



City of Gahanna

Meeting Minutes

Records Commission

200 South Hamilton Road
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Kevin Schultz, Mayor's Designee

Joann Bury

René Carter

Laura Dachenbach

Jamie McKenna

Priya. Tamilarasan

Jeremy A. VanMeter

Sophia McGuire, Deputy Clerk of Council

Tuesday, September 23, 2025

4:00 PM

City Hall, Finance Conference Room

A. CALL TO ORDER: Roll Call

Gahanna Records Commission met in regular session on September 23, 2025. The agenda for this meeting was published on September 19, 2025. Kevin Schultz called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Ciara Loftus, Department of Public Service, and Rachel Zarick, Department of Economic Development were also present.

Present: 7 - Joann Bury, Laura Dachenbach, Jamie McKenna Jr., Kevin Schultz, Priya D. Tamilarasan, Jeremy A. VanMeter and René Carter

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

2025-0184 Records Commission meeting minutes 1.30.2025

A motion was made by Tamilarasan, seconded by Bury, that the Minutes be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Bury, Dachenbach, McKenna Jr., Schultz, Tamilarasan, VanMeter and Carter

C. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/DISCUSSION:

2025-0183 Records Retention Schedule

Department of Public Service

SVC-119: Cell Tower Leases - To be removed, as the department no longer uses it; it is covered in the General Schedule under GN-106, contracts and agreements.

Bury asked if GN-106 should also include receivables if Cell Tower Leases is covered by that schedule number, and whether “to procure goods and/or services” should be removed. She noted the City of Gahanna is receiving money from the entity and the cell tower entity would receive space from the city. Schultz inquired about the ORC 2305.06 in the retention period of GN-106, and McGuire and Tamilarasan explained the code deals with statute of limitations for contract disputes. Tamilarasan asked whether there was another catch-all in which the city was not procuring goods and services. McGuire stated she was unaware of such a record series. McKenna suggested leaving the procurement language in the retention period to make it more universally applicable. Tamilarasan asked how old the most recent cell tower lease on file is. Schultz stated there are three active, so disposal would take place after their expiration. Bury described the leases as very long. Loftus stated there is one expiring in the following year. VanMeter asked if they are ever presented to City Council, Schultz stated they are originally signed by Council. VanMeter noted that if they go to Council, the leases should be permanently on file with Council Office permanent records. Loftus added there is an ordinance for the cell towers. Schultz inquired whether another schedule number should be referenced in place of GN-106. McGuire commented that it could fall under GN-106 but with the “goods and services” language remaining, allowing the Service Department to eliminate their copy of the records. Tamilarasan clarified the issue: that the cell tower leases are not necessarily procuring goods and services, therefore it does not fit appropriately within GN-106. She felt it could be stricken, but did not need to reference GN-106, as the official record would be kept with Council Office. Provided all cell tower leases are recorded, the office copy could simply be destroyed. Corresponding records could fall within general correspondence.

SVC-209: Strike Consumer Confidence Report. Recommendation to remove from the Service Division and place on the Water Division schedule, to accurately represent the creation and use of the record. No objections were raised at the time.

SVC-128: Contracts, Leases, and Service Agreements are accounted for in GN-106. Bury noted the item is to procure goods and services and meets the record series definition. No objections were raised at the time.

SVC-137: Franklin County Public Health Reports, Inspections, and Violations: no longer handled by the Service Department, they are handled by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS). McGuire noted that DAS does not have a schedule. Schultz recommended the item be placed on the Mayor’s schedule.

SVC-172: Solid Waste Collection Statistics: Data provided to the city that is kept as part of agreements that fall under GN-106. Additionally, GN-106 has a retention period of one year longer than SVC-172. Schultz asked Loftus if the information was kept digitally. Loftus confirmed it was, but that the contract and accompanying data were also maintained physically. VanMeter noted that staff would not go into the file after 5 years to remove one specific piece. No objections were raised at the time.

SVC-179: Unsuccessful bids and related records are kept under GN-106. Bury asked if “unsuccessful bids” were bids that were not awarded, or unsuccessful in general and no bids were awarded. Loftus stated it covered both scenarios. Tamilarasan asked if language could be added to GN-106 that related records are kept with the contract as well, and that it did not cover solely the contract. Schultz directed the Commission’s attention to GN-103: Bids and Estimates and Proposals, which has a one-year retention period. The Commission agreed that GN-103 was an appropriate placement, and that GN-106 would be edited to incorporate supporting contract documents.

SVC-404: Auction. Strike “copy of notarized titles and certificates of origin for transferred vehicles and equipment.” Encompasses other items. Tamilarasan suggested that instead of striking, additional language be added. No objections were raised at the time.

SVC-405: Strike, as it is covered in SVC-404. No objections were raised at the time. VanMeter inquired about the 3-year retention period, and whether it was for auditing. Bury stated at least one year was necessary for audit purposes; members speculated perhaps three years was decided upon if it was lost or not recorded.

SVC-902: Boil Advisories: recommended for removal because boil advisories are no longer a required process. Loftus believed residents were previously notified via news outlets. The City of Gahanna obtains its water from the City of Columbus, therefore does not issue its own boil advisories. Tamilarasan asked if Boil Advisories could reuse SVC-902 instead of 920. McGuire said the only issue with this was that if there are still records labelled Boil Advisories/SVC-902, there could be confusion about disposal. Loftus explained there were no longer Boil Advisory records.

Loftus left the meeting.

Council Office Retention Schedule

CN-14: Franklin County Board of Elections Documents: Strike “attach to an ordinance and submit to the Board of Elections” and replace with “attach to original ordinance or resolution.” It is a permanent record. VanMeter explained that this clarified the process.

CN-16: Meeting Minutes: Adding to the definition to include “reports such as constituent reports and city official reports.” Permanent.

CN-37: Council Office Newsletters: Permanent. It does not follow the retention of other types of newsletters on the schedule; therefore, should be listed separately. VanMeter explained that they are attached to agendas and minutes and therefore retained permanently. Schultz suggested they be added to the Meeting Minutes schedule number instead of being added as their own schedule number. The Commission agreed to change the CN-16 description to include minutes.

Building Division Retention Schedule

PLN-108: Commercial Permit Files: Adding “except for demolition permits” to the definition. Retention period for digital records: all are permanent for life of the structure. Clarifies retention for digital compared to paper records. Tamilarasan suggested adding the additional language at the end of the description.

PLN-107: Construction Documents: Adding the same language regarding digital and paper files.

PLN-110: Contractor Registration: Strike the entire item, as the item is obsolete.

PLN-111: Demolition Permits: Strike one year after the date of project completion, retain until project completion (once the building is removed). Tamilarasan questioned if there was any need beyond project completion; McGuire noted that the previous retention of one year read as administratively valuable; Schultz wondered if a record should be maintained to prove that the city approved removal of a building. Bury suggested changing the retention language to “until no longer of administrative value” until additional information could be obtained from the Planning Department.

PLN-116: Notice of Violation/Citation: Change retention period to “permanent for the life of the structure.”

PLN-118: Residential Permit Files: Adding language regarding the exception of demolition permits. Adding permanent for digital files, and “paper” for the 1-year retention.

PLN-204, 201, 203: Updating retention from five years to ten years. This provides staff the ability to access the records for a longer period of time.

PLN-301 - Applications 301 - Applications approved/denied administratively. Adding “minor development plans” to the definition and changing the retention period from five years to ten years.

PLN-302 - Application Exemption: strike entire item; city no longer has exemption applications and all previous applications expired.

PLN-303, 305, 306 - Changing retention periods to ten years.

Development Retention Schedule

DV-108 - Office of Industrial Incentive Advisory Board: Adding a note in retention that applications for incentives are kept with the minutes.

McGuire added that the applications could be included in a description rather than listed in the retention column. Tamilarasan inquired about the retention of agenda compared to minutes and their attachments.

McGuire noted that agendas that are attached to meetings in the Council Office’s software would be so tedious to extract, that they are now maintained permanently with the file. However, in the past, agendas were maintained separately and with their own retention period. Tamilarasan asked how the Office of Industrial Incentive Advisory Board maintains their minutes currently. Zarick said they are kept on the department’s drive. She noted the meetings happen infrequently. Tamilarasan suggested all the records be retained permanently, and the description adjusted to include the applications. Bury asked whether applications not accepted would have the same retention period. It was determined all applications would be kept permanently.

DV-109: Creekside Outdoor Refreshment Area (CORA) Records: adding the record series. Description includes “application to renew the district, agendas and notes from annual meetings, data on district activity, and procedural information” with a retention period of five years after review and continuation or cessation of the Outdoor Refreshment Area. Tamilarasan requested a change to the retention period. McGuire explained her approach in assigning retention. Every five years, the CORA must be reviewed and a determination must be made, denoting whether it will continue for an additional five year period, or if it will cease

to exist. Additionally, McGuire researched municipalities with Designated Outdoor Refreshment Areas, and found only one, which also has a five-year retention period. Tamilarasan agreed with five years after cessation, but she suggested that all CORA records be maintained until the CORA no longer exists, in case questions arise. It was noted that many of the records would be available through Council records. Zarick described information contained within Development's records that would not be in Council's records, such as notes from the annual meetings, and information provided to CORA members. Tamilarasan suggested each record be kept for five years. McGuire asked if this was a rolling five years, or if records should be kept for five years after the renewal. Tamilarasan suggested they be retained on a rolling basis, as all records from the previous five years would be available for the decision to renew a new five-year term. Five years would be the retention period, and all other language struck from the retention.

DV-110 - Project Files: Includes intake or project sheets, supporting information, provided by the company such as business plans, correspondence, or notes. Suggested retention period five years after last contact. No objections.

Zarick left the meeting.

General Retention Schedule

McGuire explained that video recordings are being updated. This changes multiple retention schedules with video recordings. All following items were related to video footage.

GN-136: Facility Video Recordings: Needs created. These records are defined as "recordings of facility buildings, such as City Hall, Parks and Service facility, Price Road, Golf Course Club House, etc." to be kept for 30 days and automatically purged by the software system. Therefore, an Internal Disposal Form is not required.

Bury noted that "Traffic" on Engineering's schedule is retained for ten years. Reducing retention to 30 days was a significant change. Schultz clarified that there are cameras that monitor intersections, but there are also detection cameras that prompt light cycles. The detection camera itself does not capture anything. The entire "Traffic" item can be struck from the Engineering schedule. Tamilarasan suggested checking to determine if there were any records from the last ten years that fall in line with the existing retention period. Schultz shifted back to the facility recordings, noting that there is currently a 14-day period set and it can

easily be changed to 31 days. VanMeter asked if there would be any changes when City Hall operations moves to the new facility. Schultz said there would be no changes.

Bury raised a question regarding PD-17 - Holding & Sally Port Facility Video Recordings: 120-day retention, and all others follow GN-136. She wondered if "Facility" should be removed from PD-17. Tamilarasan recommended the description be updated as well. The Commission agreed. This includes the cameras around the sally port. VanMeter asked about exterior cameras currently. Schultz explained that within the recording software, the Police Department's exterior recordings are retained for 120 days, while the current City Hall building is set to retain recordings for 14 days. The cameras are activated by motion. Bury asked if there was a reason for the difference in retention periods, such as public safety. Schultz stated it needed to be retained for a longer period of time in case an issue or complaint arises from an individual being brought into the sally port. Instances that happen in the parking lot or around the building do not require as long of a retention period. The final video clarification is on

PR-129 - Parks Surveillance Video. This item includes public parks and facilities, such as the pools and golf course. The proposed retention for these is 14 days. A suggestion was made to remove "Surveillance" from the record series name. VanMeter recalled there was a different retention for traffic cameras. McGuire noted that is on the Division of Police schedule, and the retention is ten days.

A motion was made by Bury, seconded by Dachenbach, to amend the proposed Records Retention Schedule as discussed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Bury, Dachenbach, McKenna Jr., Schultz, Tamilarasan, VanMeter and Carter

A motion was made by VanMeter, seconded by Tamilarasan, that the amended Records Retention Schedule be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Bury, Dachenbach, McKenna Jr., Schultz, Tamilarasan, VanMeter and Carter

D. OFFICIAL REPORTS:

1. Records Analyst

McGuire reported she had worked with departments on shredding. Several departments are purging old records ahead of the move to 825

Tech Center Drive. Additionally, specialized boxes were being ordered for departments that needed them. Questions were raised about the frequency of shredding and the process. McGuire explained that the City had a monthly agreement with Ohio Mobile Shredding. Records were sometimes taken offsite for destruction, or destruction may be done onsite, and records were turned into confetti-sized pieces that were then recycled. Some departments shredded on an annual basis or longer, while others shredded monthly.

McGuire also reported the department had had many of their files re-digitized. Many files had previously been digitized from microfilm, which was not ideal quality. Physical files were re-scanned to improve the quality of digital copies. Bury inquired about how much microfilm the city still had. McGuire stated it does still have some records on microfilm. It could be eye-readable in an emergency situation, but microfilm and fiche readers are becoming obsolete.

E. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Records Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Sophia McGuire
Deputy Clerk of Council

*APPROVED by the Records Commission, this
day of 2026.*

Kevin Schultz