



The CONNservator

Newsletter of the Office of the Public Records Administrator

August 2006

Volume 6 Number 2

State Library Board

- Mollie Keller, Ph.D., Chair
- Robert D. Harris, Jr., Vice-Chair
- John Barry
- Daphne Anderson Deeds
- Mary Etter
- Judge Joseph P. Flynn
- Jackie Hemond
- Judge Francis X. Hennessy
- Allen Hoffman
- Joy Hostage
- Barbara Westwater

Library Administrative Staff

- Kendall F. Wiggin, State Librarian
- Richard Kingston, Director, Administrative Services
- Lynne Newell, Director, Division of Information Services
- Sharon Brettschneider, Director, Division of Library Development
- Eunice G. DiBella, Public Records Administrator
- Dean Nelson, Director, Museum of Connecticut History
- Mark Jones, Ph.D., State Archivist

Grant Program Staff

- LeAnn Johnson, Public Records Grant Program Specialist
- Kathy Makover, Field Archivist
- Lizette Pelletier, Public Records Archivist and Editor
- Bruce Stark, Assistant State Archivist

Inside this issue:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <i>A Town Clerk's View</i> | 2 |
| <i>List of Grantees</i> | 3 |
| <i>Reviewing Competitive Grants</i> | 7 |
| <i>Grant Contract Changes</i> | 7 |
| <i>Reminders</i> | 8 |
| <i>Financial Report</i> | 8 |

2007 Cycle I Grant Recipients

The Office of the Public Records Administrator announces the awarding of one hundred grants totaling \$1,094,670 from the Historic Documents Grant Program. This year's grants include for the first time, competitive grants in the areas of Records Management and Archival Management. The program awarded \$337,670 in Competitive Grants and \$757,000 in Targeted Grants.

Competitive Grants fund projects up to \$50,000. Eleven towns submitted applications. Nine towns survived the process to receive grants ranging from \$12,350 to \$50,000. The awards consist of \$62,350 for Archival Management and \$275,320 for Records Management.

Targeted grants for the fourth consecutive year again range from \$7,000 to \$17,000. The awards consist of \$54,719 for Inventory and Planning grants to conduct Records Management, Preservation Planning or Disaster Planning Surveys; \$304,137 for Organization and Indexing to improve indexing or automate the retrieval process; \$290,167 for Preservation/Conservation grants; \$22,500 for Program Development grants to implement a town wide records management program; and \$85,477 for Storage and Facilities grants for upgrading records storage and environmental monitoring equipment.

For a complete list of grantees, please turn to page 3.

Setting Goals

Eunice G. DiBella, Public Records Administrator

We often think of life as a series of goals. We achieve a goal and then strive to reach the next higher one. This has been the case in the development of the Historic Document Preservation Grant Program. The initial goal for this program was to distribute modest targeted grants to municipalities to fund badly needed conservation treatment for municipal public records as well as preservation planning activities.

Over the next few years, we expanded the categories as well as increased the dollar amount of the grant awards, in the hope of building a solid foundation of records management and preservation of public records for Connecticut towns and municipalities. Our success has been evident as the staff and I travel around the state and see the improved condition of the records, of the records storage

equipment used as well as the technological advancements implemented by many of the town clerks.

From the beginning, we intended to expand the program to allow municipalities who had met these basic goals to compete for higher dollar amounts for more extensive projects. As early as the second year of the program, the State Library began setting aside money in the fund to support competitive grants. The grant program staff, along with the Historic Documents Preservation Advisory Committee, developed the framework for an additional tier to the program based upon the targeted program, which shall remain the foundation for the program. Staff analyzed survey reports funded under the targeted grants to identify the greatest areas of common need based upon

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)

the recommendations made in those reports. We finally selected two broad categories in which the towns could compete for the larger grant awards. They are records management or archives management projects that demonstrate a town-wide approach. In addition, the staff studied other state's local grant programs, which are strictly competitive, to see what worked and what did not concerning the application review process.

We have been extremely pleased by the response on the part of

the town clerks. We received eleven applications, and have been able to award grants to nine towns in whole or in part. We look forward to seeing the impact these grants have on the quality of records management and archival preservation in Connecticut. The staff will evaluate the results at the end of grant period next June in order to plan for the future. Our goal has been and will continue to be to move the program forward to meet the ever changing management and preservation needs of public records of the State of Connecticut and its citizens.

The Competitive Grant Process: A Town Clerk's View

Agnes M. Pier, Windsor Town Clerk

A year ago, I never would have imagined that I would be involved with a \$50,000 grant. In all my professional life, I never had any experience with grants, much less had to develop, plan and write one. I was at a loss to know where to begin.

When we received the competitive grant program guidelines in the mail, I decided I would take a stab at it. I decided the Town would benefit the most from a formal Records Management program. Although records management procedures had been established for the town, it depended on the initiative of

"A year ago, I never would have imagined that I would be involved with a \$50,000 grant."

interested individuals to keep it going. Therefore, depending on their particular availability, the program functioned or not. This was not an efficient, much less effective, way for a program to operate. In addition, if any one particular person left the program, it might also end.

I have to say I found the application process for the competitive grants extremely worthwhile. Not easy, but worthwhile. The process of going through the planning and development phase gave me an opportunity to review our current records management procedures and the recommendations made by the consultant who did our assessment and to determine how these could be made into an effective formal records management program for the Town. It also allowed me the opportunity to make connections with other departments to better understand what an effective records program could do for them. In the end, the process led to a plan that I could follow to establish a formal records management program, whether or not I received the grant.

There were a few critical components to the application proc-

ess that I found extremely significant. They were the training session in January, the earlier submission time line and the requirement to submit a draft version of the application before the real thing. The training was critical because it provided me with a base level of understanding the competitive grant process and the sample templates I needed to follow to start developing and writing my own application. The earlier submission time line was crucial because it accelerated the process, making for an extremely focused process. Finally, the draft submission step generated feedback from the State Library staff, which allowed me to bring together my descriptions and justifications needed to sell the project to the independent reviewers who would rate the proposed project.

There were a number of things I did to enhance the process that I would strongly recommend to anyone applying for a grant. First, when going to the training read the grant material ahead of time. This way you are aware of the requirements even though you might not know what they mean, as was my position last January. Second, when developing the project, use goals and objectives. Have a long term goal in mind and break this down to achievable parts that can be tracked and measured. These end up being your objectives. Finally, find an outside person who knows absolutely nothing about your project to proof and critique your written application. I utilized two people. One was my husband because he was a completely neutral party and extremely good in grammar. The other person was our Town information officer. She gave me some excellent ideas on how the Town functions, which I incorporated in the project. I strongly recommend everyone apply for the Competitive Grant. If I can apply and be awarded a grant, anyone can be successful.

This was a great experience. I thank Eunice and her staff for all the time and hard work they put in helping those of us who chose to be part of the first group. Special thanks to LeAnn, who always seems to be there when we need her. Now the hard part begins. It will be up to the Town of Windsor and me to make the grant project a reality.

2007 Cycle I Grant Recipients

Competitive Grants Awarded

| Municipality | Project | Amount |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Brookfield | Records Management Implementation | \$49,855.00 |
| Enfield | Records Management Implementation | \$17,444.00 |
| Hartford | Archival Management | \$50,000.00 |
| Hebron | Archival Management | \$12,350.00 |
| North Branford | Records Management Implementation | \$49,990.00 |
| Plainfield | Records Management Implementation | \$15,175.00 |
| Southington | Records Management Implementation | \$49,856.00 |
| Wethersfield | Records Management Implementation | \$43,000.00 |
| Windsor | Records Management Implementation | \$50,000.00 |
| Total Competitive Grants Awarded | | \$337,670.00 |

Targeted Grants Awarded

| Municipality | Project | Amount |
|---------------------|---|---------------|
| Ashford | Document Reformatting w/ Imaging On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Avon | Records Management Implementation Archival Storage Equipment Preservation Microfilming | \$7,000.00 |
| Barkhamsted | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Berlin | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Bethany | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Bethel | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Bloomfield | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Bolton | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Bozrah | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Branford | Preservation Survey On-line Access and Retrieval Index Re-creation Archival Supplies | \$12,000.00 |
| Bristol | Records Management Survey Archival Supplies | \$12,000.00 |
| Brooklyn | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Canaan | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Canterbury | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Canton | On-line Access and Retrieval Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |

(Continued on page 4)

*(Continued from page 3)****Targeted Grants Awarded (cont.')***

| Municipality | Project | Amount |
|----------------------|---|---------------|
| Cheshire | Archival Storage Equipment | \$12,000.00 |
| Clinton | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Colebrook | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Cornwall | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Coventry | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Darien | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Derby | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| East Granby | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| East Hampton | Records Management Implementation Archival Supplies | \$7,000.00 |
| East Hartford | Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm Index Re-creation | \$12,000.00 |
| East Haven | Archival Storage Equipment | \$12,000.00 |
| East Windsor | Document Reformatting Archival Storage Equipment | \$7,000.00 |
| Easton | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Essex | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Farmington | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Franklin | Paper Conservation Preservation Microfilming Archival Storage Equipment Archival Supplies | \$7,000.00 |
| Glastonbury | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$12,000.00 |
| Greenwich | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$12,000.00 |
| Griswold | Document Reformatting w/ Imaging Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Groton | Preservation Microfilming Records Management Implementation Archival Storage Equipment Archival Supplies | \$12,000.00 |
| Haddam | Document Reformatting w/ Imaging Paper Conservation Preservation Microfilming | \$7,000.00 |
| Hamden | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$12,000.00 |
| Hartland | Index Re-creation Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment | \$7,000.00 |

(Continued on page 5)

*(Continued from page 4)****Targeted Grants Awarded (cont.')***

| Municipality | Project | Amount |
|-------------------------|--|---------------|
| Killingworth | On-line Access and Retrieval Preservation Microfilming | \$7,000.00 |
| Lisbon | Index Re-creation | \$7,000.00 |
| Litchfield | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Lyme | Archival Storage Equipment | \$7,000.00 |
| Manchester | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$12,000.00 |
| Mansfield | Records Management Implementation Archival Supplies | \$7,000.00 |
| Marlborough | Records Management Implementation | \$7,000.00 |
| Middlebury | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Middlefield | On-line Access and Retrieval Document Reformatting w/ Imaging Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Milford | Preservation Microfilming Records Management Implementation Archival Supplies | \$12,000.00 |
| Montville | On-line Access and Retrieval Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Morris | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| New Britain | Archival Supplies Records Management Survey Archival Supplies | \$12,000.00 |
| New Fairfield | Records Management Survey On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Newington | Preservation Microfilming Archival Storage Equipment | \$12,000.00 |
| Newtown | Paper Conservation | \$12,000.00 |
| Norfolk | Index Re-creation | \$7,000.00 |
| North Canaan | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| North Stonington | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Norwich | Paper Conservation Document Reformatting w/ Imaging On-line Access and Retrieval | \$12,000.00 |
| Old Lyme | Document Reformatting | \$7,000.00 |
| Old Saybrook | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Orange | Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm | \$7,000.00 |
| Plainville | Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm | \$7,000.00 |
| Portland | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Redding | Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm | \$7,000.00 |

(Continued on page 6)

*(Continued from page 5)****Targeted Grants Awarded (cont.)***

| Municipality | Project | Amount |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Ridgefield | Document Reformatting Archival Storage Equipment Archival Supplies | \$7,000.00 |
| Rocky Hill | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Seymour | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Shelton | Paper Conservation Preservation Microfilming | \$12,000.00 |
| Sherman | Records Management Survey Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Somers | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| South Windsor | Document Reformatting w/ Imaging | \$7,000.00 |
| Sprague | Document Reformatting w/ Imaging On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Stafford | Preservation Survey Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm Archival Storage Equipment | \$7,000.00 |
| Stamford | Paper Conservation | \$17,000.00 |
| Stonington | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Stratford | Archival Storage Equipment | \$12,000.00 |
| Thomaston | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Thompson | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Tolland | Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm | \$7,000.00 |
| Torrington | Records Management Survey Paper Conservation | \$12,000.00 |
| Vernon | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$12,000.00 |
| Wallingford | Paper Conservation | \$12,000.00 |
| Warren | Records Management Implementation On-line Access and Retrieval | \$7,000.00 |
| Waterford | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| West Hartford | Preservation Microfilming | \$12,000.00 |
| Westport | On-line Access and Retrieval | \$12,000.00 |
| Willington | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Wilton | Paper Conservation Archival Supplies | \$7,000.00 |
| Winchester | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Windham | Paper Conservation | \$7,000.00 |
| Woodstock | On-line Access and Retrieval Archival Storage Equipment | \$7,000.00 |
| Total Targeted Grants Awarded | | \$757,000.00 |

Reviewing Competitive Grants

Mark H. Jones, State Archivist, Connecticut State Library

In an effort to make the evaluation process of each competitive grant proposal as objective as possible, the State Library invited the State Historical Records Advisory Board (SHRAB) to serve as independent reviewers. Volunteers from the Board evaluated each proposal submitted by the towns.

What is a State Historical Records Advisory Board and what does it do? The primary function of the SHRAB is to evaluate historical records grant applications submitted to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), the grant funding arm of the National Archives, from Connecticut institutions and government agencies. Its other function is to report on the condition and accessibility of public records and manuscripts in the state. The Governor appoints its members to three-year terms. The chair and chief administrative officer of the board is the State Historical Records Coordinator who serves four-year terms. The State Archivist, Mark Jones, holds this position. Every state and territory of the United States has a board and Coordinator. The Coordinators form the Council of State Archivists which meets once a year to discuss issues concerning public records, archives and manuscripts at the local, state and federal level.

Although most state boards average about seven members, the Connecticut SHRAB has seventeen members who represent creators, users and administrators of historical records and manuscripts from most geographic regions of the state. The board tries to meet three times a year or whenever there is a major crisis affecting public and historical records. One recent

crisis was the attempt to reduce Congressional funding for NHPRC which would have eliminated this important program.

Given the board's extensive experience in reviewing grant applications at the federal level, the Public Records Administrator felt the board was a logical choice to become part of the review process for the competitive grants. The members enthusiastically accepted this invitation. Prior to receiving the grant applications, Eunice DiBella, Public Records Administrator, and the grant program staff met with the SHRAB to explain the Historical Documents Preservation Program, the goals for the competitive grants, the kinds of competitive grants projects being encouraged, and the evaluation process and form being used. Board members directly associated with the Connecticut State Library were not eligible to review the grant applications. Each volunteer evaluated every project. The evaluations provided both a narrative review and a numerical score of 1-10 in 10 areas for a total maximum score of 100. This system provides the Public Records Administrator with a means of weighing the applications against each other as well as an explanation of the score reached. The Public Records Administrator and the grant staff found the board members' comments regarding the proposed projects insightful and useful.

The experience was a positive one for both the board and the grant program. The board is honored to have been a part of this first cycle of competitive grants. It looks forward to a long and productive relationship with the State Library and the Historic Documents Preservation Program.

Grant Contract Changes for FY2008

LeAnn Johnson, Public Records Grant Program Specialist

The Attorney General's Office is in the process of reviewing all state contract procedures and language. As a result of this review, operating procedures have changed for many state agencies and their programs including the State Library. Beginning with the FY2008 grant cycles, you will see some changes that will impact the way grants are processed and awarded. Although the State Library and the Office of the Attorney General are still working out the specifics, the staff want to make Town Clerks aware that changes will be occurring.

The biggest change will be that the grant process will become a two-step process. Completing the application will be the first step. The town will submit an application form outlining its project(s) including a budget and project overview just as you do now. The staff will review the application and the Public Administrator will approve or deny the application.

Completing the grant contract will be the second step. Once your application has been approved by our office, the State Library's Grants Manager, Sheila Mosman, will be sending you a contract to sign. In the past, the certified resolution was a part of the grant application. In FY2008, the certified resolution will be a part of the grant contract.

Once the contract is completed and has been approved, our fiscal office will issue the grant funds. The appropriate town officials will have to sign and return the contract by the deadline for that cycle. Without a properly signed grant contract, funds cannot be released.

We are still working out the exact details which we will include in the FY2008 grant guidelines. The staff will provide additional grant training once they are finalized to make the transition as smooth as possible.

NEWSLETTER OF THE OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS ADMINISTRATOR

Connecticut State Library
231 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106-1537
Return Service Requested

Phone: 860-566-1100 x301
Fax: 860-566-1118
Email: ljohnson@cslib.org
Web Site: www.cslib.org/publicrecord/histdoc/

Mailing Address Line 1
Mailing Address Line 2
Mailing Address Line 3
Mailing Address Line 4
Mailing Address Line 5

This newsletter is published semi-annually by the Office of the Public Records Administrator. Please send submissions to:

Lizette Pelletier, *Editor*
Office of the Public Records Administrator,
Connecticut State Library
231 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106-1537
lpelletier@cslib.org

Financial Report

Historic Documents Preservation Fund

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Receipts FY2006 | \$1,829,921.00 |
| Interest accrued FY2006 | <u>\$ 99,614.00</u> |
| Total income FY2006 | \$1,929,535.00 |

Grants to Towns & Municipalities

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Grant funds received (70% of income) | \$1,350,674.50 |
| Grant balance carried from previous FY | <u>\$2,252,690.38</u> |
| Total Grant Funds | \$3,610,593.48 |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Grants Awarded FY2006 <i>Targeted</i> | \$1,293,861.00 |
|--|----------------|

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Set Asides (Replenished) <i>Disaster Recovery Grant in FY2005</i> | <u>\$ 5,000.00</u> |
|--|--------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Total Expended | \$1,298,861.00 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Grant Funds Available for FY2007 | \$2,311,732.48 |
|---|-----------------------|

From Theory to Reality ...

The Historic Documents Preservation Program recently presented its eighth workshop for Town Clerks, *From Theory to Reality: Strategies and Tips for Putting Preservation Principles into Action*, on June 8, 2006 at the Keeney Center in Old Wethersfield.



Workshop speakers (l-r) Jane Cullinane, *Preservation Librarian*, CSL; Lori Foley, *Field Services Director*, NEDCC; and Patricia Ford, *Coordinator of Environmental Services*, Image Permanence Institute.

Reminder Dates/Upcoming Events

All Project Evaluation/Final Expenditure Reports (GP-003 rev.) for FY06 grants must be in the office no later than close of business September 1, 2006. There can be no exceptions.

Grant applications for FY07 Cycle 2 must be postmarked by September 30, 2006 to be eligible for consideration.