California Historical Records Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
October 26, 2006

Location: Sainte Claire Hotel, San Jose, CA

Members Present: Pauline Grenbeaux, Jim Henley, Jim Hofer, Waverly Lowell, Jennifer Martinez, Leslie Masunaga, Laren Metzer, Charles Palm, Chuck Wilson, Nancy Zimmelman

Members Absent: Gary Brutsch, Gary Kurutz

The meeting was called to order by State Coordinator Nancy Zimmelman at 10:03 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Charles, seconded by Chuck, to approve the minutes for June 9, 2006. The motion carried unanimously. A motion was made by Jim Hofer, seconded by Pauline, to approve the minutes for September 25, 2006. The motion carried unanimously.

Board Membership

Nancy noted that letters of information had been mailed to three candidates to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Hynda Rudd. The three candidates are Barbara Nye, Joyce Sayed, and Christine Figueroa. Nancy anticipates making a decision in the near future for the board's consideration.

Nancy indicated that four current board members will have expiring terms at the end of December 2006, including Chuck Wilson, Gary Kurutz, Leslie Masunaga, and Jim Hofer. Nancy will send a letter to the appointing authority to remind them of the expiration date, as appropriate.

Chuck noted that revised language was needed in the bylaws to clarify when the term for board membership begins. In addition, he indicated a need to more clearly define the length of membership and suggested the wording, "two successive terms". There was general agreement that a clarification was in order. Chuck agreed to send suggested wording to Laren.

Report from State Agencies

Nancy directed the members to her report that was distributed in the meeting packets. She emphasized her recent efforts in electronic records and digital preservation, including cooperative efforts with the State Library. She noted the success of Archives Month activities at the State Archives, including the Open House on October 7th and Family History Day on October 14th. About 2,000 posters were distributed for Archives Month with half the number being mailed out to federal agencies by the National Archives-Pacific Region.

The recording tape was turned off at 10:18 for an off the record discussion. The tape was turned on at 10:21.

Nancy indicated that the Archives' recent efforts in emergency preparedness work has resulted in an invitation to participate in the State Office of Emergency Services' State Hazard Mitigation Planning team. Nancy reported that the California Museum for History, Women, and the Arts is continuing to redefine the museum's exhibitions. Several new exhibits have opened up in recent months. Fundraising efforts continue to look promising. Nancy also noted that the Archives' Geospatial Records Project is back on track. Difficulty in obtaining authority from the State Dept. of Finance had sidetracked the project, but the San Diego Supercomputer Center has agreed to act as the new fiscal agent. The funds should be transferred from the state to the Supercomputer Center in the near future.

Archivist Award of Excellence

There was a discussion about the Archivist Award of Excellence and the respective roles of the board and the Society of California Archivists. Jennifer indicated that she had found in her files as SCA President a letter to Charles Palm on this subject. The letter noted that SCA was comfortable with funding the award while the California Heritage Preservation Commission would continue to advertise the award and select the awardee. There was a general consensus that although the CHPC was now defunct, the board was the appropriate organization to carry on the role of the CHPC. Several members noted that past recipients of the award have included people not recognized as archivists, while others emphasized that the work mentioned in the award was archival in nature. Chuck made a motion, seconded by Jim Hofer, that the board should be responsible for publicity for the award, for the nomination process, for making the final selection of the awardee, and for developing and presenting the award, with SCA covering the costs of creating the award. The motion passed unanimously.

Regrant Project

Nancy noted that the California Museum for History, Women, and the Arts had agreed to act as fiscal agent for the Regrant Project. This change has been approved by NHPRC, although the funds have yet to be transferred. Nancy indicated that this problem underscored the need for the State Archives to have its own foundation or friends group that could, among other things, receive external funding on behalf of the Archives. A general discussion ensued about the value of friends groups, their composition, and the work required to make them useful.

The one-day basic archives workshops continue on pace. The third workshop will be offered in San Jose on November 16, 2006 and will again be taught by Blaine Lamb.

Board Administrative Support Grant

Laren indicated that an administrative support grant for calendar year 2007 had been submitted to NHPRC on behalf of the board. As previously, the application is for $7500 and will cover expenses associated with the board meetings. Unlike the current support grant, however, the new proposal provides flexibility for the board to expend the money on other activities. There

followed a general discussion about future funding for the board and whether it was politically feasible to introduce legislation that would establish the board as a state agency with a revenue source. Some members suggested that this was another role that a friends group or foundation could adopt. A friends group could provide financial support for the board with the latter serving as a policy-making organization.

Other Business

Nancy spoke about the letter in the meeting packets concerning a request from Orange County officials for board support for the construction of a new National Archives facility at the Orange County Great Park. The facility may also include space for the Orange County Archives and the State Archives. Nancy noted that a State Archives presence would focus on reference of microfilm copies of records and, perhaps, exhibits. A consensus emerged that the letter does not contain sufficient information for the board to support a particular site for a new NARA building, but that a letter offering general support for the construction of a new facility somewhere in Southern California was amenable. Nancy indicated that she would draft language for the board's consideration in the near future.

Laren noted that the NHPRC had received five grant applications from California repositories for the October 1st deadline, but that no copies had been sent to the board. As soon as the applications are received, copies will be distributed to the board members for their evaluation. It was agreed that a teleconference meeting would be held to discuss these proposals on Tuesday, November 28th beginning at 9:30 a.m. In addition, the board decided to designate primary readers for the applications as follows:

California Dept. of Parks and Recreation	Waverly, Jennifer
California State University – LA	Jim Hofer, Jim Henley
Santa Clara County	Charles, Nancy
Regents of the University of California	Leslie, Laren
Japanese American National Museum	Pauline, Gary B.

The board broke for lunch at 12:10 and reconvened at 1:15.

Review of Regrant Applications

Nancy suggested that given the large number of applications to be considered, it might be more efficient to initially evaluate each proposal in terms of a recommendation (fund, reject, revise) rather than have a full discussion for each application in turn. This was agreed to following which the board focused its discussion on proposals that were neither recommended for funding nor rejection.

The board supported funding for the following applications: California Historical Society ($9980), Fresno County Superior Court ($10,000), and Riverside Public Library ($9664). [Note: Chuck did not vote on the Riverside Public Library application.]

The board rejected the following applications: City of Pomona and Coachella Valley Historical Society. Since these applications were not discussed, it was decided that members should send their objections/comments to Laren so that he may communicate the consensus of the board to the applicants.

The board recommended that the following applications be submitted for reconsideration at the February 2007 grant cycle with the suggested revisions as noted:

Ontario Museum of History and Art: The processing rate is unrealistic; it will take closer to 1500 hours rather than 500 hours to process everything. Project should be limited to the processing of one or two larger collections. There is no reference to standards. Are the records in danger of being lost or destroyed? In general, more information is needed to properly evaluate this proposal.

Autry National Center of the American West: The proposal contains three projects – needs assessment, move preparation, and processing. The applicant should focus on using an archives consultant to provide planning for the upcoming move to insure that the records are properly handled. A facilities management specialist is not needed. Duties of student interns should be clarified and their low rate of pay increased.

City of Eureka: The board should not support funding for travel and printing. What is rate of pay for consultant and how many hours will he/she be working on project? There is an assumption that archival supplies will be needed even prior to completion of needs assessment. Board is uncomfortable with restoration activities "if needed". Applicant should contact professional staff at Humboldt State University for assistance on standards and terminology.

Solano County Archives: There is a question about the custody of the records. If some of the records are federal, NHPRC guidelines would prohibit funding. The records may be copies. Also, there is no indication that the results of the project will be sustained. Will the county support the program in the future? What standards will be used for processing and what formula is being used for rate of processing?

Santa Clara County [note: Leslie excused herself during discussion of this proposal]: There is concern about the level of description and the processing rates described. Is there enough time built in to complete plan of work? Also, what standards will be used for the project?

City of Lynwood: The project needs an archives consultant not a records management consultant. What is the plan for maintenance and accessibility of the materials? Provide details about contents of photographs. Errors in budget should be corrected. Reference should be to cubic feet not cubic inches.

Mariposa County Library: A resume needs to be included for the consultant. The application needs to clearly state the relationships among the county offices involved in the project (clerk, library, museum and history center). The board is reluctant to support funding for web designer. Will a policy manual be produced or only begun during the project? Need some evidence of

support from county government. County seems to be pushing responsibility to the history center.

El Dorado County Historical Museum: The supply figures need to be redone; costs for boxes and folders are too high. There is a need for a conservation component in the project. More information about the bar coding system is needed. Plan of work needs more detail. The conservator should be asked to train the volunteers.

After further discussion, three other applications were rejected for the following reasons:

Pardee Home Museum: There is not enough time to complete the stated plan of work. No standards are provided for the processing. The staff does not appear to be qualified for the listed activities. The pay for the archivist ($13 per hour) is too low. The reference to a registrar is troubling; what is needed is a professional archivist. The description of the Gencat software system is puzzling and does not reflect the full capabilities of the product. The board is reluctant to fund the preservation of publications, such as books. There is a question as to whether the records are all unique or if some are available elsewhere.

Mission Viejo Library: The stated guidelines for the regrant project exclude funding to support digitization proposals. The applicant should be encouraged to seek funding from the NHPRC.

Tuolumne County Archives: The applicant seems unaware of the privacy issue relating to education records. The board will not support rebinding of ledger books and suggests that the applicant contact a conservator for recommendations. In most cases, ledger books can be adequately preserved by rehousing in archival quality boxes.

After further discussion, the application from the Corona Public Library ($10,000) was approved.

Waverly recommended that a model application be identified or created that would provide assistance to potential applicants in writing a sound proposal. Similarly, the board supported the development of an application checklist that would offer key points to be addressed by applicants.

Laren noted that letters will be sent out in near future to all applicants summarizing the board’s evaluation of their proposal.

A motion to adjourn was offered by Charles and seconded by Jim Hofer. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 3:22 p.m.