

Information Related to Archival of Records and Photographs
T. H. Kent
24 March 1993

MATERIALS

1. Records: Records Committee records related to sightings of rare birds (accidental species, some casual species, and some out-of-season birds). There are 502 records from 1980 to 1992 and 372 old records. There are 204 additional old records to review. Records comprise the following:
 - a. summary sheet printed from a computerized record with data about the record and comments by committee members.
 - b. documentation(s) -- originals if possible
 - c. letter(s) including review by consultants
 - d. copies of published articles and references to the record
 - e. tangible evidence (specimen, photograph, movie/video, recording). All specimens are in museums, but we have attempted to photograph all of them. Photographs may be duplicated from the IOU Photo File (see below) or copies of published photos. The photographs usually are those reviewed by the committee and not necessarily all that are in the Photo File.
2. Photos: The IOU Photo File contains photographs, movies/videos, and recordings submitted to the IOU through Field Reports editors and the Records Committee. It contains most of the photographs reviewed by the Records Committee as well as many others. Currently there are about 400 entries in the file (each submission on each species is an entry and may include several photographs). The various types of photographs include:
 - a. 2x2 color slides
 - b. color prints
 - c. color negatives
 - d. black and white prints
 - e. black and white negatives
 - f. movies
 - g. video tapes
 - r. cassette recordings

ARCHIVAL ISSUES

1. Should the IOU try to preserve these materials on a permanent basis. The answer has been yes. One could argue that the important results have been published so that permanent preservation is not that important. We could pass these materials along to those involved and not worry about preservation.
2. If we opt for preservation, how good a job should we do? How many copies should be maintained? The use of archival quality materials for storage is probably 30-50% more expensive than standard materials (see costs below). The person(s) managing these files needs at least one copy (two would be better) for everyday access.
3. Duplication and master copies of photographs. I have taken the stand that the IOU Photo File rather than the Records Committee File contains the master copies of photographs. Should copies of the photos be made and filed with each record. I have answered yes -- master copy to IOU Photo File, 1st duplicate with original copy of record, 2nd and 3rd duplicates circulated for record review and archived with 2nd and 3rd copies of each record. To update all old records to this status will be costly. See below for costs.
4. Maintenance of these files requires a lot of time and cooperation. Such persons may not always be available in the future.
5. Several details regarding archival at a library, presumably Iowa State University, are of importance

to us. Access for study and duplication, while at the same time preserving the documents and keeping them in order are important for future users. Copying paper materials should be no problem. All will be in 8 1/2 x 11 inch format. Assuming we would file copies of photos, requests for copies of photos might be referred back to us. We do not know how much material the library is willing to preserve. For example, the original copies of reviews by committee members might be kept (these are typed into the computer file and appear on the summary sheet). We also have all original materials received by Field Reports editors and all documentations not reviewed by the Records Committee. Another issue is whether to file records by accession number (i.e., by year reviewed) or by species. In either case, indexes by number and by species can be provided. Filing by number is easier, because new years can be added without any alteration of previous files.

COST OF ARCHIVAL MATERIALS

1. Archival 8 1/2 x 11 paper for summary sheets and xerox copies of documentations, letters, and articles. The purpose is to use acid free paper that will not deteriorate over time. One year's worth of records might use 500 to 1,000 sheets (assuming 2 copies). I do not have a cost figure or source at the moment. An additional cost would be finding a xerox facility where this paper could be loaded easily (difficult to switch paper in a heavily used facility). This cost would be relatively inexpensive, but a nuisance.
2. Archival folders (manilla folders). Cost about \$0.20 each. Individual records could be put in a folder, especially when there are a lot of documentations and letters, or several records could be put in a folder. Maximum per year cost might be 50 records x 3 copies x 0.20 = \$30.
3. Acid free hanging folders and storage boxes. Boxes cost about \$7.00 and hanging folders about \$0.50 each. Each box would hold five to ten years worth of records. An alternative is to use 5-inch Archival Document Cases that store upright on standard library shelves -- cost \$3.00 per box plus folders (0.20 each) plus spacers (\$1.25 each). Each box would hold two or three years worth of records. These boxes are relatively inexpensive. We could use whichever our archival library suggests.
4. Top loaders with acid free paper inserts. These are 9 1/2 x 11 mylar protectors with three holes for notebook storage. They are excellent for storing photographic prints because they are acid free, hold the photographs without mounting media, and are easy to store. These save a lot of time, make management of photos easier, and make the photos easily available. With the paper insert (optional) three prints can be put on each side. Cost \$0.30 (0.20 for mylar alone). Estimated number per year for Records Committee about 50-100 (\$15 - \$30). Similar pages for 2 x 2 slides cost about \$0.35.
5. Acid free storage boxes for slides. A large box contains six 6-inch boxes, which in turn contain 5 small boxes. Our current slides fill slightly more than one box. Cost \$27 per large box. Need 2 or 3. A small price to help preserve valuable slides.
6. Print File negative holders sheets. These acid free sheets hold strips of negatives and can be filed in notebooks. Cost \$6.50 per 100. Currently negatives are stored in 5 x 7 envelopes in the original non-acid free holders. An easy decision.
7. Archival notebooks with D-ring. These are acid free and the D-ring is flat on one side so that sheets are stored in a flat rather than curved position. They cost \$10-12 each. We could use 6 to 10 for the current Photo File prints and negatives. Records committee records could be stored in notebooks (several notebooks per year).
8. Filing cabinet. A five drawer metal filing cabinet would be ideal for housing both the records committee files and photo file. This would facilitate transfer at some future date. I currently use parts of several file drawers, storage boxes, and shelf space to manage these two files.

PHOTO DUPLICATION COSTS

1. Original is a slide.

a. Not a Records Committee photo

opt 1: enter in computer database, print label, file

cost = time and cost of label

opt 2: same plus make print for notebook

cost = same + \$1.25

b. Records Committee photo (includes a.)

opt 1: 3 slide duplicates, circulate slides, file

cost = $3 \times 0.90 = \$2.70$

*opt 2: 4 prints (1 to photo file), circulate, file

cost = $0.90 + (4 \times 0.40) = \2.50

*advantage -- have negative, can make more prints

2. Original a slide to be returned

add \$0.90 to above

3. Original a color print

a. Not a Records Committee photo

opt 1: enter in computer database, print label, file

cost = time, label, toploader (sometimes) = \$0.30

opt 2: same plus make a slide

cost = print to slide \$3.00, or self copy for \$0.50

b. Records Committee photo (includes a.)

opt 1: show print at meeting or circulate (dangerous)

cost = delay in records evaluation, poor study

opt 2: 4 slide copies and circulate slides

commercial cost = $4 \times \$3.00 = \12.00

*self copy = $4 \times 0.50 = \$2.00$

*requires equipment, time, batching

opt 3: 1 slide plus 1 negative -> 3 prints

cost = $\$3.00 + 0.90 + 3 \times 0.40 = \5.50

opt 4: xerox copies of print to circulate for review

cost $0.03 \times 3 = \$0.09$

this works with very good photos of easy birds

negative = not good photo to file with record

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR PHOTOS

1. For many photos it is desirable to have six prints: 1 for Photo File, 3 for Records, 1 for American Birds, and 1 for Iowa Bird Life. If we receive a print, as shown above, it is costly to make copies. Furthermore, the quality of copies from prints is much inferior to the quality of duplicates from slides. Slide duplicates can be of good or bad quality -- good ones are as good as originals. For publication, a quality printer can make excellent color or black and whites from prints.

2. In my opinion, we should strongly urge Iowa bird photographers to send slides to Field Report and Christmas Bird Count editors, because we can make duplicates of the best quality at the lowest cost. When I am doing the field reports (spring and fall), I can anticipate all of the needs for duplicates. The situation may be different for Ross Silcok and Jim Dinsmore.

The following options for submission of slides are in order of preference for the Records Committee and Photo File.

a. send best photos

i. original for Photo File. Most people want to keep their best original, so this is only feasible if (1) the photographer has two equally good photos and is willing to

donate one, or (2) the photographer would be happy with a duplicate, in which case he/she can make it or we can.

ii. high quality duplicate for Photo File. The duplicate can be made by the photographer or by us and paid for by the photographer or by the IOU.

b. submit second best photos for Photo File. This should be discouraged. We have had second best photos be judged non-diagnostic by the Records Committee and had to ask for the best ones.

About half of the photos submitted are in the form of prints. Prints are much less useful because they cost more to duplicate and duplicates will be of inferior quality. They are still better than nothing. I don't know what percentage of bird photographers use color negative film, but if they shoot slides we prefer duplicate slides to prints from slides. We do have some important photos taken as ordinary snap shots on negative film. We don't want to discourage these being sent in.