



# CITY OF TAMPA

Pam Iorio, Mayor

Internal Audit Department

Wayne Boytim, Acting Internal Audit Director

March 4, 2005

Honorable Pam Iorio  
Mayor, City of Tampa  
1 City Hall Plaza  
Tampa, Florida

RE: City Clerk – Public Records Compliance, Audit 05-08

Dear Mayor Iorio:

Attached is the Internal Audit Department's report on Public Records Compliance.

The City Clerk's Office of Archives and Records has already taken positive actions in response to our recommendations. We thank the management and staff of the Archives and Records Division for their cooperation and assistance during this audit.

Sincerely,

Wayne Boytim  
Acting Internal Audit Director

cc: Shirley Foxx-Knowles  
Stephen Hogue, Police Chief

**CITY CLERK  
ARCHIVES AND RECORDS DIVISION  
PUBLIC RECORDS COMPLIANCE  
AUDIT 05-08  
MARCH 4, 2005**

**CITY CLERK  
ARCHIVES AND RECORDS DIVISION  
PUBLIC RECORDS DIVISION  
AUDIT 05-08**

---

Auditor

---

Acting Audit Director

**CITY CLERK  
ARCHIVES AND RECORDS DIVISION  
PUBLIC RECORDS COMPLIANCE  
AUDIT 05-08**

**INTRODUCTION**

As stated on the City of Tampa’s website, the “Archives and Records Service Division (Division) has the responsibility for the management of the public records of the City of Tampa in accordance with State statutes and local ordinances.” This Division also manages “the program to inventory and schedule, microfilm, store, and finally dispose of or archive City records in all formats.” The Division has a staff size of ten that includes an Archivist/Records Manager and Assistant Archivist.

Effective November 2002, the Division became logistically separated from the records with which they are charged with maintaining. Prior to the relocation of the Division, in October 2002, Certified Records Management (CRM) was awarded the contract for off-site storage.

A survey of some local governmental agencies was conducted and the results are presented below:

	<b>City of Tampa</b>	<b>Hillsborough Cty</b>	<b>St Petersburg</b>	<b>Orlando</b>
<b>Tracking System Used</b>	TRIM from Tower Software and paper request forms	Simple 32 w bar coding sytem	Alpha 5 - small program software (location, check in / out)	Simple Records Manager by Records Management Software, Inc. w/ barcode system
<b>On or Off Site Storage</b>	Off-site at a commercial storage facility	Off-site county maintained facility	Currently leasing, new facility to enter July 2005 - city facility (away from other depts)	Off-site in a City-owned / maintained facility
<b>Storage Size</b>	16,000 - 20,000 square feet	3,000 square feet	4,000 (current) - 6,500 (future expansion) square feet	10,000 square feet
<b>If Off Site, Access Restrictions</b>	Only access is for submitting dept personnel; approval required from submitting dept	Only with regard to access by the submitting dept personnel	N/A	Only Records Staff has access
<b>Inventory Performed</b>	Yes	None	Yes	No
<b>Frequency of inventory</b>	No established frequency	N/A	Full inventory completed annually; based on monthly counts	N/A

It should be noted that the City of Tampa retained Zasio Enterprises, Inc. and its Records Management Consulting Division “to prepare a long-range strategic plan for records management improvement.” A final report was issued as of July 2, 2003. There were eleven major areas with findings and recommendations that included staffing, records retention, storage and the software system.

## **STATISTICS**

Destruction of documents for the past two fiscal years has seen a substantial increase. During FY03 there were 130 cubic feet of records disposed compared to 1,047 cubic feet for FY04. The substantial increase in the number of records destroyed was greatly impacted by the requirement of the Records Division to relocate its personnel and contract its storage of records to an off-site vendor.

## **STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES**

This audit was conducted in accordance with the Internal Audit Department's FY05 Audit Agenda. The objective of this audit was to ensure that the City of Tampa is in compliance with FS Chapter 119 for the retention and disposition of public records.

## **STATEMENT OF SCOPE**

The audit period covered storage activity during FY04 (October 1, 2003 through September 30, 2004). Source documentation was obtained from the City Clerk's Office. Original records as well as copies were used as evidence and verified through physical examination.

## **STATEMENT OF METHODOLOGY**

Government Auditing Standards require auditors to determine if computer processed data are sufficiently reliable to be used in the audit process. The Archives and Records Division uses a system known as TRIM for tracking records submitted to storage, archived or destroyed. We performed certain procedures to assess the reliability of the information produced by TRIM. Based on the results of our analysis, we concluded that the information produced by the system was reliable.

The sample size and selection were statistically generated using a desired confidence level of 90%, expected error rate of 10% and a desired precision of +/- 10%. Statistical sampling was used in order to infer the conclusions of test work performed on a sample to the population from which it was drawn and to obtain estimates of sampling error involved. When appropriate, judgmental sampling was used to improve the overall efficiency of the audit.

## **STATEMENT OF AUDITING STANDARDS**

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to afford a reasonable basis for our judgments and conclusions regarding the organization, program, activity or function under audit. An audit also includes assessments of applicable internal controls and

compliance with requirements of laws and regulations when necessary to satisfy the audit objectives. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our conclusions.

**AUDIT CONCLUSION**

Based upon the test work performed and the audit findings noted below, we conclude that some improvement is needed to ensure that the City of Tampa complies with FS Chapter 119 for the retention and disposition of public records.

While the finding discussed below may not significantly impair the operations of the Archives and Records Division, they do present risks that can be more effectively controlled. Before we completed our audit, Archives and Records personnel implemented some of the Internal Audit Department's recommendations.

## **RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULES**

A sample review of 23 transmittals for storage disclosed three boxes that had the incorrect retention schedule reference. Further review disclosed that two of the three (same department) schedules being used had destruction periods shorter than the applicable schedule required. Specifically, the transmittal from the department and TRIM indicated that the applicable schedule to use was GS1-L-121a – Accounts Payable Records; however, the items being stored were Scalehouse Ticket pink copies and represented information used for billing purposes.

FS Chapter 119 requires destruction of public records in accordance with the established guidelines per the approved schedule.

Discussion and observation with Management disclosed that only the description of the retention schedule is compared to the transmittal's description of items being submitted to ensure they are the same. Additionally, there is only a comparison to ensure the proper box numbers have been retrieved.

## **RECOMMENDATION 1**

Archives and Records Division Management should provide individualized training for all department coordinators to ensure the proper retention schedule is selected for items submitted to storage. Additionally, prior to actual destruction, if only on a sample basis, the box contents should be compared with the description and schedule recorded on the transmittal.

## **AUDITEE RESPONSE**

We concur with your recommendation. Following small group training sessions, meetings with individual attendees will be scheduled to review individual department records series and any boxes being prepared for transfer to inactive records storage. Periodic reviews of the contents of boxes being picked up for storage at CRM will be done by the Manager or designee before the boxes are transmitted.

A sample of boxes eligible for disposition will be reviewed to check the actual contents. This will be in addition to the boxes reviewed for archival purposes.

## **RECORDS INVENTORY**

A discussion with Records personnel disclosed that several boxes submitted to off-site storage can not be located by the vendor. These boxes represent records from various City departments. Further review disclosed that there is no periodic comparison of records recorded by the City's TRIM System and the off-site vendor's database.

## **RECOMMENDATION 2**

Management should establish a procedure that would include periodically comparing information recorded on the City's system with the off-site vendor's database. Any deficiencies should be rectified in a timely manner.

## **AUDITEE RESPONSE**

The first year after records were sent to CRM all TRIM entries were reviewed to make sure that there was a corresponding CRM entry. Since then they have been checked on an irregular basis.

A schedule will be made and new entries will be checked on a regular basis.

CRM estimates that their new tracking system will be available through the internet by the end of the first quarter of 2005. This will make checking much easier, and eliminate the need for CRM to print reports that number 6-700 pages.

## **TAMPA POLICE DEPARTMENT (TPD) RECORDS DIVISION**

During the testing of accuracy of records stored to information recorded on the transmittal form, it was noted that Tampa Police Department records were labeled as restricted access to “Authorized Personnel Only.” Therefore, no actual review of the box contents was performed. However, TPD Records personnel were interviewed to determine the process used to submit items to off-site storage.

The discussion disclosed that although there is a designated Records Coordinator (Coordinator), several areas within TPD send records directly to off-site storage without notifying the Coordinator. Also, due to the volume of records transferred, the off-site storage vendor retrieves boxes from TPD directly for transporting to their facility. TPD Records personnel expressed concern regarding the sensitivity of information stored at the off-site location and the lack of controls to restrict access to them.

Additionally, it was noted that when a record had been permanently sealed by the courts, a different section of TPD retrieved and retained the microfilm roll containing the records. The film roll was held until it was determined that there were enough sealed records requests to process. However, the period of time between retrieval from Records and removal was not very timely. As a result, when Records Division personnel needed to make a copy from the roll of film that had been removed, they were required to go to the other department to retrieve the film roll.

### **Versadex**

The system used to capture record incident reports has resulted in a records continuity issue. The initial report generated through the system is captured and microfilmed at one time. However, there is often supplemental paper reports produced. The paper reports are currently microfilmed at a separate time and therefore not linked to the initial report. However, with the use of a scanner, the supplemental paper reports could be scanned and inserted as a continuation of the initial reports, allowing for continuity of information and limiting the probability of omitting additional information.

## **RECOMMENDATION 3**

TPD management should establish the section responsible for the overall maintenance of Police Records. Other Divisions should be required to coordinate with this area any action taken that involves records in any manner.

## **AUDITEE RESPONSE**

Concur. SOP 619, Procedures for Retention of Department Records, will be rewritten to provide more specific information regarding the responsibilities of each division and their responsibilities to, and interaction with, TPD’s Records Custodian.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4**

TPD should obtain a legal opinion on the appropriateness of records stored off-site and determine if there is any access restrictions required.

#### **AUDITEE RESPONSE**

Concur. This issue is being researched by Kirby Rainsberger, Police Legal Advisor.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 5**

The use of scanners should be evaluated for including supplemental records as a continuation to the initial report.

#### **AUDITEE RESPONSE**

Concur. The Police Department has acquired additional imaging equipment and personnel are being trained regarding their responsibilities as it relates to scanning documents into the Records Management System. Currently, Delayed Crimes Investigative Unit (DCIU) has received one scanner and Major Crimes Bureau (MCB) has received three scanners. Their personnel have already received the referenced training. The three patrol divisions will receive training upon receipt of their scanners.