative copies. Users should complete an onboarding template for each document type that they were expecting to collect on DocuSign. The policy was a work in progress and needed further discussion. He was meeting with user departments.

Atty. Block said that he would work offline to address some issues.

Vice-chair Henke said that it was appropriate to store completed envelopes elsewhere and that he appreciated the efforts for a policy.

5. Information and Technology Management Division.

A. Communication on existing security policies

Ms. Sieltman commented. A concern was people not being aware of a master security policy and the framework of policies within it. A question to consider for easier accessibility purposes was whether all policies should be pulled out entirely from the master security policy to exist individually on their own and for the master policy to remain by itself. Departments seemed to not know about or found it difficult to locate these policies despite being notified previously. The City website containing the master policy could expand out to display individual policies under it.

Vice-chair Henke said that the MINT needed improvement to organize better overall and to better lay out the policies.

Member Watt said that departments and their IT personnel should have the responsibility to remember the policies.

Member Dettmer said that she did not have a preference on whether the policies should remain within the master policy or pulled out.

Amy Demmann appeared and gave public comments. She was not aware of the policies among other various public City records. She was available to offer her services to promote, make available, and better organize City information.

6. Agenda items for the next meeting.

Member Klein inquired about making records from the Comptroller's Office publicly available on the City's open data portal website to reduce open records requests to their office.

Vice-chair Henke replied that ITMD was available to assist.

Member Klein and Brenda Koehler, Comptroller's Office, said that forthcoming as agenda items to the committee were some audits, including the annual IT audit by BakerTilly.

Further items to be determined.

7. Next meeting date and time.

A. Thursday, September 16, 2021 at 10 a.m.

Meeting venue to be determined based on overall sentiment with other City bodies, but likely to be in-person.

8. Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 11:08 a.m.

*Chris Lee, Staff Assistant
Council Records Section
City Clerk's Office*

Meeting materials from this meeting can be found within the following file:

[210196](#)

Communication relating to the matters to be considered by the City Information Management Committee at its June 10, 2021 meeting.

Sponsors: THE CHAIR