



"Closest to Home"

Archival Programs for Local Government Records

A project of the Council of State Archivists, funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission

Report on programs and services for local government records provided by state archives and records management agencies

March 2006 (updated June 2006)

Data in the tables that follow were collected during two surveys conducted by the Council of State Archivists (CoSA).

The latest was completed in early March 2006 in conjunction with the CoSA Local Government Archives Project. CoSA received responses from 35 (out of 37) combined archives and records management programs, 10 (out of 14) archives only programs, 4 (out of 12) records management only programs (see Table 1 for respondents). Two states (AR, MN) do not have state records management programs. The responses included on pages 3-19 are from this latest data collection. (For a few states that did not report in 2006, we used staffing numbers provided during the FY2004 survey to complete Table 3.)

CoSA collected the remaining data during a comprehensive survey of state archives and records management programs that covered FY2004.

The data include:

- Number staff (FTEs) in state archives devoted to local government records;
- Types and levels of service provided for local government records;
- Fee structures and programs/services supported by funds based on revenue received from filing fees at the local level;
- Evaluations, needs assessments, surveys, and reports on local government records that could be useful for the work of the Local Government Archives Task Force, its Expert Panels, and consultants;
- Total volume of local government records held in state archives and records centers at the close of FY2004 and local government records accessioned in FY2004

The six largest state-based local government programs can be found in states that have a fund based on revenues from filing fees at the local level (Table 6a-6c). New York, Washington, Missouri, Virginia, and New Jersey, and Texas all have 15 or more FTEs devoted to local government records at the state level (Table 3). All but Texas has a revenue stream from fees to help support its program for local government records. At the other extreme are states that have only fractional or no FTEs to address local government concerns. Nearly half of the states have less than 2 FTEs and one-quarter have less than 1 FTE working on local government records.

A number of states also have implemented funds in which filing fees stay in the local jurisdiction but are specifically allocated for the care of records. In Delaware, New York, and Rhode Island, the fee is split between the locality and the state. In Indiana, Iowa, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Vermont the fees stay entirely with the local governments.

Table 1. State archives and records management programs responding to the March 2006 and FY2004 surveys. ARM = Joint Archives & Records Management Program | A = Archives only | RM = Records Management only

State	Program	March 2006	FY2004
Alabama	ARM	yes	yes
Alaska	ARM	yes	yes
Arizona	ARM	yes	yes
Arkansas	A	--	yes
	no RM program in AR		
California	A	yes	yes
	RM	--	yes
Colorado	ARM	yes	yes
Connecticut	ARM	yes	yes
Delaware	ARM	yes	yes
Florida	ARM	yes	yes
Georgia	ARM	yes	yes
Hawaii	ARM	yes	yes
Idaho	A	yes	yes
	RM	--	yes
Indiana	ARM	yes	yes
Iowa	ARM	yes	yes
Kansas	ARM	yes	yes
Kentucky	ARM	yes	yes
Louisiana	ARM	yes	yes
Maine	ARM	yes	yes
Maryland	RM	yes	yes
Massachusetts	ARM	yes	yes
Michigan	ARM	yes	yes
Minnesota	A	yes	yes
	no RM program in MN		
Mississippi	ARM	yes	yes
Missouri	ARM	yes	yes
Montana	A	--	yes
	RM	--	--
Nebraska	A	yes	yes
	RM	yes	--

State	Program	March 2006	FY2004
Nevada	ARM	yes	yes
New Hampshire	ARM	yes	yes
New Jersey	ARM	yes	yes
New Mexico	ARM	yes	yes
New York	ARM	yes	yes
North Carolina	ARM	yes	yes
North Dakota	A	yes	yes
	RM	yes	yes
Ohio	A	yes	yes
	RM	--	yes
Oklahoma	ARM	yes	yes
Oregon	ARM	yes	yes
Pennsylvania	ARM	yes	yes
Rhode Island	ARM	yes	yes
South Carolina	ARM	yes	yes
South Dakota	A	yes	yes
	RM	--	yes
Tennessee	A	yes	yes
	RM	--	yes
Texas	ARM	yes	yes
Utah	ARM	yes	yes
Vermont	A	yes	yes
	RM	yes	yes
Virginia	ARM	yes	yes
Washington	ARM	yes	yes
West Virginia	A	--	yes
	RM	--	--
Wisconsin	A	yes	yes
	RM	yes	yes
Wyoming	ARM	yes	yes

Table 2. State archives and records management authority for local government records.

ARM = Joint archives & records management program | A = Archives only | RM = Records management only

State	Authority for	
	Estab/approve retention/disp stds/scheds	Estab other recordkeeping practices or regs
Alabama	ARM	ARM
Alaska	ARM	ARM
Arizona	ARM	ARM
Arkansas	None	None
California	A	A
Colorado	ARM	ARM
Connecticut	ARM	ARM
Delaware	ARM	ARM
Dist of Columbia	ARM	ARM
Florida	ARM	ARM
Georgia	ARM	ARM
Hawaii	Other	Other
Idaho	A	A
Illinois	ARM	ARM
Indiana	ARM	ARM
Iowa	None	None
Kansas	ARM	ARM
Kentucky	ARM	ARM
Louisiana	ARM	ARM
Maine	ARM	ARM
Maryland	A & RM	
Massachusetts	ARM	ARM
Michigan	ARM	ARM
Minnesota	Other	Other
Mississippi	ARM	None
Missouri	ARM	ARM

State	Authority for	
	Estab/approve retention/disp stds/scheds	Estab other recordkeeping practices or regs
Montana	Other	Other
Nebraska	A & RM	A & RM
Nevada	ARM	ARM
New Hampshire	ARM	Don't know
New Jersey	ARM	ARM
New Mexico	ARM	None
New York	ARM	ARM
North Carolina	ARM	ARM
North Dakota	RM	RM
Ohio	A	A
Oklahoma	Other	Other
Oregon	ARM	ARM
Pennsylvania	ARM	ARM
Rhode Island	ARM	ARM
South Carolina	ARM	ARM
South Dakota	A & RM	A
Tennessee	Other	A
Texas	ARM	ARM
Utah	ARM	ARM
Vermont	RM	RM
Virginia	ARM	ARM
Washington	ARM	ARM
West Virginia	A	A
Wisconsin	RM	Other
Wyoming	ARM	ARM

Summary, all states	Number of ARM programs having authority for	
	Establishing/approving LG retention/disposition standards/schedules	Establishing other LG recordkeeping practices or regulations
Responsibility of joint Archives & RM Program	34	31
Responsibility shared by separate A & RM Programs	3	1
Sole responsibility of Archives	4	6
Sole responsibility of Records Management	3	2
Responsibility born by another agency	5	5
No agency bears responsibility	2	4

Table 3. Number of FTEs in state archives and records management providing programs and services relating to local government records. Figures include both staff who are assigned primarily to local government work and those who work on local government records in addition to responsibilities. Data collected March 2006, except those marked with an asterisk (*) are from CoSA FY2004 survey. Sorted from largest to smallest FTE count.

State	Program	FTEs per program	All FTEs for state	State	Program	FTEs per program	All FTEs for state
New York	ARM		35.50	Indiana	ARM		2.00
Washington	ARM		30.00	Oregon	ARM		2.00
Missouri	ARM		25.00	Wisconsin	A	1.50	1.60
Virginia	ARM		17.00	Wisconsin	RM	0.10	
New Jersey	ARM		15.00	Mississippi	ARM		1.50
Texas	A	3.00	15.00	Rhode Island	ARM		1.50
Texas	RM	12.00		California	A	1.00	1.00
Maryland	A	*13.00	13.05	California		*0.00	
Maryland	RM	0.05		Massachusetts	ARM		1.00
Illinois	ARM		*11.00	Michigan	ARM		1.00
Connecticut	ARM		10.00	Minnesota	A		1.00
Florida	ARM		9.00	Nevada	ARM		1.00
North Carolina	ARM		7.00	Ohio	A	1.00	1.00
South Carolina	ARM		7.00	Ohio	RM	*0.00	
Kentucky	ARM		6.00	Vermont	A	0.50	1.00
Idaho	A	1.00	5.00	Vermont	RM	0.50	
Idaho	RM	*4.00		Colorado	ARM		0.50
South Dakota	A	1.00	5.00	Kansas	ARM		0.25
South Dakota	RM	*4.00		North Dakota	A	0.25	0.35
Tennessee	A	5.00	5.00	North Dakota	RM	0.10	
Tennessee	RM	*0.00		Maine	ARM		0.25
Pennsylvania	ARM		4.50	New Hampshire	ARM		0.20
Louisiana	ARM		4.00	New Mexico	ARM		0.15
Arizona	ARM		3.00	Iowa	ARM		0.10
Delaware	ARM		3.00	Alaska	ARM		0.00
Nebraska	A	2.50	3.00	Arkansas	ARM		*0.00
Nebraska	RM	0.50		Hawaii	ARM		0.00
Wyoming	ARM		3.00	Montana	A	*0.00	*0.00
Georgia	ARM		2.50	Montana	RM	no report	
Utah	ARM		2.00	Oklahoma	ARM		0.00
Alabama	ARM		2.00	West Virginia	ARM	no report	

*FY2004 data

Table 4a. What levels of services does the state archives and/or state records management program provide for local government records in each of the following areas? March 2006.

Name of state	Program	Serves as repository for LGR (i.e., accessions permanent records)	Storage for LGR (i.e., temporary custody of records)	Imaging services for LGR	Microfilming services for LGR	Security storage of microfilm for LGR	Preservation or conservation services for LGR
Total # reporting		51	51	51	51	51	51
Active program	+++	19	3	6	15	28	7
Occasionally	++	7	12	7	7	3	10
Rarely	+	17	9	7	10	9	13
Never	--	8	27	31	19	11	21

Table 4b. What levels of services does the state archives and/or state records management program provide for local government records in each of the following areas? March 2006.

Name of state	Program	Serves as repository for LGR (i.e., accessions permanent records)	Storage for LGR (i.e., temporary custody of records)	Imaging services for LGR	Microfilming services for LGR	Security storage of microfilm for LGR	Preservation or conservation services for LGR
Alabama	ARM	+	++	--	--	--	+
Alaska	ARM	+	+	--	+	+++	+
Arizona	ARM	+++	--	+++	+	+++	+++
California	A	++	--	--	--	--	--
Colorado	ARM	+	--	--	--	+++	--
Connecticut	ARM	+++	+++	--	--	+	--
Delaware	ARM	+++	+	++	+++	+++	+
Florida	ARM	+	+	+	+	+++	+
Georgia	ARM	+	--	+	+	+++	+
Hawaii	ARM	++	--	--	--	+++	--
Idaho	A	+++	--	++	++	+++	+++
Indiana	ARM	+++	+	--	+	+++	++
Iowa	ARM	++	--	--	--	--	--
Kansas	ARM	++	++	+	+	+	+
Kentucky	ARM	+	++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Louisiana	ARM	+	++	--	+++	+++	+
Maine	ARM	+	--	--	++	+++	--
Maryland	RM	--	--	--	--	--	--
Massachusetts	ARM	--	--	++	++	--	--
Michigan	ARM	+++	--	++	++	--	+

Table 4b, cont. What levels of services does the state archives and/or state records management program provide for local government records in each of the following areas? March 2006.

Name of state	Program	Serves as repository for LGR (i.e., accessions permanent records)	Storage for LGR (i.e., temporary custody of records)	Imaging services for LGR	Microfilming services for LGR	Security storage of microfilm for LGR	Preservation or conservation services for LGR
Minnesota	A	+	--	--	--	--	--
Mississippi	ARM	++	--	--	--	--	--
Missouri	ARM	+++	++	--	+++	+++	+++
Nebraska	A	+++	--	--	--	+++	++
Nebraska	RM	--	--	++	++	--	--
Nevada	ARM	--	--	--	--	--	--
New Hampshire	ARM	++	++	--	--	+++	--
New Jersey	ARM	+	++	+++	+++	+++	--
New Mexico	ARM	+	++	++	++	+++	--
New York	ARM	++	--	--	--	++	--
North Carolina	ARM	+++	+	+++	+++	+++	++
North Dakota	A	+++	--	--	++	+	++
North Dakota	RM	--	--	--	+	+	--
Ohio	A	+++	--	--	--	+	++
Oklahoma	ARM	--	--	--	++	+++	++
Oregon	ARM	+++	--	--	--	+++	+
Pennsylvania	ARM	+	++	+	+++	+++	++
Rhode Island	ARM	+	+	--	--	++	+
South Carolina	ARM	+++	--	--	+++	+++	+++
South Dakota	A	+++	++	++	+++	+++	+
Tennessee	A	+++	+	+++	+++	+++	+
Texas	A	+	--	+++	+++	+++	--
Texas	RM	--	--	--	+++	--	--
Utah	ARM	+++	+++	--	+++	+++	+
Vermont	A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Vermont	RM	--	--	++	+++	+++	--
Virginia	ARM	+++	+++	++	++	+	+++
Washington	ARM	+++	++	+++	+++	+++	+
Wisconsin	A	+++	--	--	--	++	++
Wisconsin	RM	+	+	--	--	+	--
Wyoming	ARM	+++	+	--	+	+++	++

Table 5a. What levels of services does the state archives and/or state records management program provide for local government records in each of the following areas? March 2006.

Name of state	Program	Training to local government officials and employees	Onsite consultation to local govt officials and employees	Assists local governments in preparing records schedules	Writes schedules for LGR	Approves schedules for LGR	Grants to local governments
Total # reporting		50	51	51	50	50	51
Active program	+++	32	32	32	30	40	14
Occasionally	++	4	8	6	3	1	4
Rarely	+	12	10	7	4	1	1
Never	--	2	1	6	13	8	32

Table 5b. What levels of services does the state archives and/or state records management program provide for local government records in each of the following areas? March 2006.

Name of state	Program	Training to local government officials and employees	Onsite consultation to local govt officials and employees	Assists local governments in preparing records schedules	Writes schedules for LGR	Approves schedules for LGR	Grants to local governments
Alabama	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Alaska	ARM	+	+	++	0	--	--
Arizona	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
California	A	++	+++	+++	--	--	--
Colorado	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Connecticut	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Delaware	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Florida	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+
Georgia	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	+++
Hawaii	ARM	--	--	++	--	--	--
Idaho	A	+++	+++	+++	++	++	+
Indiana	ARM	+	+	+++	+++	+++	--
Iowa	ARM	+	+	--	--	--	+++
Kansas	ARM	+	+	+++	+++	+++	--
Kentucky	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Louisiana	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+	+++	++
Maine	ARM	+	+	--	+++	+++	+++

Table 5b, cont. What levels of services does the state archives and/or state records management program provide for local government records in each of the following areas? March 2006.

Name of state	Program	Training to local government officials and employees	Onsite consultation to local govt officials and employees	Assists local governments in preparing records schedules	Writes schedules for LGR	Approves schedules for LGR	Grants to local governments
Maryland	RM	++	++	+	--	--	--
Massachusetts		+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Michigan	ARM	+++	++	++	++	+++	--
Minnesota	A	+	++	++	--	+++	--
Mississippi	ARM	+	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Missouri	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Nebraska	A	+	+	+++	--	+++	--
Nebraska	RM	+	++	+++	+	+++	+++
Nevada	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
New Hampshire	ARM	++	++	++	+++		--
New Jersey	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
New Mexico	ARM	+	+	+++	+++	+++	--
New York	ARM	+++	+++	--	+++	+++	+++
North Carolina	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+
North Dakota	A	+	+	--	--	+++	--
North Dakota	RM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Ohio	A	+++	++	+++	++	+++	--
Oklahoma	ARM	++	++	++	--	--	--
Oregon	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Pennsylvania	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Rhode Island	ARM	+++	+++	--	+++	+++	+++
South Carolina	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++
South Dakota	A	+	+	+	--	--	--
Tennessee	A	+++	+++	+	+	+++	+++
Texas	A	+++	+++	+++	--	+++	--
Texas	RM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Utah	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--
Vermont	A	+++	+++	+	--	--	++

Table 5b, cont. What levels of services does the state archives and/or state records management program provide for local government records in each of the following areas? March 2006.

Name of state	Program	Training to local government officials and employees	Onsite consultation to local govt officials and employees	Assists local governments in preparing records schedules	Writes schedules for LGR	Approves schedules for LGR	Grants to local governments
Vermont	RM	+++	+++	--	+++	+++	--
Virginia	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Washington	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Wisconsin	A	--	+	++	--	+++	--
Wisconsin	RM	+++	++	+	++	+++	--
Wyoming	ARM	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	--

Table 5c. States that operate active regional repository systems (March 2006)

Colorado	Michigan	Utah
Idaho	South Dakota	Washington
Illinois	Texas	Wisconsin

Funds supporting local government records based on fees collected by local governments.

Table 6a. States with funds to support local government records that receive revenue from fees collected by local governments. March 2006.

Connecticut

Year started: 2000 Revenue generated: \$1 million +

Fee structure: The legislation established an additional fee of three dollars to be collected by town clerks for recording land records, including deeds and mortgages. The Town Clerk retains one dollar of the fee for their own preservation use. The Historic Documents Preservation Account is comprised of the two dollars that the town clerks forward to the State Library. Two-thirds of the money is returned to the towns in the form of grants. The State Library uses the remaining third to administer the grant program, to provide workshops and other training to the town clerks, and to preserve and manage local government records in the State Archives collections.

Delaware

Year started: 1991 Revenue generated: \$250,000

Fee structure: \$1.00 per document w/county recorders (state share - \$0.75 - counties keep \$0.25).

Indiana

Year started: Revenue generated: All handled locally

Fee structure: Varies, both the county recorder and county clerk have fees which are to be used for records preservation. The clerks statute is loose and allow for furnishings, etc. to qualify for funding. All revenues are retained locally and do not flow through the state.

Iowa

Year started: 1993 Revenue generated: not reported

Fee structure: Fee is \$1.00 per document filed with county recorder. Fees stay in the county but are dedicated to 'preserving and maintaining public records' Code of Iowa 331.605A

Kentucky

Year started: 1984 Revenue generated: not reported

Fee structure: \$2.00 per legal process document.

Mississippi

Year started: 1996 Revenue generated: \$70,000

Fee structure: \$1.00 per non-court filing

Missouri

Year started: Revenue generated: not reported

Fee structure:

New Jersey

Year started: 2003 Revenue generated: \$65-\$70 million total; 40% of total goes to local government grants (PARIS)

Fee structure: \$5.00 per document filed in the county clerk or register of deeds office, plus \$5.00 per page.

New York

Year started: 1989 Revenue generated: \$14 million

Fee structure: \$5.00 per document filed or number registered (for certain court records) in County Clerk's Offices. \$4.75 goes to the fund; \$.25 to the County Clerk.

North Dakota

Year started: Revenue generated: Varies with each county

Fee structure: However, county recorders do have a \$3.00 per filing fee that is used only by that office for records preservation and access.

Pennsylvania

Year started: 1998 Revenue generated: \$0 for state; county money varies by size

Fee structure: \$2.00 per document filed with county recorder, however, the county keeps that money and places it into a County Records Improvement fund to be used at the county's discretion for preservation of local government records.

Rhode Island

Year started: 1993 Revenue generated: not reported

Fee structure: A \$2.00 fee is attached to most land evidence and certain probate records filed at the municipal level (note: not county). \$1 remains with the City or Town Clerk (except in Providence), \$1 is transmitted to the State Archives. Both at the state and local level the funds are deposited in restricted receipt 'Historical Records Trust' accounts, and may be used only for purposes defined in statute.

Vermont

Year started: 1998 Revenue generated: Varies from town to town

Fee structure: The state does not have a fund. Each municipality is authorized to create a fee of up to \$1.00 per page for the preservation and conservation of land records.

Virginia

Year started: 1991 Revenue generated: \$3 to 4 million/yr over last 4 years

Fee structure: The Circuit Court Records Preservation Program (CCRP) is a part of the Library of Virginia's Local Records Services Branch. Funded through a \$1.50 recordation fee, the CCRP provides grants to the Commonwealth's circuit court clerks to help preserve the historically valuable records in their courthouses and those that have been transferred to the Library's archives for safekeeping.

The fees support the processing of circuit court records, maintaining and duplicating circuit court microfilm (which includes converting the Library of Virginia's index and inventory of circuit court microfilm from paper to an electronic format), and allocating grants to the clerk's offices to address specific records preservation issues.

Washington

Year started: 1994

Revenue generated: \$2,500,000

Fee structure: \$2.00 per document recorded by County Recorder; \$20.00 for each delinquent State Tax Warrant satisfied in County Superior Court

Table 6b. Programs or services supported by the funds described above.

Name of state	Grants to local governments for records-related activities (scheduling, appraisal, arrangement, description, conservation)	Grants for imaging or microfilming LGR	Salaries for state archives staff who are assigned to assist local governments with their records	Training programs for local government officials and employees	Purchases of supplies (e.g., boxes, folders)	Purchases of shelving, equipment	Construction or renovation of facilities in which LGR are housed
Connecticut	+	+		+	+	+	
Delaware			+	+	+		
Indiana		+			+	+	
Kentucky	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Mississippi			+	+			
New Jersey	+	+		+	+	+	+
New York	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rhode Island	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Vermont					+	+	
Virginia	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Washington	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Table 6c. Other programs and services covered by the funds described above.

Iowa	My understanding is this fee is used at the local level, with local level control usually for imaging services
New Jersey	I. Counties: <ul style="list-style-type: none">-- state-coordinated county needs assessment and strategic planning services;-- grants-in-aid for archives and records management staffing;-- grants-in-aid for county-municipality shared services needs assessment and strategic planning; and-- grants-in-aid for imaging systems and services, electronic records management systems, and electronic filing portals development and expansion; II. Municipalities w/population greater than 75,000: <ul style="list-style-type: none">-- grants-in-aid for archives and records management staffing; and-- grants-in-aid for imaging systems and services, electronic records management systems; III. Municipalities w/population less than 75,000 and greater than 45,000: <ul style="list-style-type: none">-- grants-in-aid for needs assessment and strategic planning to include and evaluation of the opportunities for shared services with the county government. IV. County Seats w/population less than 45,000: <ul style="list-style-type: none">-- grants-in-aid for needs assessment and strategic planning to include and evaluation of the opportunities for shared services with the county government
New York	Development of general retention schedules for local governments. \$500,000 to the Documentary Heritage Program (\$400,000 for advisory services; \$100,000 for grants) \$300,000 to operations of the Archives Partnership Trust
Rhode Island	Develop preservation plans. Consult on vault rehab and construction projects. Consult on all aspects of archives & records management. Assist in vault & storage area clear-outs. Just about anything else requested of us.
Vermont	Restoration and preservation of records
Washington	Operation and maintenance of Regional and Digital Archives facilities

Table 7. Evaluations, needs assessments, survey, reports on local government records

Alabama

Assessing Alabama's Archives – 1985. Survey of Local Government Digital Imaging Programs – 1996. Copies available by contacting ADAH, Government Records Division at 334-242-4452

California

Archives: A report that included a section on local government records was issued in 1981. A summary of state laws relating to the retention and disposition of local government records was issued in 1982. In 2004, a revised manual on the historical records of county government was completed and distributed.

The 1981 and 1982 publications are out of print. The 2004 manual is available at:
<http://www.ss.ca.gov/archives/pdf/corecdsmanrev.pdf>

Delaware

Progress re needs identified in 1986 NHPRC-funded statewide assessment project addressed by SHRAB in 1999.

No longer available on our website. Copy can be made available upon request. Recommendation for a new statewide assessment of needs/conditions expected to be included in SHRAB strategic planning project to be initiated this year.

Florida

The SHRAB has conducted several surveys over the past decade on these issues. Those reports covered both local and state government records issues. 2004 was the last one.

Results are being prepared for our website and should be available in the next few weeks.

Georgia

The historical records advisory board conducted needs assessments in 1983 and 1995 to evaluate the condition of historical records in the state and to identify strategic initiatives for the board. The reports evaluated state and local government records and records in historical repositories.

Contact Elizabeth Barr GHRAB Coordinator Georgia Archives 5800 Jonesboro Road Morrow, GA 30260 ebarr@sos.state.ga.us 678-364-3718

Idaho

Survey of state government records repositories; country government records repositories, municipal government records repositories, and public school district records repositories in Idaho's [Family History: Historic Records at Risk](#). Completed in 2001. http://www.idahohistory.net/Arc_Main.pdf

Kansas

In conjunction with state wide surveys by the SHRAB in 2000.

<http://www.kshs.org/preserve/documents/kshrab/blueprint3.pdf>

Louisiana

Archives: State Archives sends out a request for a records liaison officer to be named by the appropriate local and state agencies - over 3000. Updated annually

Call the Records Manager at Louisiana State Archives. 225 925-7552

Survey was conducted of Clerks of Court records in the state. 1991

Doug Harrison, Louisiana State Archives, PO BOX 94124, Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Maine

2004

Massachusetts

Historical records survey updated every ten years. Next one is due in 2007.

Michigan

With NHPRC funds, the Michigan State Historical Records Advisory Board sponsored a Local Records Task Force. We conducted a survey of 500 local officials, and issued a report of our findings and recommendations, 'Michigan's Local Government Records are in Danger!' It outlines problems and solutions to LGR issues. January 2006.

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/hal_mhc_rms_localtf_whitepaper_149325_7.pdf

Minnesota

Archives: We produced a manual and set of guidelines to help local government entities and local and county historical societies collaborate on the preservation of local government records. 2001, modified 2004.

<http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/recordsguidelines/guidelines.html>

Mississippi

Needs assessment of local government records (1982). Report to the Legislature: Local Government Records Advisory Committee (1995)

Both reports are out of print.

New Hampshire

Surveys in 1984 and 1995 that showed an LGR program is needed in the state. An LGR Program was enacted by the legislature in 2003 but has never been funded. 1984 and 1995.

New Jersey

A state-contracted and -coordinated basic needs assessment of traditional and electronic records systems was completed in all 21 counties in 2004-2005. Composite reports based on the county data were also completed for the State Records Committee.

The reports are not going to be posted to our web site. Hardcopy or PDF versions are available, on request, from PARIS Grants Program Administrator Jennifer Driscoll Petrino, at (609) 530-7493 or <Jennifer.Petrino@sos.state.nj.us>.

New Mexico

Assessment conducted through an NHPRC grant by the state historical records advisory board. 2004.

New York

Starting in the 1980s, the Archives has released annual reports on the state of records management in local governments. Since the implementation of the Local Government Records Management Improvement Fund in 1989, we have submitted these reports to the governor and the legislature. Ca 1986 until present

Currently, only paper copies exist. Contact Geof Huth for copies.

North Carolina

Completed by Government Records Branch, 2002. Also SHRAB has does work in this area.

Ohio

Archives: In 2002 a short survey was sent to all counties, townships and municipalities consisting of 6 questions concerning funding, resources and assistance. In 2003 agreeable local governments were sent a longer survey that looked at storage, staff, resources, microfilm, electronic records, public access, scheduling and disposal, and how the State Archives programs are used and can provide better assistance. 2002-2003

A formal report was not written. I have the raw information in databases and I have statistics pulled from the surveys in a spreadsheet. I am happy to provide this information and/or assist in the interpretation of it.

Oklahoma

The report, 'Preserving Today's Records for Tomorrow's Use' is the product of a year long project assessing historical records conditions and needs in Oklahoma. The study was sponsored by the Oklahoma Historical Records Advisory Board through a grant from the NHPRC. The study assessed state government records, local government records, nongovernmental records, and issues of statewide interest. 1985.

Hardcopies of the report are available within the State Archives. This report is not available online.

Oregon

We conduct assessments/evaluations as requested by the local government entity or one of their sponsoring organizations. Reports focus on overall programs or particular issues that may be of concern to the local government entity. Ongoing

Pennsylvania

A state-wide county records survey done in 1984.

Can contact me by phone or email.

Rhode Island

1991 Statewide Preservation Planning survey

We have the individual survey returns from 1991/2, but am unsure about compiled data.

South Carolina

Consultant survey and analysis. 1999.

http://www.state.sc.us/scdah/shrab/local_99.htm

Tennessee

Archives: Volunteer Challenge 2004.

www.tennessee.gov/tsla/aps/vc/index.htm

Utah

The State Archives, in cooperation with Utah's seven Regional Associations of Government, developed and implemented the Local Government Records Preservation Project. This project is designed to identify and permanently preserve historical records on microfilm, provide regional centralized locations for access to copies of the microfilm, and to train local government officials on the management of records.

The project is being implemented by regions across the state. This project is in process, with approximately one-third of the state completed. Ongoing.

Vermont

Archives: Joint reports on land information management and municipal scanning projects. For both local and State government: Preservation and disaster recovery; Access to public records (general); Trustworthy information systems; Electronic records; etc. Most recent report was January 2006.

Vermont Municipal Land Records Commission website contains current report as well as previous reports: <http://vermont-archives.org/records/vtmlrc> Vermont Judicial Records Program now contains links for law enforcement (under development): <http://vermont-archives.org/records/vjrp> Vermont Trustworthy Information Systems: http://vermont-archives.org/records/electronic/er_trust.html Access to public records: <http://vermont-archives.org/records/access/pubrec.html> Electronic records: http://vermont-archives.org/records/electronic/elec_rec.html

Virginia

We just completed a brief customer satisfaction survey for local clerks of court. 2006.

Only an in-house summary is available, but would be glad to provide a copy.

Washington

A survey was conducted in 2001 focusing on the visibility of the program and the needs of client agencies. Another such survey will be conducted in 2006.

We have hardcopy and electronic versions of the 2001 survey and statistical reports on the performance of the Local Government Archives and Records Management Program, but nothing online. Copies can be obtained upon request.

Wyoming

Records Management: In 1995, NHPRC provided grant funds to do a records assessment and strategic planning project, which included local government records.

Good idea to put it on our SHRAB website!! We have a few copies left and they can be obtained by writing: Tony Adams Wyoming State Archives 2301 Central Avenue, Barrett Building Cheyenne, WY 82002

Table 8. Comments included in March 2006 survey on state archives and records management programs for local government records

Alabama

Since the early 1980s Alabama has cooperated with the Genealogical Society of Utah to microfilm the majority of the records housed at the county probate offices (births, deeds, deaths, estate case files, etc.). They also filmed the divorce case files at the circuit courts. This microfilm preserves most of the probate records through the mid 20th century.

Alaska

If we had the staffing we could do much more to assist local governments.

Connecticut

We have awarded over 5 million dollars in grants to local governments since the programs inception.

Delaware

SHRAB expected to consider Local Government Records Management Improvement Fund increase this year. Primary goal will be to address electronic records services/storage provided.

Georgia

I would like to clarify my answers to the services we provide to local governments -- *acquisition of permanent records: we have a standard acquisition policy for local government records (available at www.sos.state.ga.us/archives/who_are_we/rims) that allows the transfer of records *imaging services: we are currently exploring the feasibility of providing scanning services to local governments but do not offer this as a regular program *microfilming services: our microfilming services are limited (at this time) to the product of COM from images *writing and approving local schedules: the Archives issues a common retention schedule for local government records (updated every other year). Local government agencies official adopt the schedule or portions of the schedule that apply to their records.

Idaho

Working with the Association of Idaho Cities to put in place a statewide retention schedule by December 2007.

Iowa

Iowa does not require local governments to do any thing with local records. Certain statutes require that some records be preserved permanently and all other records to be preserved for 10 years. Code of Iowa 331.323(2)(d).

Kansas

We used to have a local records archivist but layoffs a few years ago forced us to make that position .5 FTE. The incumbent left and we have not been able to fill the position. We proposed a fee based structure a number of years ago with no success. Our KSHRAB efforts identify local government records as some of the most endangered in the state but we (KSHS or SHRAB) have no resources to address the issue.

Louisiana

We have conducted over 20 workshops statewide and have had over 750 participants.

Maryland

Records Management: The Maryland Records Management Program provides general direction and guidance to local governments who make inquiry regarding the establishment of records retention schedules. The Maryland State Archives approves the actual schedule and will report separately on their involvement with local governments.

Michigan

Archives: The RM portion (schedule creation) is handled by the Michigan Records Management Services; archival records are handled by the State Archives of Michigan.

Records Management: No funds are appropriated for our local government records program (both archives and records management). All resources that are provided to local governments are taken away from appropriations that were designated for state government records.

Minnesota

Archives: Our SHRAB has been exploring and encouraging various forms of collaborations at the local level - local government with historical societies and public libraries, notably.

Nebraska

Archives: Finally, after three years of waiting to fill a vacated position, our new Government Records Archivist begins work on March 6, 2006. I anticipate that our services to local governments will be improved with this hire.

New Hampshire

As of Feb 2006 we have a statute governing the retention of Municipal Records by an established Board and that schedule is effectively in place. The LGR program established by law in 2003, through the State Archives, has never been funded. There is continual expectation that the LGR Program will get underway in the near future.

New Mexico

Section 14-3-18 NMSA 1978 authorizes the State Records Administrator who is also the Director of the State Records Center and Archives to advise and assist county and municipal officials in the formulation of programs for the disposition of public records maintained in local government offices.

North Dakota

Archives: Records Management (separate agency) generates retention schedules and manuals for counties and cities. The archives reviews and approves all retention schedules.

Records Management: We have retention schedules set up for the city and county government offices. We issue annual disposal reports to these offices so they can dispose or transfer records to the State Archives accordingly.

Oklahoma

A local government records program is virtually non-existent. On occasion large metropolitan areas; Oklahoma City, Tulsa, etc., will request information concerning the development of records disposition schedules and ask for examples. We provide information that is available online and provided information concerning upcoming workshops. Attempts have been made to assist local governments in developing a grant for submission to the NHPRC. However, to date only one has received a grant but due to a lack of personnel had to return the grant.

Oregon

We have a very strong relationship with our local governments. Two of the many bi-products of this relationship are the e-mail management manual and video for local governments found on our website at <http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/recmgmt.htm> and the Oregon Historical Records Project also found on our website at <http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/local.htm>. Both show that quality products can be produced when state archives have good working relationships with their local government entities.

Pennsylvania

Most of our services to local governments are provided out of our General Operating Budget. Grants for local governments come out of appropriation by state legislature.

Tennessee

Archives: Tennessee's Secretary of State has committed a \$200,000 budget, 3 professional staff positions, a \$50,000 annual grants program, and an annual training institute to developing and supporting local government records archives in this state. In five years TN has gone from a handful of county archives to a growing network of more than sixty-five municipal and county archives.

Vermont

Archives: Local government in Vermont is comprised of 246 towns; there is a limited county government and county clerks are State employees. The Vermont State Archives is actively working with municipalities in the State on archives and records management issues, specifically in the areas of land records and law enforcement. We provide a broader service by conducting workshops, training, etc. in preservation, public access, etc.

Currently there is no state authority designated to work directly with local governments and each municipality operates as its own entity. There are no local government 'archives,' although the Vermont Commissioner of Department of Building and General Services (BGS) operates a microfilming service and records storage facility that municipalities may use for a fee. BGS also is responsible for authorizing the destruction of public records and has created a municipal records schedule.

Presently the town clerks' offices serve as the local archives; however, many municipalities do not have adequate space typical office functions let alone records. While there is strong resistance to State involvement of any kind and consortia for sharing tools and resources among towns for archives and records management, recent legislation has caused some towns to rethink how they manage records and have sought assistance from the State Archives. Therefore, in addition to our presence on several municipal records commissions and committees, we are actively working with more progressive towns to seek solutions to their records problems (lack of space, staff, money) at an enterprise-wide level (state and local government).

Because of our population it is no longer feasible to sustain 246 separate silos of records. Further, record-wise, it is very rare to have records that are not interrelated (or duplicated) at both the local and State levels.

Virginia

As an institution, we have not encouraged the establishment of local government archival programs. Several large localities have active records management programs, with records centers that hold some permanent records. We have not encouraged placing local government records at local historical societies, libraries, academic institutions, etc.

Wisconsin

Records Management: Local government officials may attend training offerings. Several local units use the same RM software as the state. We provide a limited amount of assistance and support related to use

of this software. Otherwise we have no resources to devote exclusively to local government records related issues.

Wyoming

Wyoming Statutes are very clear in directing us and the local government officials concerning the management of records, regardless of physical characteristics. I think that the Wyoming State Archives has done a good job of working with local government officials to preserve any permanent records in paper or on microfilm.

Table 9. Volume of local government records held in state archives at the close of FY2004
(in linear or cubic feet).

State	Paper	Oversize	Still pictures	Moving images	Recorded sound	Electronic records
Alabama	2,000	–	–	–	–	–
Arizona	4,794	20	–	–	–	–
Arkansas	50	–	–	–	–	–
California	4,000	10	–	–	–	–
Colorado	100	5	5	–	–	15
Delaware	14,500	300	5	–	–	–
District of Columbia	70	15	25	10	10	10
Florida	4,933	–	–	–	–	–
Georgia	5,553	–	–	–	–	–
Idaho	28,720	1,620	250	10	108	–
Illinois	8,528	–	–	–	–	–
Indiana	15,000	–	–	–	–	–
Iowa	432	–	–	–	–	–
Kentucky	13,877	–	–	–	–	–
Louisiana	–	–	–	1	–	–
Maine	40	80	–	–	–	–
Maryland	153,415	14,968	1,403	701	702	4,677
Massachusetts	–	8,000	–	–	–	–
Michigan	10,000	–	–	–	–	–
Mississippi	–	–	–	1	–	–
Montana	806	–	–	–	–	–
Nebraska	12,000	260	5	3	1	–
Nevada	135	–	–	–	–	–
New Hampshire	82	6	–	–	–	–
New Jersey	3,215	8	4	–	–	–
New Mexico	500	50	–	–	–	–
North Carolina	29,546	304	304	0	304	–
North Dakota	6,960	–	–	–	–	–
Ohio	2,799	18	14	14	2	–
Oregon	6,340	10	10	–	–	–
Pennsylvania	5,669	–	–	–	–	–
South Carolina	7,077	1,500	–	–	–	–
South Dakota	3,200	1,000	60	40	30	20
Tennessee	1,000	–	–	–	–	–
Texas	19,800	120	50	5	3	1
Virginia	21,245	–	–	–	–	–
Washington	73	1,000	2,000	50	10	–
West Virginia	100	–	–	–	–	–
Wisconsin	15,260	21	31	1	–	–
Wyoming	22,100	600	1	–	–	–

Table 10. Microfilm/fiche of local government records held by state archives, not including security copies at the close of FY2004. (linear or cubic feet)

State	Record Copies	Preservation copies	User copies	Purchased
Alabama	–	135	135	10
Arizona	10	–	90	–
Arkansas	–	12	24	–
California	–	–	2	–
Colorado	8,000	–	–	–
Connecticut	–	–	–	–
Delaware	–	380	120	–
District of Columbia	10	10	10	3
Florida	–	–	68	–
Georgia	–	1,200	700	–
Idaho	2	10	10	–
Illinois	–	–	15,055	–
Indiana	3,000	30	–	–
Iowa	–	–	–	–
Kentucky	–	–	378	–
Louisiana	–	–	–	–
Maine	–	20	20	10
Maryland	1,684	7,297	2,245	–
Massachusetts	–	–	–	–
Michigan	–	–	–	–
Minnesota	–	–	–	–
Mississippi	38	2	333	–
Missouri	1,120	1,120	1,120	–
Montana	–	11	11	–
Nebraska	480	4,430	5,235	10
Nevada	–	–	–	7
New Hampshire	–	–	–	–
New Jersey	6	8	8	245
New Mexico	20	–	3	–
New York	–	170	232	–
North Carolina	1,785	–	720	–
North Dakota	–	–	10	–
Ohio	20	66	75	–
Oklahoma	–	–	–	–
Oregon	–	–	25	–
Pennsylvania	–	144	179	114

Table 10, cont. Microfilm/fiche of local government records held by state archives, not including security copies at the close of FY2004. (linear or cubic feet)

State	Record Copies	Preservation copies	User copies	Purchased
South Carolina	100	265	265	125
South Dakota	20	10	100	20
Tennessee	40,000	40,000	35,000	–
Texas	1	1	1	1
Utah	–	–	–	–
Virginia	–	–	–	–
Washington	–	–	20	1
West Virginia	–	–	150	–
Wisconsin	1,057	237	24	–
Wyoming	–	–	–	–

Table 11. Total volume of local government records accessioned by state archives during FY2004
(in linear/cubic feet).

State	Local govt records accessioned in FY2004	State	Local govt records accessioned in FY2004
Alabama	0	Montana	1
Alaska	0	Nebraska	55
Arizona	95	Nevada	0
Arkansas	10	New Hampshire	1
California	20	New Jersey	1,003
Colorado	10	New Mexico	0
Connecticut	2	New York	12
Delaware	325	North Carolina	533
District of Columbia	2	North Dakota	41
Florida	3,965	Ohio	5
Georgia	0	Oklahoma	0
Hawaii	0	Oregon	268
Idaho	3,287	Pennsylvania	0
Illinois	281	Rhode Island	0
Indiana	10	South Carolina	85
Iowa	0	South Dakota	100
Kansas	0	Tennessee	0
Kentucky	0	Texas	0
Louisiana	35	Utah	46
Maine	1	Vermont	0
Maryland	10,856	Virginia	927
Massachusetts	100	Washington	3,662
Michigan	540	West Virginia	0
Minnesota	136	Wisconsin	150
Mississippi	0	Wyoming	506
Missouri	475		

Table 12. Total volume of local government records held by state records centers at the close of FY2004
(in linear/cubic feet).

State	Local govt records held in state records centers
Delaware	50
District of Columbia	125
Florida	3,937
Indiana	7,369
Utah	2,735

About the “Closest to Home” project

Visit the Council of State Archivists website at <http://www.statearchivists.org/lga/> to learn more about the “Closest to Home” project.

The project is funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

About the Council of State Archivists



The Council of State Archivists (CoSA) is a national organization comprising the directors of the principal archival agencies in each state and territorial government. Working collectively through their membership in CoSA, the State Archivists encourage cooperation and promulgation of best practices among the states; define and communicate archival and records concerns at a national level; and work with other national organizations to ensure that the nation's documentary heritage is preserved and accessible.

For additional information contact
 Victoria Walch, Executive Director
 Council of State Archivists
 308 East Burlington Street #189, Iowa City IA 52240.
 Voice: 319-338-0248 | Fax: 319-354-2526 | Email: vwalch@statearchivists.org