



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, Robert Jaeger, James Klajbor, Jennifer Meyer, James Owczarski, Jeffrey Madison, James Zimmer, David Klein, Richard Watt, and Jeffrey Larson.

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

Thursday, December 9, 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/503040845>. You can also dial in using your phone United States: +1 (224) 501-3412 and Access Code: 503-040-845.

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 10:02 a.m.

2. Roll call.

*Present 11 - Henke, Richter, Jaeger, Klajbor, Meyer-Stearns, Owczarski, Madison, Zimmer, Klein, Watt, Larson
Excused 1 - Kovac*

Also present:

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

3. Review and approval of the previous meeting minutes from September 16, 2021.

The meeting minutes from September 16, 2021 were approved without objection.

4. Records Retention.

a. Proposed departmental record schedules for approval

Mr. Houston gave an overview. There were 7 schedules, and 4 were resubmissions or new ones. Being amended or recreated were the schedules for video and audio recordings of committees and standing committees. An issue was the large size of video recordings for virtual meetings. There was not enough demand and server space

to justify retaining video recordings. Schedule 11-E058 contained an error and the retention should be changed to 6 months and destroy under supervision. There were about 900 gigabytes of audio recordings being stored with most of them for minor committees holding no relevance except to those committees directly. Major committee videos would be kept. Audio and video recordings of minor committees would be kept long enough for those committees to retain them themselves separately and as necessary. Meeting minutes were the official document of record for most meetings. He was comfortable presently with keeping video recordings on third party platforms that had active contracts with the City.

Atty. Block said he has not looked at those contracts, concurred with Mr. Houston, and had no objections.

Member Klajbor moved approval of the proposed department record schedules. There was no objection.

b. State Records Board approval of previous schedules

Mr. Houston commented. All previous schedules were approved by the board except schedules 88-0074 and 93-0041. There were concerns with the lack of having companion schedules, those schedules having open ended retention, and susceptible to litigation. The two schedules would be resubmitted with events of seven years after the close of litigation for use of force reports and eight years after the final disposition of the criminal case for internal investigation files.

c. Microsoft 365 Data Retention Policy for review or approval

Mr. Houston gave an update. Since the last meeting, the policy was updated to remove references to questionable legal citations, change confusing terminology, and avoid ambiguity. The wiki part of the definition for what was or was not a record was removed. Distinction was made for the official custodian to say that the records coordinator of a department may designate a site administrator for a SharePoint. The site administrator would be responsible for making sure record schedules, types, and rules were being applied. Going forward the preference was to get buy-in from departments still, get an approval in principal, and come back to the committee for final review and approval.

Member Klajbor moved tentative approval of the policy in principal and to hold final review and approval of the policy. There was no objection.

d. DocuSign Records Maintenance and Retention Best Practices for review or approval

Mr. Houston gave an update. Since the last meeting, the policy has also been changed to eliminate ambiguity and questionable legal language. The records custodian would be based on the governance policy of record steward for maintenance official or authoritative copies of completed DocuSign records. That person would have responsibility for managing the records in a given department. Practicing this was difficult due to the way DocuSign manages envelopes. Someone other than the original employee who created an envelope could record, change fields, download, and possess the same administrative privileges. He would like to work with departments further on the policy, especially those power users of DocuSign who consistently used it at 2% or at least 20 envelopes a month. Those departments included DPW, DCD,

DER, Comptroller, City Records Center, and the Health Department.

Member Klajbor said for Mr. Houston to solicit input from those departments that uses 10 instead of 20 envelopes in DocuSign so that more input could be obtained.

Member Klajbor moved tentative approval of the policy in principal and to hold final review and approval of the policy. There was no objection.

5. Review of copying costs.

Member Owczarski commented. Actual cost for physical copies is at \$.05 and \$.35 with labor added. There should be a standardized cost established for \$.05 for a 8 inch by 11.5 inch or legal sized copy in black and white. Costs may go up from there based on high labor or effort to produce copies. Chair Kovac could be approached to put forth legislation to amend the copying cost ordinance via the Common Council.

Mr. Houston inquired about costs associated with reproduction, research, digital copies, labor, and oversized or nonstandard sizes.

Atty. Block said that the public records law allows charges for locating records above \$50 of staff time, does not generally allow charges for digital copies unless allowed under other statutes, that charges can be made for scanning physical documents into electronic form, that he believes additional costs can be charged for the creation of a copy, and he can work with Mr. Houston offline on the additional costs.

Member Klein said that the Comptroller's Office had encountered record requests that would have taken significant staff time to download and produce those records, but they had found an alternative way that took minimal staff time to do.

Atty. Block said that the cost being considered today pertained only to physical copies, he would also work with the Comptroller's Office on additional costs, departments have the ability to deny burdensome records requests if those request would significant affect office operations, and departments should contact requestors with burdensome record requests to find out what was being sought.

Member Klajbor moved approval to amend Ch. 81-385 of the Milwaukee Code of Ordinances for the cost of a single sided copy in regular size 8 inch by 11.5 inch in black and white ink to be \$.05 and double-sided to be \$.10. There was no objection.

6. Information & Technology Management Division

a. Data Governance Plan for review or approval

Ms. Sieltmann commented. The plan was presented last time and was a high level plan. She had not received any feedback since the last meeting. The plan addressed three important aspects: who owns data, data custodians, and the source of data.

Member Watt commented. The plan helps the City to understand the data that was being produced and managed. Of importance were to create a data governance committee and establish responsibility for datasets.

Members discussed and inquired about data custodians on whether they were the system administrator or other professional who was responsible for some aspect of the

management and operation of any of the systems that served as sources of city data.

Ms. Sieltmann said that the plan called for a data governance committee to oversee and make the clarification, the data governance committee would be a huge undertaking, the plan was an outline at this point, and the plan would be further expanded.

Atty. Block added that the plan differentiated between a data custodian and records custodian.

Ms. Sieltmann added that the data governance plan needed every department represented, ITMD could set up the committee, and ITMD should not necessarily lead the committee.

Member Klajbor said that the data governance committee can elects its own chair, vice-chair, and have ITMD, City Records Center, and the City Attorney's Office as counsel.

Member Klajbor moved approval of the Data Governance Plan. There was no objection.

Vice-chair Henke commended Ms. Sieltmann and added that the CIMC and departmental experts could provide the necessary expertise to the data governance committee.

7. Review and approval of the 2022 meeting schedule.

2022 proposed meeting dates were follows for 9 a.m.: March 17, June 16, September 15, and December 8.

Vice-chair Henke said that the proposed meeting dates should not conflict with chair Kovac's schedule, that he would check with him, but otherwise had no issues.

Mr. Lee said that chair Kovac's schedule was not factored in and that the proposed schedule followed past schedules.

Member Klajbor moved approval of the 2022 proposed meeting dates. There was no objection.

8. Agenda items for the next meeting.

To be determined. Items to include review and approval of the Microsoft 365 Data Retention Policy and DocuSign Records Maintenance and Retention Best Practices Policy.

9. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 10:53 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:

[211174](#)

Communication relating to the matters to be considered by the City Information Management Committee at its December 9, 2021 meeting.

Sponsors: THE CHAIR