



The CONNservator

Newsletter of the Office of the Public Records Administrator

August 2008

Volume 8 Number 2

State Library Board

- Mollie Keller, Ph.D., Chair
- Robert D. Harris, Jr., Vice-Chair
- Daphne Anderson Deeds
- Linda Anderson
- John Barry
- Eileen DeMayo
- Judge Francis X. Hennessy
- Allen Hoffman
- Joy Hostage
- Scott Hughes
- Judge William J. Lavery
- Barbara Westwater

Library Administrative Staff

- Kendall F. Wiggan, 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 Power, Public Records Grant Program Specialist
- Kathy Makover, Field Archivist
- Lizette Pelletier, Public Records Archivist and CONNservator Editor

Inside this issue:

<i>Deterioration of Land Record Maps</i>	2
<i>Connecticut Federal Arts Project Inventory</i>	2
<i>List of Grantees</i>	3
<i>Reminders</i>	8
<i>Financial Report</i>	8

Fiscal Year 2009 Cycle I Grants Awarded

The Office of the Public Records Administrator announces the awarding of one hundred and eight grants totaling \$1,234,327 from the Historic Documents Grant Program. The program awarded \$429,157 in Competitive Grants and \$804,000 in Targeted Grants. It also awarded a \$1,170 Disaster Recovery Grant to Windsor Locks for document drying services for records that were damaged by a water leak in the Registrars' Office.

Competitive grants fund projects up to \$50,000. Ten towns received grants ranging from \$30,050 to \$50,000. The awards consist of \$50,000 for Archival Management and \$379,157 for Records Management.

Targeted grants range from \$7,000 to \$17,000. The awards consist of \$53,700 for Inventory and Planning grants to conduct records management, preservation planning or disaster planning surveys; \$399,582 for Organization and Indexing to improve indexing or automate access; \$238,324 for Preservation/Conservation grants; \$13,600 for Program Development grants to implement a records management program; and \$98,794 for Storage and Facilities grants to upgrade records storage and environmental monitoring equipment.

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

The Bulls are Out and the Bears Have Arrived

Eunice G. DiBella, Public Records Administrator

Town clerks are more in tune to the ups and downs of the housing market than any other group of professionals in the field. Although the situation in Connecticut is more stable than other states, such as Florida, Nevada and California, nonetheless we have been hit hard by the current downturn in housing sales across the state.

When the Historic Documents Preservation Grant Program was created in 2000, Connecticut was just at the beginning of the housing market boom and the expansion of home

refinancing. Since the fund is supported by a fee associated with the recording of documents on the land records, housing market activity and mortgage refinancing have a direct impact on our revenue stream. The first four years of the program were growth years for the fund with steadily increasing revenues. During that time, we were able to increase the grant awards twice from the initial amounts of \$2,500; \$5,000 or \$7,500 depending on the size of the municipality. In addition, we were able

(Continued on page 6)

Deterioration of Land Record Maps

Kathy Makover, Field Archivist

A recent call from a town clerk alerted us to a serious problem that is affecting certain maps filed on the land records. She had pulled a map from the cabinet in order to make a copy and found that it had turned completely black. On further investigation, she found a number of other maps with dark brown sections, streaking, and other signs of deterioration (see *Images 1-3*).

After additional research, we determined that these problems are affecting a small percentage of fixed line photographic maps. The fixed line process has always been highly regarded for the creation of permanent images. It is one of three approved processes for producing maps, as specified in Administrative Regulations §11-8-19 through §11-8-26, *Filing Requirements for Maps* (www.cslib.org/publicrecords/mapregs1991.htm). These regulations, adopted in late 1991, require that maps for filing be "fixed line photographic polyester film," "wash off photographic polyester film," or "original ink on polyester film or linen." Today, the two photographic processes are less commonly used, and most maps are produced by inkjet plotting on polyester film, under the "original ink" category.

When processed correctly, fixed line photographic maps are considered stable. In some cases, however,

it appears that the maps were not properly fixed, due to faulty chemical solutions or other technical errors. The improperly fixed areas of the maps are continuing to develop over time, turning brown or black.



Image 1: A fixed line map that has turned completely black, shown above its copy in the map book.

Checking the Maps

A survey of several towns found that some have a number of maps with this type of deterioration, while others have few or no affected maps. To check your

(Continued on page 7)

Connecticut Federal Art Project Inventory

Mark H. Jones, State Archivist

In the 2007 session of the Connecticut General Assembly, Representative David McCluskey (20th District) proposed a bill to appropriate money to develop a "catalogue of Connecticut Federal Art Project Artists and their work." Representative McCluskey had read an article in the Winter 2006/2007 issue of the *Hog River Journal* by Amy L. Trout of the New Haven Museum and Historical Society, entitled "The Federal Art Project in New Haven: The Era, Art and Legacy."¹

Trout contended in a footnote that there was no "definitive catalogue of Connecticut FAP artists and their artwork." She observed that the Connecticut

State Library "has probably the most complete listings of artists" in Record Group 033, Records of the Works Projects Administration (WPA) in Connecticut.² The bill was not passed, but the General Assembly appropriated \$150,000 for the State Library to compile an art inventory. State Librarian Kendall Wiggin oversees the project, and State Archivist Mark Jones is project coordinator.

In 1935 President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the WPA in order to put people back to work. For the first time in the nation's history, the federal

(Continued on page 6)

2009 Cycle I Grant Recipients

Competitive Grants

Municipality	Amount	Municipality	Amount
<i>Farmington</i> Records Management Implementation	\$30,050	<i>Redding</i> Records Management Implementation	\$50,000
<i>Hartford</i> Archival Management Implementation	\$50,000	<i>Southington</i> Records Management Implementation	\$46,399
<i>Hebron</i> Records Management Implementation	\$31,555	<i>Wethersfield</i> Records Management Implementation	\$45,000
<i>Manchester</i> Records Management Implementation	\$50,000	<i>Woodbridge</i> Records Management Implementation	\$50,000
<i>Meriden</i> Records Management Implementation	\$42,364	<i>Woodbury</i> Records Management Implementation	\$33,789
		Total Awarded	\$429,157

Targeted Grants

Municipality	Amount	Municipality	Amount
<i>Ashford</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000	<i>Canaan</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000
<i>Avon</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Canterbury</i> Preservation/Conservation Storage and Facilities	\$ 7,000
<i>Barkhamsted</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000	<i>Canton</i> Storage and Facilities	\$ 7,000
<i>Berlin</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000	<i>Chaplin</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000
<i>Bethany</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Cheshire</i> Storage and Facilities	\$12,000
<i>Bethel</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000	<i>Chester</i> Inventory and Planning Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000
<i>Bethlehem</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Clinton</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000
<i>Bolton</i> Inventory and Planning	\$ 7,000	<i>Colebrook</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000
<i>Branford</i> Organization and Indexing	\$12,000	<i>Columbia</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000
<i>Bridgewater</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Cornwall</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000
<i>Brookfield</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000	<i>Darien</i> Inventory and Planning Storage and Facilities	\$ 7,000
<i>Burlington</i> Inventory and Planning Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000		

(Continued on page 4)

Targeted Grants (Continued from page 3)

Municipality	Amount	Municipality	Amount
<i>East Granby</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Marlborough</i> Preservation/Conservation Program Development	\$ 7,000
<i>East Hampton</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000	<i>Middlebury</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000
<i>East Hartford</i> Organization and Indexing	\$12,000	<i>Middlefield</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation Storage and Facilities	\$ 7,000
<i>East Haven</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$12,000	<i>Milford</i> Organization and Indexing	\$12,000
<i>East Windsor</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Monroe</i> Preservation/Conservation Storage and Facilities	\$ 7,000
<i>Easton</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Montville</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000
<i>Enfield</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$12,000	<i>Morris</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation Storage and Facilities	\$ 7,000
<i>Franklin</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000	<i>Naugatuck</i> Storage and Facilities	\$12,000
<i>Glastonbury</i> Organization and Indexing	\$12,000	<i>New Britain</i> Organization and Indexing	\$12,000
<i>Granby</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>New Fairfield</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000
<i>Greenwich</i> Organization and Indexing	\$12,000	<i>New Hartford</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000
<i>Hamden</i> Organization and Indexing	\$12,000	<i>New Milford</i> Preservation/Conservation	\$12,000
<i>Hartland</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Newington</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$12,000
<i>Killingworth</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Newtown</i> Inventory and Planning Preservation/Conservation Storage and Facilities	\$12,000
<i>Lebanon</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>Norfolk</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000
<i>Lisbon</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000	<i>North Branford</i> Inventory and Planning Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000
<i>Litchfield</i> Inventory and Planning	\$ 7,000		
<i>Lyme</i> Organization and Indexing Preservation/Conservation	\$ 7,000		
<i>Madison</i> Organization and Indexing	\$ 7,000		
<i>Mansfield</i> Preservation/Conservation Program Development	\$ 7,000		

(Continued on page 5)

Targeted Grants (Continued from page 4)

Municipality	Amount	Municipality	Amount
North Canaan	\$ 7,000	Stonington	\$ 7,000
Preservation/Conservation		Organization and Indexing	
Storage and Facilities		Thomaston	\$ 7,000
Norwich	\$12,000	Organization and Indexing	
Storage and Facilities		Thompson	\$ 7,000
Old Lyme	\$ 7,000	Preservation/Conservation	
Organization and Indexing		Torrington	\$12,000
Orange	\$ 7,000	Organization and Indexing	
Preservation/Conservation		Voluntown	\$ 7,000
Plainfield	\$ 7,000	Organization and Indexing	
Preservation/Conservation		Preservation/Conservation	
Storage and Facilities		Storage and Facilities	
Plainville	\$ 7,000	Wallingford	\$12,000
Preservation/Conservation		Preservation/Conservation	
Portland	\$ 7,000	Warren	\$ 7,000
Organization and Indexing		Organization and Indexing	
Prospect	\$ 7,000	Washington	\$ 7,000
Organization and Indexing		Organization and Indexing	
Rocky Hill	\$ 7,000	Waterbury	\$17,000
Preservation/Conservation		Preservation/Conservation	
Salem	\$ 7,000	Waterford	\$ 7,000
Organization and Indexing		Preservation/Conservation	
Salisbury	\$ 7,000	Storage and Facilities	
Organization and Indexing		Watertown	\$ 7,000
Preservation/Conservation		Preservation/Conservation	
Storage and Facilities		West Hartford	\$12,000
Scotland	\$ 7,000	Preservation/Conservation	
Organization and Indexing		Westport	\$12,000
Seymour	\$ 7,000	Organization and Indexing	
Organization and Indexing		Willington	\$ 7,000
Shelton	\$12,000	Organization and Indexing	
Preservation/Conservation		Wilton	\$ 7,000
Storage and Facilities		Preservation/Conservation	
Sherman	\$ 7,000	Winchester	\$ 7,000
Organization and Indexing		Preservation/Conservation	
Storage and Facilities		Windham	\$ 7,000
Simsbury	\$ 7,000	Storage and Facilities	
Organization and Indexing		Windsor	\$12,000
South Windsor	\$ 7,000	Inventory and Planning	
Preservation/Conservation		Organization and Indexing	
Stafford	\$ 7,000	Woodstock	
Preservation/Conservation		Inventory and Planning	\$ 7,000
Stamford	\$17,000	Total Targeted Awarded	\$804,000
Preservation/Conservation			

(Continued on page 6)

Grants (Continued from page 5)

Disaster Recovery Grant

<i>Windsor Locks</i>	\$ 1,170
Total Disaster Recovery Awarded	\$ 1,170

Bulls and Bears (Continued from page 1)

to build up a reserve in the grant portion of the fund in order to insure our ability to award grants at a stable level. For the past five years (FY2004 to FY2009), we were able to maintain an award level for targeted grants at \$7,000, \$12,000, and \$17,000 even though the economy began moving downward during FY2005. We were also able to fund larger broader based projects as requested by the town clerks through the competitive grant program.

Beginning with FY 2005, we began to see a steady downward trend to what was more in line with what was considered by town clerks to be normal activity.

Unfortunately, things have continued to progress downward into a “bear” market, and the fund experienced a 20% decline in revenue from FY 2007 to FY 2008. It is difficult to predict the future, but based on the current situation, we need to prepare for what may be a long period of declining or at the very least, flat activity in the housing market.

It has become clear that in the short term we will not be able to maintain our current funding levels for FY 2010 which begins in July, 2009. As we progress into this fiscal year, the State Library will determine to what level we will need to cut back the award amounts. However, we intend to continue to fund a two tier grant program of targeted and competitive grants, as well as disaster grants, if possible.

We remain optimistic that the bears will soon retreat and the bulls will once again dominate the state’s economic climate. In the interim we will adjust to meet the challenges that remain ahead of us.

WPA Project (Continued from page 2)

government hired hundreds of artists and paid them an hourly wage for art that was pleasing to the eye and that could inspire faith in democracy.³ In Connecticut, the headquarters of the State Federal Art Project (FAP) was in New Haven.

Staff has entered data from the artists’ work cards for each piece of work into an MSAccess database. It is also compiling detailed biographical files for most of the known 150 artists and for those discovered during the project. A consultant will organize around 1,000 black and white negatives of Connecticut FAP art work at the New Haven Museum and Historical Society and create a database.

Approximately 5,000 pieces of art were produced under the FAP. We believe that many of them are still in Connecticut.⁴ In several towns, there has been revived interest in preserving FAP murals. However, many other types of art were produced including easel art, sculpture, crafts, prints, posters, signs, and photographs.

We need your help in locating extant WPA art in

order to produce a comprehensive inventory. We do not plan to take art back to Hartford. Staff intends to record surviving FAP art in the database and shall request permission to make a digital image of each piece for our inventory files.

If you would like to help, please contact Mark Jones at mjones@cslib.org or (860) 757-6511 with questions, stories, remembrances, and recent sightings.

Since approximately 5,000 pieces of art were produced under the Federal Art Project, we believe that many of them are still in Connecticut.

¹ Vol. V/No. 1, pp. 26-31.

² Ibid, p. 31. n. 10. From 1935-39, WPA meant, “Works Progress Administration.” In 1939, amid criticism of the program, “Progress” was changed to

“Projects” in order to stress that useful work was being accomplished

³ A. Joan Saab, *For the Millions; American Art and Culture Between the Wars* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

⁴ A final report in August 1942 of the Connecticut FAP showed the following figures of production: 107 murals at 20,983 square feet; 3,464 pieces of easel art; 166 sculptures, 171 prints, 796 signs, 217 posters; 10,768 photographs and 2,929 negatives; 1,519 crafts; 460 pieces for the Index of American Design; 200 stenciling; and 2,176 frames.

Maps (Continued from page 2)

town's maps, begin by looking at those filed in the 1990's and early 2000's, when the fixed line process was most commonly used. Beginning in 1992, the regulations require that maps bear a red stamp identifying the process and producer, so it will be easy to identify fixed line maps filed after this date. Note any affected maps, including the map number, date, producer and condition. There may also be affected fixed line maps filed in earlier or later years.



Image 2: Brown or tan streaks are one typical sign of deterioration in fixed line maps.

As you look through the cabinets, you may also see signs of deterioration in maps produced by other methods. Prior to 1992, some maps were likely produced by the diazo method, which makes them especially susceptible to fading from light exposure. Others might have been produced by the electrostatic

method, which sometimes leads to ink transfer or losses. Any type of map, of course, can suffer deterioration due to other factors, such as poor storage or environmental conditions.



Image 3: Brown sections are another typical sign. Other maps may look mottled or show white 'ghost images' of text or drawings within the darker areas. A few may turn completely black (as shown in *Image 1*).

Next Steps

For any maps you discover that have deteriorated to the point of becoming illegible, it will be necessary to provide a new original or copy. We expect that this will apply to only a very small number of maps that have a loss of information, not to those that may be discolored or faded but still readable. We plan to issue a General Letter in the near future outlining a procedure for replacing these maps. Grant funds, the dollar fund or local funds may be used to cover any costs.

To safeguard land record maps and slow deterioration, basic preservation principles regarding proper storage, handling and environmental conditions all apply. Here are three specific recommendations:

- **Microfilm:** Check your microfilm inventory to be sure all maps have been filmed and that the film is securely stored off-site. Ensure that filming and storage are in compliance with General Letter 96-2 (rev.), *Required Microfilming Standards for Public Records* (www.cslib.org/publicrecords/micro.htm). As microfilm can deteriorate, it is important to request inspections at least every two years, as described in more detail in Part 6 of this Standard.
- **Light:** Light exposure is detrimental to all records, but unfixed photographic maps and diazo maps are especially sensitive to light. Always keep the covers on vertical map cabinets closed. Do not leave maps out when not in use. Consider adding UV filters to the fluorescent lights in the vault; these are available through archival supply catalogs.
- **Proper Materials:** The ink in pens or stamp pads used for marking filing information on polyester maps must be designed for use on this type of material. Other inks may run or smear over time. Pens and pads intended for this purpose are available through archival supply catalogs or reprographic shops.

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: lpower@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 FY2008	\$ 1,385,495
Interest Accrued FY2008	<u>\$ 79,763</u>
Total Income FY2008	\$ 1,465,258

Grants to Towns & Municipalities

Grant Funds Received (70% of income)	\$1,025,681
Grant Balance Carried From Previous FY	<u>\$2,311,732</u>
Total Grant Funds	\$3,337,413

Grants Awarded FY2008 <i>Targeted</i>	\$ 1,138,000
<i>Competitive</i>	<u>\$ 379,847</u>
Total Awarded	\$ 1,517,847

Grant Funds Available for FY2009	\$ 1,819,566
---	---------------------

Site Visits Available

Kathy Makover, Field Archivist, is available to meet with you at your office to assist with grant, vault or other records issues. To request a site visit, please contact her at (860) 566-1100 x303 or by email at kmakover@cslib.org

Reminder Dates/Upcoming Events

FY2009

Cycle 2 Grants Due September 30th

Just a reminder that applications for FY2009 Cycle 2 targeted grants must be postmarked no later than September 30th to be eligible for funding.

If you have any concerns or questions, please contact LeAnn Power at 566-1100 x301.