

Docs Prescriptions



The Newsletter of the Government Documents Round Table of Ohio

Issue 63

Spring 2006

From the President

Joseph A. Salem, Jr.
Kent State University

As I finish my term as GODORT of Ohio President, I am looking forward to some of the exciting developments within the government information community in Ohio and across the country. It should surprise no one in the government documents community to see how quickly we are adapting to the ever-changing environment and how clearly we are charting our course into the future. Rather than meet the stereotype of atavistic traditionalists, we are using technology to meet the core mission of the federal and state programs of which we are a part, ensuring access to the information of our governments for every citizen, and we are adapting our work to the new tools available to meet that lofty but essential mission.

At the state level, I am excited to report that the Access to State Government Information Committee has been working on a plan to digitize state documents and offer them online. The project will once again demonstrate how Ohio libraries cooperate to meet their missions on demanding projects and in demanding times. In this case, we will be using technology to further ensure access to state documents.

Effective use of technology will also be on display at our spring meeting, where GPO staff members who have undertaken to lay the foundation for the FDLP of the future will update us through a teleconference on their various projects. I would like to thank our Program Chair, SaraJean Petite, for putting the teleconference together; George Kline at the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library for hosting the meeting and making the technology

available; and the panel from GPO for their willingness to provide this unique opportunity for us to meet with them all without leaving the state.

Of course, technology can only go so far. Although we are making good use of it in our work and in our professional involvement and development, our mission of providing access to government information can only be met when that access is provided by the governments with whom we partner. As encouraged as I am to see our work enhanced by technology, I am equally concerned with the erosion of access to government information in the digital age. I hope to be encouraged by the updates we receive at our spring meeting that GPO will be able to lengthen the shelf life of digital government information; however, those solutions are likely at least a few years away. Even when we are able to solve the born-digital crisis, I am still concerned about the trends we have seen over the last five years to restrict access to government information.

The solution to that problem can use new technology (i.e., sending an e-mail to our members of Congress) or old (calling their offices on the phone), but either way, it will require work and dedication on our part. I would like to encourage you all to stay involved in the advocacy that has developed within the government information community over the last decade. We can only influence government information policy and access if we remain involved. The National Legislative Day in May (sponsored by the ALA) is a perfect advocacy opportunity for those of you who can carve out time in your busy schedules. If you cannot afford the time commitment, keeping up on the issues and sharing your opinion with your elected officials is also a good way to make your voice heard!

Docs Prescriptions

The Newsletter of the Government
Documents Round Table of Ohio

Issue 63 • Spring 2006

Joseph A. Salem, Jr., President
Main Library
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242
(330) 672-4440
jsalem@lms.kent.edu

SaraJean Petite,
Program Chair/President Elect
Case Western Reserve University Law
Library
11075 East Blvd.
Cleveland, OH 44106
(216) 368-6356
sjw3@po.cwru.edu

Jennifer McMullen, Secretary/Treasurer
Co-Editor, *Docs Prescriptions*
Libraries
College of Wooster
Wooster, OH 44691
(330) 263-2119
jmcmullen@wooster.edu

John Graham
Co-Editor, *Docs Prescriptions*
Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton
County
800 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 369-6932
john.graham@cincinnati.library.org

SAVE THIS DATE!

*November 17, 2006
State Library of Ohio
Ohio GODORT's 25th Anniversary
and Fall Meeting*

From the Editors

By now, we've all become accustomed to seeing an increase in electronic-only documents (paired with the ever-dwindling tide of GPO shipment boxes for the tangible materials) at the federal and state government levels both. As the flow of current documents to the online environment steadies, more interest turns to making older materials available in electronic format as well.

The GPO has said for a few years now that it plans to get involved in the massive digitization of U.S. federal government documents, and it looks like this time they mean business. Not only has the GPO put up a web site to coordinate digitization projects (see "News from GOVDOC-L" this issue), but at a panel session on Public Policy from Scholarship and Libraries in Transition on March 11, 2006, Bruce James, Public Printer, was quoted as saying that the GPO intends to "digitize all government documents [back to 1776]... We have organized the people to do it. We have found the funds to do it. We will be starting that, I'm sure, later this summer. We expect to have that project completed by the end of '07." (Quote posted to GOVDOC-L on March 20, 2006, by Shawn W. Nicholson, Head, Government Documents, Michigan State University.) Will it actually happen as planned? Stay tuned to find out.

In the last issue, our chair, Joe Salem, announced his plan to jump-start "a state-wide effort to digitize the documents of the State of Ohio and provide no-fee public access to the historical record of our state government" through our Access to State Government Information and Publications Committee. The committee met earlier this year and formed a Digitization Committee, with Nicole Merriman (SLO) serving as chair, to explore the possibilities of digitizing state of Ohio documents and storing them for public access. Nicole's report appears in this issue to update us all on the progress the committee has made to date.

Maybe digitizing parts of your collection, let alone the whole of Ohio's documents, sounds daunting to you. Mary Prophet shares with us

the details of Denison's project to digitize documents from the War Relocation Authority, from the technical aspects to what they might do differently. If you're considering a digitization project of your own, Mary offers much food for thought before you get started.

Keeping in the spirit of examining the past in the future, don't forget that our fall meeting will celebrate the 25th anniversary of Ohio GODORT. We're also planning to have a special anniversary issue of *Docs Prescriptions*, featuring interesting articles from past issues, stories from veteran members about the early years of Ohio GODORT, and much more. If you have any fascinating anecdotes, information, and assorted tidbits about Ohio GODORT history that you would like to share, please contact your friendly editors! We'd love to hear from you!

Minutes

Fall Meeting • October 28, 2005
Ohio Wesleyan University

Welcome from Chair

Twenty-eight people showed up for the morning business meeting, and Joe Salem banged the gavel to greet the meeting attendees at 10 AM. He welcomed everyone to Ohio Wesleyan and reminded them about the celebration for Ohio Wesleyan's 160th anniversary this afternoon. On behalf of Ohio GODORT, he congratulated the staff at Ohio Wesleyan for their 160 years of providing documents to the public, and he outlined the order of the afternoon's program.

He also exhorted Ohio GODORT members to continue their long history of active service by spending some time today thinking about long-term goals.

Secretary/Treasurer's Report

Jennifer McMullen noted that copies of the minutes from the spring meeting were left at the table at the door. Mark Gooch moved that the minutes be approved as written, Schuyler Cook seconded; there was no discussion, and the minutes were approved as submitted. Jennifer also shared the treasurer's report, indicating that once she had receipts, she would be reimbursing

John Graham \$67.10 for the newsletter costs and John Walters for his travel and lodging (as speaker for today's program). She also reminded the membership that they can still pay dues for the year if they have not done so already. SaraJean Petite moved to approve the treasurer's report, and Lorna Newman seconded the motion; there was no discussion, and the report was approved as submitted.

Report from State Library

Audrey Hall shared handouts from the fall conference providing a summary of GPO activities. She also offered handouts about Learning Express Library, which offers information on tests of all sorts. Audrey has been "lax" in visiting Ohio libraries but hopes to start again soon; these visits do not constitute an inspection, just a chance to get to know the libraries and to offer what SLO can do for you.

Nicole Merriman commented on cataloging electronic-only state documents and asked that if anyone finds State of Ohio docs that need to be cataloged, let her know. SLO will catalog the document and have it digitally archived through OCLC, and then you can access it through OCLC First Search. Check with Nicole for details if you're interested.

Doreen Hockenberry asked if the microfiche duplication was still available through the State Library; Audrey indicated that they have a new system that is working fine. Doreen asked if items could be digitized instead and sent on email, and Audrey indicated that if the file is not too large, that would be feasible.

Report from Executive Board

Joe shared information from the Executive Board meeting held at the State Library on August 12. Two significant initiatives emerged:

1. *Upcoming 25th anniversary of Ohio GODORT:* Ohio GODORT was founded in 1981, so next fall's meeting marks our 25th anniversary, and it's time to plan the "bash." We will be meeting November 3, 2006 [later rescheduled for November 17] at the State Library of Ohio, and the Board has gathered some ideas for the program. Joe asked for volunteers to form an ad hoc committee to assist the Program Chair in planning the program, and

the following members volunteered: Lorna Newman, Mary Prophet, Nicole Merriman, Audrey Hall, and Karen Kimber.

One idea raised was to invite the Superintendent of Documents since we have plenty of time to get it on her calendar, and the membership agreed. We'd also like to consider fund-raising activities so that we can bring in former Ohio GODORT members and possibly former GPO members. Mark asked what the fund-raising would cover. Could we look into having vendors sponsor parts of the reception as they did at Cincinnati's anniversary last year? Lorna recommended trying one organization first to see if they would cover the whole thing; vendors were then able to set up tables to display their products. Mark pointed out that if we can have reception underwritten, it frees up our treasury to reimburse speakers' travel.

Who should we invite? Names included: Sheila McGarr, original members (Sherry Mosely, Julia Baldwin, Clyde Hordusky; check Archives), Clyde Award recipients, neighboring GODORTs, chair of ALA GODORT. As the committee gets started, Joe will send out an email for other volunteers and to ask for feedback for committee.

2. *State-level project for digitizing Ohio state documents:* Joe noted that the Executive Board had considered what we can do in our libraries and as an organization to make more government information electronically available. We had considered working with OhioLINK, but since there is so much going on for federal government information (esp. with Google, GPO, and ARL projects and proposals), perhaps we should focus our energies on Ohio state documents. Joe chaired the Access to State Government Information committee with looking into this and outlining a proposal, but at this time he's the committee, with Audrey as advisor. Doreen and Nicole both volunteered to work on the committee, with Nicole volunteering to act as chair.

What do we think of the value of something like this? Would your library benefit? Audrey indicated that they've had reference questions where an electronic version would be very useful, especially for series runs. There are about 51 state depositories in Ohio, and the project could be coordinated through Ohio

GODORT. One library could be set up as a central digitizing point, but the details can be worked out to accommodate staff and collection issues. Audrey asked about the digitizing setup at KSU; at neither Kent nor SLO do the books have to be destroyed to be digitized. Participation wouldn't be mandatory. GPO's standards for digitization are a model, and we would need to set at least minimum standards for this project.

Joe asked if any of the depositories have started such projects. Nicole indicated that some items have been done by the State Library. Cheryl Paine pointed out that the public library in Alliance has started digitizing Alliance historical materials, and Karen Perone (in charge of that project) was able to get a grant to help get the project started and had community volunteers helping. Joe wanted feedback from the membership because he was not sure that anything this big has been coordinated by Ohio GODORT before. Sherry Moeller indicated that Ohio State has an online repository; she can check to see if the people in charge would be willing to host Ohio state documents. The committee will hope to have a progress report by the spring meeting.

Report from Federal Depository Conference

Mark started the discussion from the conference by noting that Judy Russell had a family emergency and did not attend DLC. The main focus of the conference was the discussion of the Vision for the 21st Century document from GPO. GPO/DLC hosted breakout sessions to discuss the four broad categories of the Vision statement: access, collection management, non-exclusive environment, adding value. The GPO Update portion of the conference addressed some of the concerns raised by the community, such as web harvesting, working to provide "seal" or authentication of GPO online documents, re-emphasizing an understanding of the need for no-fee access, developing push capabilities, proposing a Master Integrator position to coordinate all contractors and parts of implementation, and setting up a registry of digitization projects at GPO.

Doreen noted that Bruce James has planned out a strategy to save money that does not depend on getting approval for developing the old brick building; even building and moving to a more

modern facility would be a savings at this point. Mark added that Bruce James has been asked by the Joint Committee on Printing to start rethinking Title 44, but he didn't want to approach JCP without having the backing of depositories for any changes.

Doreen shared a note from George Kline that from the public library point of view, the public libraries are willing to provide access but are concerned because GPO is pushing the cost back to depositories; they would like training and support from GPO.

Mark noted that this felt like a Council-directed conference. Mary noted that the past couple of years, Council was not allowed to approach other GPO folks except through Judy Russell or T. C. Evans, and those restrictions were not in place this year... and it showed. Audrey noted that the regional meeting occurred after the regular conference, and they had a chance to share what they've done over the year before going over the vision statement.

Mark added that the one consultant position that was filled (Michigan) did not work out, and after a few months the agreement was ended "by mutual agreement," so it sounds like the program will not be revived. Audrey noted that the depository community does want guidance, especially through inspections and training.

Schuyler reminded everyone that GPO wants comments on their three drafts related to item selection by the close of day on Monday, October 31. Joe added that GPO also wants comments about the e-LCSH proposal. Doreen pointed out that notes from the conference session are available at freegovinfo.info.

Audrey indicated that over dinner one night, the possibility of hosting a light archive for digital materials at OhioLINK was raised. Is this something we should investigate? Joe indicated that the committee looking at the state documents digitization could raise this with OhioLINK and get their technical advice.

Report from ARL Symposium

Joe noted that there were 2 symposia held by ARL (in DC and Seattle) labeled as "Future of Government Information in ARL Libraries." Doreen reported that people at the conference

brought up the same issues we've been discussing for some time (access, authentication, redundancy, etc.). Teams of two members from institutions (directors and documents librarians) were invited so that the message could be spread and misinformation could be debunked (it will not ALL be available in digital format by the end of 2005!). The comment was made that directors and docs folks apparently get different messages from GPO! ARL also shared more information about their digitization plan for federal documents.

Old Business

None.

New Business

Joe asked for a Nominating Committee to pull together a slate of candidates (Program Chair and Secretary/Treasurer) for the spring meeting. No volunteers stepped forward, so Joe indicated that he would appoint someone.

Mary announced that Denison has finished its historical cataloging project... including that last handful of microfiche! The membership offered their congratulations.

Cheryl Lubow said she went to the New Depository Librarians conference and discovered that the GPO isn't what it used to be, isn't what it wants to be, and isn't sure what they are now! But the GPO staff members were helpful and it was good to meet other new documents librarians, so she encouraged that new folks be sent to the annual conference.

SaraJean announced that discussions have been held with George to hold the spring meeting at Toledo-Lucas County Public Library on either May 5 or 12, depending on what we hear from our colleagues in Michigan and Indiana about a joint meeting. The fall 2006 meeting will be November 3 at SLO. Joe indicated that he thought the constitution allowed us to switch the meeting locations, and Jennifer confirmed that the constitution indicates that the spring meeting should be in the Columbus area, but that it also says that one meeting of the year should be in the Columbus area, so we can bend the rules.

Jennifer shared information about the upcoming fall GODORT of Michigan meeting. In

reference to the program speaker talking about the Google project at the Michigan meeting, Cheryl Paine noted that Microsoft has partnered with Yahoo to do a project similar to the Google project.

Adjourn

Seeing that there was no further business, Schuyler moved that the meeting be adjourned, and Doreen seconded. Joe adjourned the meeting promptly at 11:30 AM, and Joy He gave information about the location of lunch and walking around campus.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer McMullen
Secretary/Treasurer

Treasurer's Report

As of March 31, 2006

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Ending Balance (10/1/05) | \$2,962.05 |
| Income: Dues | \$ 140.00 |
| Interest | \$ 4.69 |
| Expenses: Fall speaker | \$ 674.46 |
| Newsletter | \$ 67.10 |
| Ending Balance (3/31/06) | \$2,365.18 |

**** Don't forget your dues! ****
\$20 for members, \$5 for MLS students

Dues for 2006-2007 are due at the spring meeting! If you feel the need to pay in advance, please send them to your friendly treasurer at:

Jennifer McMullen
Government Information
The College of Wooster
Wooster, OH 44691

Checks should be made out to **GODORT of Ohio**. Your dues go toward our meetings (speakers' travel reimbursement, refreshments) and administrative expenses such as the publication of our newsletter.

News from the State Library

Audrey Hall
State Library of Ohio

As of March 3, there are 1002 items in the Digital Archive. We started adding records in June of 2002 and reached the 500 mark in May/June of 2005. As these numbers indicate, state publications are increasingly born digital and we are working to keep up with the pace. Those involved in the process are Audrey Hall, who initially creates the record by adding the URL and assigning an Ohio document call number, and Kathy Hughes and Nicole Merriman, who capture, harvest and ingest the record into the Digital Archive and create a full bib record in OCLC.

Progress is being made on the State Library's business plan. There are numerous teams working on marketing our products and services to state agencies, the General Assembly, the library community. Targeted goals are being met. A new tag line is being evaluated and there are plans for a new logo.

The State Library Board has tentatively approved the transfer of the genealogy collection to Columbus Metropolitan Library.

Free, short and convenient Web-based sessions from the 30 Minute eClassroom can be accessed through your computer and telephone. The training is available to state employees and the library community. See a list of classes available and register at:

<http://winslo.state.oh.us/train/index.html>

News from Around the State

Sherry Moeller (OSU) announces the birth of Alexander Adam Roman Moeller on Saturday, February 11th, weighing in at 8 pounds 2 ounces. Sherry will be on maternity leave until May. Congratulations!

Schuyler Cook (CSU Law) reports that he has been asked to manage the government documents collection for Cleveland State's Main

Library as well as for the Law Library and to coordinate collection development information for new items.

News from GOVDOC-L

From 1/20/06:

GPO is pleased to announce the launch of its Registry of U.S. Government Publication Digitization Projects at

<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/legacy/registry/>.

GPO encourages you or the colleagues at your institution performing digitization to contribute information about your planned, in process, and completed digitization projects including U.S. Government publications to the Registry. You may update information about the projects as they progress.

The Registry's goal is to provide comprehensive coverage of all appropriate digitization projects that include U.S. Government publications. ... Projects represented in the Registry must be freely accessible and entirely composed of digitized U.S. Government publications or include a substantial number of them.

From 3/9/06:

The Superintendent of Documents is pleased to announce the launch of the enhanced version of the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (CGP) (<http://catalog.gpo.gov/>). This version of the CGP is the online public access catalog module of the Government Printing Office's (GPO) new integrated library system. With the availability of the new CGP Phase 1 of a larger modernization plan to replace older legacy systems is complete.

The new and improved CGP currently offers more than 500,000 records to both historical and current Government publications. These records have been created or updated since July 1976. Plans are underway to include records for publications dating back to the late 1800s.

"Locate Libraries" is incorporated into the enhanced CGP. If a user needs a paper copy, CD-ROM, or a librarians' expert assistance, clicking on the "Locate in a Library" feature

within the displayed record will find a Federal depository library that has the particular publication. New features of the CGP include "Other Catalogs to Search" that provide access to the U.S. Congressional Serial Set, periodicals, and Internet publications.

From 3/10/06:

The GODORT web site is moving to a new location: <http://www.ala.org/ala/godort/>

Hidden Treasure

Audrey Hall

State Library of Ohio

The State Library of Ohio has found a treasure in its attic. Our attic is a section affectionately known as "Miscellaneous Potpourri." No one knows exactly when items began to be stashed in a far corner of the stacks while the library was located at 65 S. Front St. The Miscellaneous Potpourri was transferred en masse to our present location during our move in December 2000.

When its space was needed to house the FEMA flood maps, everything was shifted and a preliminary sort done to group uncataloged Ohio and federal duplicates. Library assistant Leigh Winner and cataloger Nicole Merriman are spending an afternoon a week checking the duplicates and substituting to keep the best copy for our collection. Most of the duplicates are quite old.

Leigh and Nicole found our treasure. It is a hand written note by Adelaide R. Hasse in an 1833 Ohio Senate Journal indicating the contents of missing pages in a report on the condition of the Ohio Medical College. Her note is signed A.R. Hasse and dated Sept. 14, 09.

Adelaide Hasse was the first librarian at the Superintendent of Documents' office. In her brief career at the Government Printing Office from 1895 to 1897, she almost single-handedly set up the documents library and devised the classification system that is still used today. With a staff of three catalogers, within six weeks of her arrival at the Public Documents Division's

leased quarters in the Union Building, nearly 300,000 documents, including duplicates, had been organized and classified, pulling together many scattered collections stored around the Capitol.

Dr. John Shaw Billings, director of the New York Public Library, was so impressed with the library and classification system that he extended an offer to Hasse to join his staff and build up their documents collection. During her tenure at the New York Public Library, Hasse made herself one of the first authorities on public documents not only of this country and of its states but of other countries according to a sketch about her written by R.R. Bowker for the August 1920 Library Journal.

It was during the compilation of the Index of Economic Material in Documents of the States of the United States, Ohio prepared for the Department of Economics and Sociology of the Carnegie Institution of Washington that Hasse noted the missing pages in the 1833 Ohio Senate Journal. The volumes for individual states contain "references to material outside of the New York Public Library so far as Miss Hasse was able to locate it through trips or correspondence." Several collections in Ohio including the Ohio State Library were examined. The Senate and House journals were read for orders to print and entries were made for all items ordered to be printed. The binding error in the 1833 Senate Journal is included in the Index entry. The Ohio volume of the monumental series was published in 1912.

An additional note in our imperfect copy says that a perfect copy was substituted.

References.

Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, 1973, v. 10, p. 374-376.

Article by GPO historian James Cameron, appearing in TYPELINE, September, 1983, reproduced as GPO's Living History: Adelaide R. Hasse. available from the FDLP Desktop at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/history/hasse.html

**Ohio GODORT
Online**

<http://www.wooster.edu/library/gov/ohgodort/>

Digitization Committee

Nicole Merriman
State Library of Ohio

The GODORT of Ohio Digitization Committee was organized at the Fall 2005 meeting, and met for the first time on Jan. 13, 2006. The members are Audrey Hall (State Library of Ohio), Joseph Salem (Kent State University), Doreen Hockenberry (Ohio University), and myself (Nicole Merriman, State Library of Ohio) as chair. The purpose of the Committee is to investigate methods for digitizing Ohio state documents. We discussed possible funding sources, standards we might use, potential storage solutions, priorities for digitization, and a future comprehensive plan for all Ohio state documents, both born digital and digitized.

Here is some background: Some Ohio depositories have already started projects digitizing items, possibly as part of a wider library effort, or as part of a wider university effort. For example, the State Library of Ohio (SLO) has been capturing born digital Ohio state agency publications. We currently use OCLC's Digital Archive product and store the items in OCLC's storage space. We alert the Ohio depositories of additions to the Digital Archive via the Ohio Documents quarterly publication and monthly shipping lists. We have digitized a few older items, but currently concentrate on born digital items.

But what about a common storage location and assurance that one library is not duplicating another library's efforts?

The Committee discussed the following possible (and very tentative!) scenario: An Ohio depository scans an older item, then uploads the file to a shared website. Either the contributor or SLO adds a bibliographic record to OCLC. Then SLO (or possibly the contributor) adds a digital archive record (metadata). The item is ingested into the Digital Archive (with SLO paying for the space). SLO adds record information to the Ohio Documents publication for dissemination. Ohio depositories (and any library, for that matter) can export the bibliographic record to their local catalog where it is accessible to anyone via the local public catalog. This

bibliographic record will link directly to the scanned version. There will need to be a method for registering which items have been digitized, to avoid duplication of effort.

This scenario is certainly not set in stone. Since the State Library is currently paying for storage space in the Digital Archive, and will continue providing access to born digital items, providing storage space for digitized items is a natural next step.

This information was shared in an email to the Ohio listserv on February 10 with the following questions:

What are your thoughts and ideas?

Other scenarios?

What do you see as priorities for a digitization project?

Are you doing any digitization now?

Where are you storing the items?

What are your long term plans for those items?

The Committee met via conference call on March 22. We talked about the following:

1) Interest in project from listserv: While I didn't hear interest following the email sent to the listserv, I plan to bring this project up at the Spring GODORT meeting to see if there is any interest. (I also will send a quick update to the listserv, but not until the April needs and offers are finished being posted.)

2) What's new at OhioLINK and OCLC: OhioLINK is working on its Digital Resource Commons, and this project is a possibility for future storage space and source for archiving tools.

3) What's going on at the State Library of Ohio: Digitization/born digital archiving: the State Library of Ohio continues to archive born digital state documents. We recently reached the 1000 mark! We are open to using the Digital Archive for storing digitized state documents, too. The State Library is working on its own digitization plan, to give us a roadmap of where we want to go in the next few years.

4) Standards: We discussed standards for scanning and storage. These will need to be worked out before the start of any project.

5) Report for Spring GODORT of Ohio meeting: I'll be reporting our progress at the Spring GODORT meeting.

**Want a Mentor?
Want to Be a Mentor?**

Ohio GODORT has established a mentorship program for any interested documents librarians and staff members of Ohio GODORT. Whether you are new to government documents or just want to branch out and learn a new aspect of the field, the mentorship program is for you!

Find out more about the program at

<http://www.wooster.edu/library/gov/ohgodort/mentorship.htm>

A Walk Down Memory Lane

The 25th anniversary of Ohio GODORT is fast approaching. Were you there at the very beginning? Have you been involved with our organization for the better part of two decades... or more?

Your newsletter editors are looking for your thoughts and memories about the early years of Ohio GODORT. Please share with us some of the more memorable projects, programs, events, and people that made your involvement in Ohio GODORT all worthwhile! (And if you don't, you might get tagged for an "interview" anyway!)

Whether you feel like writing a full article or just want to share anecdotes, your participation is welcomed! The deadline for the fall newsletter will be **September 15, 2006**, so please start thinking now about "the good ol' days" and send those stories and anecdotes to Jennifer McMullen (jmcmullen@wooster.edu) for inclusion in a special anniversary edition of *Docs Prescriptions*. Thanks!

Report on and Procedures of a Pilot Digitization Project: Documents from the War Relocation Authority

Mary Webb Prophet (with editorial assistance from Cynthia Cort)
Denison University

Introduction

Every few years a student at Denison University would do a research project on the relocation of Japanese-Americans during World War II. This research would involve all of the usual resources: books on the topic, journal articles and, after the historical documents cataloging project provided records for them in the online catalog, original documents of the War Relocation Authority from Denison's Federal Depository Library collection. These publications are over sixty years old and extremely fragile. They are paper bound, printed on the high acid papers produced during World War II, and many are ten or fewer pages in length. While one use per few years could not be considered "heavy use" it was enough to result in considerable damage. It became apparent that if they were going to be available to consult in the future, some efforts needed to be made to preserve them and to provide alternative forms of access.

The need to find a preservation solution for the publications of the War Relocation Authority developed at about the same time that the depository library community began to discuss the digitization of legacy collections of federal publications. Questions were raised about the ability of depositories at small liberal arts colleges to contribute to a national digitization effort. At the Annual ALA conference in Toronto, ALA-GODORT offered a digitization pre-conference. The confluence of these factors led to the proposal for a pilot digitization project for the publications of the War Relocation Authority in the collections of the Consort Colleges of Ohio, to be carried out at Denison University.

Goals and Conditions of the Pilot Project

There emerged several goals for the project. These included learning about digitization, making digital versions of fragile documents available to both a local and a web audience, and testing our capability to achieve national digitization standards using already owned technology and software. With these goals in mind the following conditions were established for the project as a whole.

1. The project would use national standards for scanning and storage.
2. Equipment used in the project would be that already available in the library and would only receive the standard university upgrades.
3. Software purchases would be kept to a minimum. Most programs used would already be available in the library or somewhere else on campus.
4. All work would be done with student staff under the supervision of the documents librarian and no overt changes in librarian responsibilities would be made to accommodate the project.

Reviewing the Collection

One of the first steps in developing the digitization project was to review the materials to be scanned. It was important to understand the nature of the materials to be digitized as this would help determine the standards required, the equipment needed, and the procedures to be used.

For the War Relocation Authority project, all of the publications were either text, text with line drawings, or text with black and white photographs. None of the publications involved in the project had color illustrations. Ninety-eight percent of the publications were either a standard 8.5 x 11 inch paper size or smaller. This allowed the use of a standard sized flat bed scanner. Publications varied from single pages to monographs of approximately 300 pages. Format for these publications included single pages, trifold pamphlets, small pamphlets of single signatures stapled in the center fold, corner stapled full sheet

publications of 6-20 pages, and paper back or hard cover glue bound monographs.

Equipment

Equipment in use as of December 2005 includes:

Computer: Dell Pentium 4 PC.

Scanner: HP Scan Jet 5470c

Mass Data Server: Solaris Server Version 8 Netra X1

Software

Software used included: Microsoft Office Document Imaging (version 11.0.1897.0), Microsoft Office Word 2003 (11.6113.5703) and Excel 2003, ContentDM Acquisition Station (version 4.0010.470 and predecessor), Adobe Acrobat, Adobe Capture, Adobe Photoshop, and HP Precisionscan Pro 3.1. Adobe Capture was the only program was purchased specifically for this project.

Standards

The project began with a review of the literature on existing digitization projects. This included information on projects at the Library of Congress, the University of Texas and other organizations and agencies. Based on our review, standards for scanning were established.

Text would be scanned at 300 dpi in 8 bit gray scale. Pages were to be cropped where necessary and stored as a compressed TIFF file for archival purposes. After GPO guidelines came out the standard for text was changed to scanning at 600 dpi but continued to be gray scale rather than switching to black & white. These decisions were made because the software in use had automatic settings for 600 dpi and keeping all scanning in gray scale removed a level of decision making from the student workers.

Text with black and white images, either drawings or photographs, would be scanned at 600 dpi in 8 bit gray scale. Images were to be cropped if necessary and stored as a compressed TIFF file for archival purposes.

Use files would be scanned using OCR (Optical Character Recognition) scanning and saved as PDF files. The OCR behind the PDF would either be 90% accurate or corrected to 90% accuracy levels. After the GPO Standards were announced this accuracy level was raised to match the new standard of 99%.

In 2004, after the project was well underway, the Government Printing Office convened a meeting of organizations involved in major digitization efforts and other experts to evaluate the scanning standards being used, publishing the results at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/about/reports/preservation2.pdf>. GPO standards were modified again by the time the final report was issued in June of 2005. This report, which contains a great deal of technical information, is on the GPO web site at http://www.gpoaccess.gov/legacy/FDsys_ccspecs.pdf. Future projects should be planned based on that document or on future versions of that document.

In addition to the technical standards outlined above, metadata standards were also reviewed and established for the CONSORT project. ContentDM software allows for the mapping of its metadata fields to several national standards including OCLC's Dublin Core. Several different types of metadata are described in the literature. These include bibliographic, technical, and preservation metadata. Since the originals of all the documents included in this project are fully cataloged in OCLC, selected fields from a full bibliographic record were chosen for the bibliographic metadata for the project. These include

author, title, publisher, LC subject headings, and OCLC record number for the cataloging record of the original item. Technical metadata includes information on the equipment used, level of scanning (e.g. dpi, bit rate and grayscale), date of scanning operation, and file types used for both preservation and presentation. Preservation metadata includes information on the TIFF files and the location of the original document.

Procedures

Before any scanning could be done, file structure and project tracking procedures needed to be developed.

File structure was in part dictated by the requirements of the ContentDM software. Because it was felt desirable to have full text search capability, it was necessary to provide both image and transcripts to ContentDM for the creation of compound documents. This required, at a minimum, a master file for the document with a subfolder for the image document and a subfolder for the transcribed text document. File names in the image folder with a .tif extension needed to be the same as the file names in the transcript folder with a .txt extension. File naming conventions also needed to be consistent throughout the collection, reflective of the content and easily identifiable. Length restrictions prevented the SUDOC numbers from being used as file names. Each document in the collection was given a name consisting of the letters WR for “War Relocation” and an identifying number having two digits, since there are less than 100 documents in the collection. The master folder contains level 1 folders named WR01-PDF, WR01-TIF (for the archival TIFF files), WR01-TXT (for the corrected transcript files), and WR01-Uncorrected (for the original OCR files). All documents no matter how small or how large share this same basic file structure. Larger documents require identically named subfolders in each of the level 1 folders (see Illustration 1). In order to make these folders and files load into ContentDM in the proper order the folder for the introduction is titled Aintro and the folder for the appendix is titled X-appendix.

File Tracking is necessary to ensure that all processes are completed for each document. This was accomplished by use of an Excel file. The file contains rows for document identification information and for every page in each document. The status of the scanning and editing procedure is represented by a column for each process. Illustration 2 is a section of the Excel tracking sheet for WR01 Relocating Japanese Americans. The date scanned and text/word columns were added after the first revision of procedure.

Pre-scanning preparation

No paper back or hard cover monographs were disbound for the scanning procedure. Documents stapled at the corner had the staple removed before scanning. Small pamphlets that were stapled in the fold did not have staples removed.

Each Document was assigned a document name. Document level information was entered into the Excel tracking worksheet. Information required at the document level includes: Sudoc number, title, assigned documents name and name of person working on the document.

Each document was reviewed to determine if the file structure would require subfolders in the level one folders and the entire file folder structure was set up prior to scanning by the librarian.

Scanning Procedures

1. All pages of the documents are to be scanned. This includes Front cover, back cover, and all blank pages. This is in keeping with the procedures outlined by GPO. Pages are scanned in the order they appear in the publication.
2. File names and locations for each page are assigned following the file structure conventions. Save each image as a TIFF file in the assigned location on the share drive.

3. Only one person will work on each document. That person will be responsible for all scanning and editing for that document. The only exception to this practice will be that editing may be done by another student in the event the student that scanned the document no longer works for the department. Should a student quit before scanning on a particular document is completed, the Librarian will review the work done thus far and assign completion or remediation based on the results of that review.
4. Great care must be taken in handling the documents to avoid damage.
5. All scanning will be done on the equipment in the Library office. Place heavy green cloth over the scanner and document to eliminate any stray light which might degrade scanned image quality. Be very careful during this process not to damage document or to change its position on the scanner bed.
6. Record technical information in the tracking spread sheet.

Transcript preparation/OCR production and editing

Early in the process every page was scanned twice: once for the archival TIFF file and once for OCR and saved as a PDF. Quite often the TIFF scan would turn out to be excellent while the OCR/PDF scan would have large black blocks surrounding the text. In addition, correcting the OCR behind the PDF using Adobe Acrobat was a time consuming process as each line had to be edited separately and often there were font problems in the OCR scan. In other words, the OCR scan would result in the situation that while each individual letter in a line might be correct the font would change drastically and the resultant OCR line might look something like this:

As you **can** see this could result in interesting spacing problems for the PDF.

At other times significant editing was required to correct faulty OCR translations. Several steps were taken to try and make this process easier and less time consuming. A better OCR quality was obtainable if the OCR was done from the TIFF file rather than from a separate OCR scan. This could be done using Microsoft Document Imaging software or Adobe Capture. We tried both. Using Microsoft Document Imaging, a text transcript of the documents could be prepared for use as a compound document in ContentDM. Using the OCR capability of Adobe Capture, a PDF file with searchable text could be produced. This program automatically identifies captured words that are suspect. Full text searching can be done for the document only. The advantage of using transcripts is that full text of the documents can be searched from the ContentDM search facility across the entire database. The disadvantage of loading compound documents using transcripts is that each page must be printed separately.

When creating/correcting the transcript of a page, we suggest that you do not make any corrections until you check questionable areas against the original document. You may find that things that look like errors are actually letter for letter as they appear in the original document.

For any parts of the documents containing numbers be sure to check very carefully all occurrences of 3, 5, and 8 as these numbers often tend to be misread by the OCR software. Occasionally you will have a page that is blank or contains a picture only. In these case you should produce a txt file which says either (blank page) or (picture only)

Metadata

There are three areas of Metadata to consider in relation to this project; bibliographic, technical, and preservation. ContentDM metadata fields and their relation to the Dublin Core fields are illustrated in the following chart. The tracking spread sheet records information needed in the technical data fields. NOTE: the OCLC record number included here is for the original print publication.

| Field name | Dublin Core map | Searchable |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Title | Title | Full Text |
| Author | Creator | Yes |
| Publisher | Publisher | No |
| Subject | Subject | Yes |
| Date of Publication | Date Created | Yes |
| Language | Language | No |
| OCLC Accession Number | Relation is Format of | No |
| Original Document Location | None | Yes |
| Scanning Device | None | No |
| Bit-Depth | Format extent | No |
| Resolution | Format extent | No |
| Format | Format | No |
| Display Image | Format | No |
| Transcript | None | Full text |
| Date of Digitization | Date Modified | No |
| Coverage | Coverage | No |
| Rights | Rights | No |
| Image Name | Identifier | Yes |

Once fields are established in ContentDM the program automatically requests needed information. In addition controlled vocabulary lists can be established for such fields as subject heading. Information which does not change from record to record can be set as a default. In this project such information as Scanning Device, Bit-Depth, Resolution, and Display Image were preset as defaults. Students use the ContentDM Acquisition station to upload image files and metadata to the Server. All files are reviewed by the Librarian and approved before they are available for public display.

ContentDM

At this time ContentDM procedures are still in flux. The last change in software has created some problems with the original plans for uploading to the web, compound documents, transcripts and PDF files for printing in ContentDM. The most severe difficulty encountered was that the entire transcript of a document would upload into the title field making the record incorrect and unusable. This has been referred to the Content DM programmers and they are working on it. The changes in ContentDM procedures may also result in some slight changes in the metadata fields listed above. Completed documents mounted as PDFs in ContentDM may be viewed at <http://content.test.denison.edu/> (use the browse feature to move to the War Relocation Authority Collection) but these do not show the problem.

Conclusions

The original goals for this project included preservation of fragile materials, testing the ability of a small depository to participate in a national digitization project, and learning the processes of digitization. At this point, the final outcome of the project is still a bit unclear, almost all of the documents have now been scanned, OCR conversions made and transcript files created or OCR corrected. PDF files of scanned documents have been burned to CDs and given to students to use in their research rather than allowing them to check out fragile materials. We have begun loading a few of the documents into ContentDM as PDF files. The project still operates under the constraint of minimal time from the Documents Librarian and this will continue to hamper uploading of materials for use beyond the Denison community.

Since the GPO standards were not in place before the project was begun, implementing them caused a significant delay in completing the scanning of documents. Thus, we have only partially succeeded in fulfilling condition #1, that the project use national standards. These standards are always changing as technology improves and this may always create difficulties.

In the time since the project was begun, some of the plans for the national digitization project have changed and it now appears that the GPO is planning to do much of the conversion in house. This may mean that the ability of small depositories to do digitization to the level of the national standards will be irrelevant. However based on current experience, a limited role for small depositories could be found in the digitization of locally held, uncommon materials, of short runs of very fragile materials, and of materials too fragile for any handling by mass document feeders.

Conditions #2 and #3, that the project be accomplished with readily available equipment and software, were not a problem in the college library setting.

While student workers on this project have been outstanding, they have been frustrated by the changes in procedure and the difficulties in arranging time for direct supervision and training by the librarian in charge. Summer breaks and changes in student personnel have increased the training load beyond that originally expected. In addition, the learning curve for many of the software applications has been steeper than expected and version changes in the software have created the necessity of doing some work twice. This suggests that condition #4 was unrealistic and should be reconsidered for future projects. However, lessons learned from this project will be very useful in designing and implementing other such projects. Software applications learned in the course of this project will be useful in many other library projects and applications.

During the period of this project, a number of workshops beyond the ALA-GODORT pre-conference were attended. Each provided some insight into the process and answers to some of the questions and technical problems raised. However, none really provided a complete picture and many concepts discovered in the literature review are still only partially understood. The NEDCC "School for scanning" was not among the events attended and its three day format might have provided a firmer basis for undertaking the project.

In summary, while this project has not been completed to our satisfaction, we have learned a lot and made some strides in figuring out how digitization may be useful within our documents department and the library as a whole. The choice of a small sample has allowed us to see where the pitfalls lie and where we may be able to plan future projects more successfully.

Illustration 1: File Structure, WR 17 - Community Government in War Relocation Centers

WR17

WR17-PDF

 AIntro
 WR17_page001.pdf
 WR17_page002.pdf
 Chapter01
 WR17_page003.pdf
 WR17_page004.pdf
 Chapter...
 X-Appendix
 WR17_Titlepage.pdf
 WR17_TOC01.pdf
 WR17_TOC02.pdf

WR17-TXT

 AIntro
 WR17_page001.txt
 WR17_page002.txt
 Chapter01
 WR17_page003.txt
 WR17_page004.txt
 Chapter...
 X-Appendix
 WR17_Titlepage.txt
 WR17_TOC01.txt
 WR17_TOC02.txt

WR17-TIF

AIntro
 WR17_page001.tif
 WR17_page002.tif
 Chapter01
 WR17_page003.tif
 WR17_page004.tif
 Chapter...
 X-Appendix
 WR17_Titlepage.tif
 WR17_TOC01.tif
 WR17_TOC02.tif

WR17-Uncorrected

AIntro
 WR17_page001.txt
 WR17_page002.txt
 Chapter01
 WR17_page003.txt
 WR17_page004.txt
 Chapter...
 X-Appendix
 WR17_Titlepage.txt
 WR17_TOC01.txt

Illustration 2: Tracking Sheet for *Relocating Japanese Americans*, I 52.2:J 27/2, WR01

(Editor’s Note: Due to formatting difficulties, the original table has been abbreviated here, with the column for “Issues?” added as a note at the bottom of the table. Please accept apologies for any confusion this may cause the reader.)

| dpi | bits | type scan | TIFF files | PDF files | OCR quality? | sections PDF | PDF cleaned | text |
|---------|------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P001 | P001 | | SO1 | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P002 | P002 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P003 | P003 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P004 | P004 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P005 | P005 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P006 | P006 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P007 | P007 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P008 | P008 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P009 | P009 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P010 | P010 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P011 | P011 | | | Yes | |
| 300 dpi | 8bit | grayscale | P012 | P012 | | | Yes | |

Issues?

OCR clarity is terrible (probably due to the two column format). However, words good, placement bad.

The Swine Flu Scare of 1976

Carol Singer

Bowling Green State University

On February 4, 1976, a U.S. Army recruit at Fort Dix, New Jersey, came down with what was at first thought to be a cold – sore throat, headache, congestion and fever. Although he was advised to stay in the barracks, he chose to go on a training march. During the march, he collapsed and died.

There were twelve other confirmed cases of this particular strain of influenza on base. After an unrelated county medical meeting, New Jersey's chief epidemiologist bet the senior Army doctor that there was a flu epidemic at Fort Dix. To prove his point, he sent some cultures to the state laboratory. The lab found that some samples contained a virus that didn't match any of the three commonly recurring human influenza viruses. Instead, it was similar to the type of swine flu that caused 20 million deaths worldwide in the 1918 influenza epidemic. This strain of flu was officially named A/New Jersey, but was later commonly called swine flu.

On March 10, 1976, the Public Health Service's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices reviewed the events and determined that a pandemic was possible and recommended that a public immunization program be launched. They felt a need to make a very quick decision because the companies that make the flu vaccine had just finished manufacturing the flu vaccine to be used for the 1976-1977 flu season. At that time, the vaccine was produced in fertilized hen's eggs from special flocks of hens. The hens and roosters needed to fertilize the eggs were scheduled to be slaughtered because they were no longer needed. If this was done, the companies that produced the vaccine wouldn't be ready to start making a new vaccine for three months.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended a national vaccination program be established. This was endorsed by a Presidentially convened group of scientists, including Albert Sabin and Jonas Salk, and President Ford initiated the National Influenza

Immunization Program (NIIP), meant to inoculate every man, woman and child in the United States against the swine flu. The proposal went to four Congressional committees, who reported out favorable legislation and the bills were passed and signed. The estimated budget for this initiative was \$137 million.

Of course, at this point, there was no available vaccine. The companies prepared and tested a vaccine, but refused to supply it unless the federal government guaranteed to bear the cost of any possible lawsuits resulting from the vaccine. The government agreed to do so and the national vaccination campaign began.

This was the largest voluntary mass vaccination campaign since the programs that disseminated the Salk and Sabin polio vaccines. By October, 45 million people, 25 percent of the U.S. population, had been vaccinated.

There were several deaths among people who had received the vaccine, but these were felt to be unrelated to the vaccine. Then, cases of Guillain-Barre Syndrome began to appear among people who had received the vaccine and the immunization program was officially halted on December 16, 1976.

Thirty-two people who received the swine flu vaccine died from Guillain-Barre Syndrome. The only death from this outbreak of swine flu was the young soldier at Fort Dix.

SOURCES:

Adams, Rebecca and Kate Shuler. "Lawmakers Weigh Incentives for High-Risk Vaccine Business," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, v. 62, no. 42 (October 30, 2004), p. 2556-2559.

Krause, Richard. "The Swine Flu Episode and the Fog of Epidemics," *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, vol. 12, no. 1 (January 2006). <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/EID/vol12no01/05-1132.htm> (Accessed Feb. 16, 2006).

Larkin, Timothy. "The New Flu: What It Is and What Is Being Done About It," *FDA Consumer*, vol. 10, no. 4 (May 1976) p. 5-11.

Sencer, David J. and J. Donald Millar. "Reflections on the 1976 Swine Flu Vaccination Program," FDA Consumer, v. 12, no. 1 (January 2006) p. 29-33.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Swine Flu Affair: Decision-Making on a Slippery Disease, by Richard E. Neustadt and Harvey V. Fineberg. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978).

NOTE: For a list of U.S. Government publications about the Swine Flu scare, see: Swine Flu: A Bibliography of U.S. Government Publications at <http://www.bgsu.edu/colleges/library/infosrv/lue/swineflu.html>.

What's New on the Web

Though by the time this issue goes to print we'll have passed through most of flu season, the current news about "bird flu" and the fears of a new pandemic flu will probably linger well into next year's season. Still, it's good to know where to find the information when you need it.

For basic information on influenza, various agencies within the National Institutes of Health have useful fact sheets and web sites:

<http://www.cdc.gov/flu/keyfacts.htm>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Key Facts About Influenza and the Influenza Vaccine

<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/flu.html>

MedlinePlus

<http://www3.niaid.nih.gov/news/focuson/flu/>

National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Focus on the Flu

Since it has been nearly four decades since the "Hong Kong" flu pandemic swept across the world, there is growing concern that another pandemic flu outbreak will catch people unprepared. To educate citizens as well as public health professionals, the government has set up the PandemicFlu.gov web site (<http://pandemicflu.gov/>) to coordinate these efforts. Most concerns focus on the H5N1 strain

of avian influenza ("bird flu"), and you can learn more about this particular disease at the following sites:

<http://www.cdc.gov/flu/avian/outbreaks/current.htm>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention:
Avian Influenza: Current Situation

http://www.who.int/csr/disease/avian_influenza/en/

World Health Organization: Avian Influenza

After reading Carol's article about the swine flu scare in the 1970s, it's worth considering that the CDC web site indicates that while there were an estimated 34,000 deaths in the United States during the last pandemic (1968), there are roughly 36,000 deaths from influenza in an average flu season. That's a little-touted fact worth keeping in mind when worries about pandemic flu reach a fevered pitch.

Of course, the influenza pandemic of 1918 ("Spanish flu") has received a great deal of publicity in the past couple of years as more research has appeared, so it's no surprise that the government has web sites on that as well:

<http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/influenza-epidemic/>

The Influenza Epidemic, 1918 (NARA)

<http://www3.niaid.nih.gov/news/focuson/flu/research/pandemic/toxictraces.htm>

Toxic Traces: What Made the 1918 Influenza Virus So Deadly? (NIAID)

We've come a long way in medical science, but I think I'll keep my hands washed all the same, thanks.



Martha Powers, Dr. Theresa Byrd, Joy Gao
Congratulations to Ohio Wesleyan University!
160 Years Strong! October 2005 Meeting

Ohio GODORT Spring Meeting, May 5, 2006

Toledo-Lucas County Public Library

Agenda

Did you go to the Depository Library Council meeting in Seattle? If not, don't worry! Our spring meeting will feature a video teleconference with folks at the Government Printing Office who will update us on the status of their many projects.

| Preliminary Agenda | |
|--------------------|---|
| 9:30 - 10:00 | Registration and Refreshments |
| 10:00 - 11:30 | Teleconference with GPO Project Leaders |
| 11:30 - 1:00 | Lunch |
| 1:00 - 3:00 | Business Meeting |

Lunch

George Kline, our host, has arranged for us to order individual box lunches. Boxed lunches are approximately \$10 per person. The caterer offers a vegetarian option, and information about other options should be available soon. Please RSVP to SaraJean Petite at sarajeau.petite@case.edu or (216) 368-6356 by May 1 with your request.

Directions

A map locating the [Toledo-Lucas County Public Library](#) Main Branch is available online through [Yahoo! Maps](#). Follow the onscreen instructions for driving directions from your chosen location.

Thursday Night Gathering

Do you enjoy baseball? Do you at least enjoy sitting back for an evening of fun? We're going to catch the Toledo Mudhens take on the Richmond Braves at 6:30 PM on May 4. It's Scooby Doo night at the ballpark, and it's no mystery that we will be buying a block of seats. Cost is \$8 per ticket. Those interested in attending should RSVP to SaraJean Petite at sarajeau.petite@case.edu or (216) 368-6356 by the end of the day on Monday, May 1.

Dining and Lodging

Information is available via the "accommodations" link on the [Do Toledo](#) web page. Downtown hotels Hotel Seagate, Radisson Hotel, and Wyndham Hotel are within walking distance of the library and are very close to the Mud Hens ballpark. Hotels to the west and south are less costly. Hotels south of the river are inadvisable because there are frequent problems with the bridges.

NOTE: For Conference information, to RSVP for the meeting, to order your lunch, and to RSVP for the Thursday night gathering, contact SaraJean Petite at sarajeau.petite@case.edu or (216) 368-6356.