

Washington Preservation Initiative  
Advisory Group Minutes  
May 28, 2004, Conference Call

Present: Gary Menges, UW Libraries, Chair  
Gudrun Aurand, WSU  
Jill Bourne, Seattle Public Library  
Lee Dirks, Microsoft  
Eric Palo, Renton Technical College  
Kathryn Hamilton Wang, WSL  
Susan Barrett (WSL Project Manager)  
Jeff Martin, WSL Grant Administrator-Guest

Absent: Linda Pierce, Gonzaga University

### **Small Grant Cycle for Preservation Assessment**

The group discussed whether in addition to the regular WPI grant cycle, they also wished to open a small grant cycle, limited to \$5,000 each, for the purpose of preservation needs assessments of library collections. All were in agreement that this grant cycle should be offered.

Jeff Martin, WSL's Grants Administrator, had prepared a draft of application guidelines and of a shortened application. Among the group's flow of comments: the definitions will specify collections of "significant historical or cultural importance", as the basic focus of this project. However, people applying may not be aware of the value of portions of their collections. This will be an important criteria, and those applying will be given space to describe their pertinent collections, and list any unique or significant items. The onus may be on us to describe what's most valuable, proactively. We could include a question whether the collections have ever been evaluated to determine value, but without making the applicants feel that there is a "wrong" answer, which would penalize them.

Should we ask if the material is accessible? Perhaps, but also not rule out uncataloged collections. If a collection hasn't yet been reconned, this will let the expert's opinion add weight to this being done. Standard LSTA language will be added to the criteria. As another criteria question—has this been made an organizational priority? Add that art collections will not be assessed, or other "non-library, non-archival collections", although tribal libraries may have some realia. Be sure that the guidelines include that the assessors will only be considering preservation factors, not assessments of value in monetary terms.

We can include a web FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions), to perhaps also give applicants a running start. For the assessor, we should plan a contact six months later, ask how it's going, inquire if any problems have arisen, etc. We should also be in contact with those being assessed, with the same questions, and offer a required feedback survey.

The question arose of whether the assessor could be expected to be available later for follow-up. The idea of a follow-up meeting was well received, but the logistical problems were also acknowledged. Perhaps a conference call could serve the purpose, even one at 3 months and later at 6 months? In the Letter of Agreement, mention that library agencies will participate in a follow-up conference call. Benefits for participants would include a chance to reach some insight into potential next steps or actions.

## **RFQQ**

Jeff offered a draft of this. The value of using a proposal process as a companion to the grant cycle is that having already made a selection of acceptable assessors will allow the recipients to skip this step and get immediately to work. Whether the requirement of years of prior experience was appropriate was questioned, but the group agreed that experience was an important factor, and that the language should remain “5 or more”. For the boilerplate requirement of a Washington State Business License, since many applicants will be from out of state, it was suggested that we say “eligible to obtain a business license” and give the URL. Also include language—“ability to meet the schedule.” We can request from the potential assessors a “representative narrative sample”, while not requesting full copies of prior reports.

The amount available will be \$30,000; if we don’t get applications, or sufficient qualified applicants, the remaining money can probably be folded into the major grant cycle. This makes it necessary that both grant processes proceed on a somewhat parallel course.

The Advisory Group thanked Jeff for all his work on the drafts and application process.

## **Preservation Needs Survey**

Gary has received the first draft of the written summation report from Tom Claerson. He has requested that Tom do a little more cross-tabulation by size and type of library, and to expand upon his summaries a little. Can publicity for the survey be tied into other marketing efforts?

## **Evaluations**

The group was glad to have seen the summations from the Gary Albright workshop evaluations, and noticed that the criticisms were only of minor points and that Albright’s “scores” had been excellent.

## **Future Workshops**

Hold onto the Memories: Saving Family Treasures, by Sheryl Davis, morning of June 4<sup>th</sup> at Seattle Public and the morning of June 7<sup>th</sup> at the MAC in Spokane; then Preservation of Architectural Drawings by Lois Olcott Price on June 21<sup>st</sup> at the UW.

Gary has contacted the AIA (American Institute of Architects) office in Seattle to ask that they share the word about the Lois Price event.

Gary gave more details about the three week preservation workshop series to take place in October, February and May '05, supported by an IMLS grant. CCAHA will do October; SOLINET—Feb., and Amigos- May, with guest speakers including Tom Claeson and speakers from NEDCC. The same person is expected to attend all three sessions, with homework in between; there will be an application process to select attendees. Fee will be \$100, for local arrangements.

There was some discussion of future planning, if WPI receives funding for another year. More of the assessment survey grants might be offered, depending upon how popular they prove to be for this year, along with a regular grant cycle and more workshops. Lee mentioned that New York offers both fixed grants, and discretionary ones to large libraries with established preservation programs. This might be desirable if this was a “permanent” program, but the temporary nature of Washington’s funding makes it unlikely.

Attendees at prior workshops have suggested a multitude of possible future workshop topics, enough to fill several years of training. The general area of film/video/recordings preservation has been frequently mentioned. Gary brought up the potential usefulness of a workshop on selection for preservation, what criteria to use and how to identify target portions of a library’s collection.

Our next meeting, by conference call, will be Friday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, from 9 to 11 am.  
(postponed)