From the Editors

Dear Fellow GD-SIS Members,

Sorry to have missed you at the Depository Library Council meeting and Federal Depository Library Conference, but we are looking forward to hearing all about it in the next issue of Jurisdocs.

Sincerely,

Stacy Fowler and Michael Umberger,

Your Editors
Greetings from the Chair!

The beginning of the fall is a busy time for many people, particularly those of us in academic libraries. We’ve also begun thinking about next summer’s (!) AALL conference in Chicago, as well as gearing up for a Depository Library Council meeting & Federal Depository Library Program Conference in Arlington, Virginia. As the dust starts to settle on these matters, we can turn our attention to the issues that are always before us, but are hard-pressed to become the most important: our plan for the future.

When we met as a Section in Philadelphia this summer, I mentioned that we were, to the best of my knowledge, without a strategic plan. Since that time a couple people have sent me some information about an effort a few years ago to update a prior strategic plan (the one available on our website). In the coming weeks – as my own teaching commitments wind down! – I will be moving forward with the plans I announced to form a Strategic Planning Committee and create a new Strategic Plan for the SIS.

Strategic Planning seems to be in the air, all around me. My law school is undergoing a major strategic planning effort, as well as ALL-SIS (where I serve as the Executive Board member at large, and liaison to the strategic planning committee). Even at home, my husband is involved in a strategic planning process for his primary professional association. I’m taking this as a good sign, and I’m trusting that we can absorb good energy and good process (or at worst avoid pitfalls!) from these examples, as well.

Be well, and be well informed!
Government Documents SIS

The Government Documents Special Interest Section (GD-SIS) continued to have an active and productive year. The officers of the GD-SIS during 2014-15 were Edward T. Hart, Chair; Kate Irwin-Smiler, Vice Chair; Camilla Tubbs, Past Chair; Amy Taylor, Secretary-Treasurer; and Cate Kellet, Member-at-Large.

GD-SIS members continue to write and update the AALL State Documents Bibliography series. We had two updated bibliographies, Louisiana and Texas. Volunteers are working on eleven bibliographies for future release. Our arrangement with William S. Hein & Company for the distribution of the bibliographies continues. Electronic versions of the new and historical bibliographies are included in the Spinelli’s Law Library Reference Shelf library on Hein, for which we received a royalty this year of $5,315.67. Hein reports the sales of print copies of the bibliographies dropped off completely.

JURISDOCS, the SIS’s newsletter, came under new co-editors this year with Stacy Fowler and Michael Umberger. Grateful thanks were given to Camilla Tubbs and Kate Irwin-Smiler for their service as our editors. Volume 36 was complete with two new issues.

The GD-SIS was pleased to sponsor a workshop and a program at the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. The workshop was “AALL Hackathon: Connecting Legal Information,” organized by Shawn Friend and Jennifer Wondracek. It was an opportunity for AALL members to build new ways of accessing government information and datasets. The one program the SIS sponsored was “Quality Digitization Projects on a Budget.” This program was coordinated by Marilyn K. Nicely and Camilla Tubbs and at which Erik Beck, Melissa J. Bernstein and Victoria K. Trotta spoke. While not a sponsor, members of the SIS were encourage to attend a number of other programs including “Public Policy Update” and “Confronting Future of Information Policy.”

At our annual business meeting on July 21, 2015, the membership heard from Mary Alice Baish, Superintendent of Documents, and Hallie Pritchett, Chair of FDLP Council, provided us updates on GPO and FDLP.

The Grants Committee gave out a number of grants this year. For the AALL Management Institute, a grant was given to Carolyn Hamilton. One grant to support a SIS’s member’s attendance at AALL in Philadelphia was given to Amy Taylor. The Veronica Maclay Grant to support a student’s attendance to AALL Annual Meeting was awarded to Artie Berns.

Our election was held in May of 2015. The membership elected Jennifer Wondracek as Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and Rebecca Kunkel as Secretary/Treasurer.

Respectfully Submitted,
Edward T. Hart
GD-SIS Chair, 2014-15
August 28, 2015
Hello to all GD-SISers from Dallas. I am finally able to say that Fall has come to the great state of Texas, or at least the northern tip of it. Of course, the wonderful cool weather may have followed me home from Washington D.C. when I came home from the Depository Library Council meeting.

The DLC meeting was, as always, a great meeting. A large number of documents librarians gathered to discuss the state of federal documents across the country and share their ideas. I highly enjoyed attending educational sessions such as *Buried Treasures* by Duke Law Librarians Jennifer Behrens and Sean Chen, where they discussed transferring and cataloging more than 2,000 documents from their main campus library’s collection to the law library depository collection, and *Promoting Government Information using LibGuides* by University of South Alabama’s Vicki Tate. My favorite session was actually *Constitution Day to Climate Change: Engaging Students with Docs Displays in the Library*. Displays are not a common part of my work, so it was intriguing to see how much can actually be done with them and how much fun you can make them, both for the builder and the viewer. You can view the slides and handouts for all of the sessions at: [http://www.fdlp.gov/file-repository/outreach/events/depository-library-council-dlc-meetings/2015-meeting-proceedings-1/2015-dlc-meeting-and-fdl-conference](http://www.fdlp.gov/file-repository/outreach/events/depository-library-council-dlc-meetings/2015-meeting-proceedings-1/2015-dlc-meeting-and-fdl-conference). Council session video recordings are also available online at [http://login.icohere.com/public/topics.cfm?cseq=1328](http://login.icohere.com/public/topics.cfm?cseq=1328).

The big news that was released at DLC is the *new discard policy for regional depositories*. In order for a regional to discard an item, the following must be met:

- The item must have been in the regional’s collection for seven years,
- The item must be accessible on FDsys in an authenticated format with a digital signature,
- A minimum of four tangible, preservation copies must exist in the FDLP and be distributed throughout the US,
- The regional must notify GPO of its intent to discard,
- The Superintendent of Documents must grant advance approval to discard,
- Discarded publications must first be offered to the regional’s selectives, then to other depository libraries nationwide.
To make this work, GPO noted that they will need to maintain an inventory of regional depository holdings. Since the policy did not specify that the preservation copies needed to be in regional depositories, it can be presumed that the inventory may need to extend to selective depositories as well. It must also be emphasized that the tangible copies that are designated preservation copies will need to be removed from circulation and placed in newly created dark archives. These copies will need to be kept from wear and tear and labeled as “copies of last resort.” Dark archives will be a new concept for federal depositories, whose entire existence revolves around providing access to documents to the public, not squirreling them away to hide in the shadows where no one can see or read them. In a way, dark archives are the antithesis of the federal depository program. It will be interesting to see how they work together.

Beginning in January 2016, a pilot program with six regional depositories will test the procedures that GPO has designed. These libraries are: Arizona State Library, Archives & Public Records; Boston Public Library; Oklahoma Department of Libraries; Oregon State Library; University of Florida; and University of Virginia. These regionals will start with a limited number of discardable titles and series, specifically: the daily Congressional Record, GAO Reports and Comptroller General Decisions, hearings from certain committees yet to be named, and titles requested by the test libraries. The GPO officials are hopeful that the tests will go well and that all regionals will be able to utilize the policy by the end of 2016. As with most things in life, however, they were unable to guarantee when the policy would go into effect for all. To learn more about the policy:

⇒ Read the slides
⇒ Watch the Discards Session, or
⇒ Watch the Regional Meeting

No matter how you feel about regionals discarding materials, this pilot program should be one to watch closely. If you have any comments or suggestions for GPO, you can email Mary Alice Baish at mabaish@gpo.gov or Cindy Etkin at cetkin@gpo.gov. I would also find it interesting to hear what you think. Please feel free to email me directly, Jennifer.Wondracek@untdallas.edu, or start a conversation on My Communities so that we can all participate.
Fall Public Policy News

Peggy Jarrett
Government Publications and Reference Librarian
Gallagher Law Library, University of Washington School of Law
2015-2016 AALL Government Relations Committee Chair

What’s ahead this fall? At this writing it is hard to say, but in my dual role this year as chair of AALL’s Government Relations Committee (GRC) and the GD-SIS Advocacy Committee, I wanted to give a brief report of what to look for.

The nomination for the next Librarian of Congress should be announced this fall, perhaps even by now. AALL sent a letter to President Obama in August outlining the qualities we believe the next Librarian should have. Our list of qualities includes a transformative vision; a deep commitment to preserving cultural memory; and commitment to transparency, public participation, and collaboration. Let’s hope for the best possible nominee!

Appropriations are obviously a hot issue, if not THE issue. The fiscal year ends September 30. It is likely that we will see a temporary spending bill (a Continuing Resolution, which would keep spending at current levels for a short period of time). But we shall see. Again, let us hope for the best, which at this point is avoiding a government shutdown as happened in 2013. In the meantime, you can check out AALL’s issue briefs on federal agency appropriations, including for NARA, GPO, and LC.

Congressional Research Reports are also a topic being discussed. AALL joined a coalition calling for free public access to non-confidential CRS reports.

AALL’s Washington E-Bulletin is on hiatus until December 2015, when Emily Feltren, Director of Government Relations, returns from her parental leave (congratulations and welcome baby Feltren!) This fall, then, how can you keep up?

Please subscribe to the AALL’s Advocacy listserv, if you have not already. The GRC subcommittees (Access to Information, Open Government, and Privacy) will continue to post news to the list. Make sure you’ve read AALL’s updated Government Relations Policy, which was approved by the AALL Executive Board this summer. If you feel inspired to check out what other librarians and library organizations are writing about, try the ALA District Dispatch, ARL Policy Notes, and Free Government Information. And if you work in a depository library, former Depository Library Council chair Shari Laster’s FGI post, One year later...what’s happening with Regionals and discards?, is a good refresher of this sure to be discussed issue.

Feel free to get in touch with me as well. I look forward to hearing from you and seeing some of you in October at the Depository Library Council meeting and Federal Depository Library Conference.
Local-Federal Definitional Divides: Special Purpose Districts and the Challenges of Empirical Government Research

Sarah Ryan
Head of Empirical Legal Research Services and Lecturer in Legal Research
Lillian Goldman Law Library, Yale Law School

Compiling information about the activities of municipalities, counties, and sub-state government units is challenging in the best of circumstances. Some localities pride themselves on maintaining websites that capture the weekly work of the government; new zoning plans are reflected in interactive maps and debates are captured in downloadable meeting minutes. But many maintain bare sites with facts about the area, a few contact numbers, and highlights of a public activity or two. These differences make cross-locality data analysis difficult. Federal government data sites resolve some, but not all of the challenges of local empirical government research.

The federal government captures a considerable amount of local area and government information. The Census Bureau’s American FactFinder contains demographic and economic information at many government levels. Buried within the American FactFinder’s thousands of data tables are indicators of local civic participation (e.g., “Member of a Neighborhood Watch, Community Council, etc.”), local legal practice and business organization patterns (e.g., “County Business Patterns by Legal Form of Organization”), and local public financial health (e.g., “Annual Survey of Public Pensions: State Administered Defined Benefit Data”). Similarly, the Bureau of Justice Statistics releases local jail census data annually and information about jails in “Indian Country” periodically. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports local area unemployment data, and the Social Security Administration posts annual data on local benefits determinations to its website. Though the collection—and public release—of such data has elevated the possibilities for local government research, local and federal officials do not always agree on how to define terms, count activities, or estimate local outcomes. Intergovernmental conflict over definitions results in disagreement about the accuracy of local data. Special purpose districts (SPDs) illustrate this issue well.

In his classic text on special purpose districts, John C. Bollens defined an SPD as a governmental or quasi-governmental entity with “a structural form, an official name, perpetual succession, and the rights to sue and be sued, to make contracts, and to obtain and dispose of property” (1957, p. 1). Special Purpose Districts perform public services separate from, in addition to, or in conjunction with municipalities, counties, other governmental agencies, and/or non-profit organizations. When examining the lifecycle of a public service such as waste management, it can be difficult to draw a line between municipal, private, and SPD services. In fact, the benefits enjoyed by the public often accrue from the combined efforts of these organizations. However, the finances that fuel those public goods remain separate. Relatedly, SPDs are like municipalities in that they exercise considerable autonomy over the funds they collect and spend. Their authority is enabled via legislation such as the eponymous Air Pollution Control Districts Act of Washington State.
The biggest challenges of researching SPDs, as I learned in a recent two-year project, are that 1. federal and local data is often collected in different years, and 2. local officials disagree with federal officials on how to count SPDs. The case of Washington state illustrates these issues.

In June of 2014, I first accessed the most current federal (2007) and Washington state data (2012) on SPDs. The 2007 Census Bureau “Local Governments and Public School Systems” table recorded 1,229 SPDs in Washington state as did the related 2007 Governments Integrated Directory. The official Washington state estimate of the number of SPDs, derived from 2012 data, was 1,670. That state data indicated 441 more SPDs than the federal count, or over a third more. So what did this difference indicate?

Washington state did not gain 400+ special purpose districts in five years. Rather, the federal government and the state counted SPDs differently. The nonprofit organization tasked with collecting and disseminating state SPD data, the Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC), attributed the dissonance in the data to a difference in opinion about the independence of quasi-municipal bodies; the MRSC also hinted at its superior judgment in evaluating the nature of local government entities:

The Census of Governments classifies a number of Washington [SPDs] with independent governing boards as ‘Subordinate Agencies and Areas’ of the state or county. They include: county airport districts… county park and recreation service areas, county public transportation authorities…. Washington statutes define many of these districts as quasi-municipal corporations and designate the governing body to be the county legislative body acting ex officio. The ex officio governing body of the districts convene as the governing body of the [SPD]…. If the governing body appears to be independent, as in the latter case, MRSC has included them in the total number of special districts. This accounts for the difference in totals between the Census of Government data and those MRSC lists. (http://www.mrsc.org/subjects/governance/spd/spd-number.aspx).

As the Washington SPDs example illustrates, it can be difficult to determine “how many” government services, organizations, or outcomes exist when local and federal officials disagree on how to define them. This is a big problem for empirical researchers. Knowing or approximating “how many” is often a first step in an empirical legal study. The total number of cases heard by a particular judge or number of suits filed on the EPA annually or the number of SPDs in a state sets a boundary— and denominator—for the research. The researcher can then gather individual case/instance data and perform calculations (e.g., Judge Hand ruled for the plaintiff 33/100 times or 33%). Without a somewhat reliable denominator, it is difficult to know when to stop collecting data or whether the data is a good representation of the people and events being studied.

Current and future government leaders—at all levels—need to be reminded of the importance of consistent definitions for local government positions, organizations, and activities. In the era of “big data” it is important to remain focused on “good data,” particularly when taxpayers fund its collection.
This past summer at AALL, and again at the FDLP Meeting and Conference, I had the pleasure of coordinating a program entitled “Quality Digitization on a Budget.” The goal of the program was to teach others who have no money, no extra staff and no particular expertise how to implement a digitization project at a low cost and with minimal staff time. Most important, the speakers wanted to prove that, while these types of projects can be challenging, they are not impossible.

Speaking at AALL were:
- Tori Trotta, Associate Dean, Ross-Blakley Law Library, Arizona State University
- Melissa Bernstein, Library Director and Professor of Law at the S.J. Quinney Law Library, University of Utah
- Erik Beck, Digital Services Librarian, University of Colorado Law School Library
- Maryiln Nicely, (retired) Head of Technical Services, Donald E. Pray Law Library, Oklahoma University

Speaking at the FDLP Meeting and Conference were:
- Beth Williams, former Director of the Louisiana State University (LSU) Law Library, current Library Director at the Stanford Law Library
- David Walls, Preservation Librarian, Government Publishing Office
- Linda Tompkins-Baldwin, Digitization Supervisor and Coordinator, Digital Maryland

The different panelists at each conference shared their own guidance and information about the tools that they leveraged to digitize and bring their materials to a broader audience, including identifying high-demand collections for digitization, forming collaborations funded through grants, and the creative use of student help to create professional-level metadata for digital collections. Both programs began with short lectures by the panelists to frame a conversation for how to begin a digitization project, and then the panelists broke out into shorter buzz group tables with the audience to brainstorm ideas and share tips. These are some of the best tips from those presentations.
First, before you jump into any project, ask yourself the following questions:

- Have you identified a relevant collection?
- What physical space is available to devote to the effort?
- What staff resources are available, and what are the digitization skills of the available staff?
- What digitization equipment is available? What new digitization equipment is needed?
- What level of funding/resources is available?

A “Relevant” Collection:
First, what makes a relevant collection? As panelist David Walls noted during the FDLP presentation, “digitization is not just a process of converting paper to a digital format. Digitization should be a process of connecting content to a community through technology tools that enhance the user experience, increase access, and create digital assets that can be preserved for future generations.” This should be content that is: a) in high demand; b) whose tangible form is physically worn or brittle; and/or c) difficult to access either because it is in a special collection or a collection that is geographically dispersed; and/or d) is in a format that makes it a good candidate for digitization, such as a map or a folio, which is otherwise difficult to shelve and maintain in a library. For ideas of what this can include, check out the FDLP’s Digitization Project Registry, a listing of publicly accessible collections of digitized U.S. Government publications.

Content that is out of copyright, such as governments documents, are great candidates for digitization, but don’t forget that these materials may still contain sensitive information that must be redacted. This was a hidden roadblock that panelist Tori Trotta faced when she wanted to digitize 1800 linear feet of Arizona Appellate briefs. Materials that contain social security numbers are not immediately disqualified from digitization, but there will be additional costs and steps in the digitization process to remove this personal identifiably information.

And even when you have identified content that meets the criteria above, you must also ask yourself: is the collection organized in such a way that it is “digitization ready”? As FDLP panelist Linda Tompkins-Baldwin from Digital Maryland noted, there is nothing more frustrating than halting a perfect digitization project with a partner library because their collection is dispersed “a little bit here, and a little bit there.”
The Formation of a Digital Collection Development Plan and Partnerships:

Once you have defined collection for digitization, decide what will be the scope and the objectives of the project. The formation of this plan will help you to decide whether you have enough space, staff and funding. Questions one must ask include:

- How many people will you need?
- What skills, education and experience will be needed?
- Will you want to outsource?
- Digitization
- Metadata creation/extraction
- Descriptive cataloging
- Transformation/migration of formats
- Fixity checks
- File format identification & validation
- Redaction (if necessary)
- Secure storage management
- Preservation planning
- Will you need to hire staff or can staff be retrained?
- How much of the above can be accomplished by student workers?

If you have never created a plan like this before, don’t be afraid to implement a small, distinct project first to determine whether you have the resources and expertise to develop projects on a grander scale. This is the approach taken by Beth Williams when she was the Director of the Louisiana State University (LSU) Law Library. She secured funding for a student worker, who was studying archives management at the neighboring LSU School of Library and Information Science, to process two of the smaller archival collections at the Library with the help of student workers and the Preservation Librarian. This pilot project not only served as a roadmap for future digitization activities but it also helped LSU decide what organizational changes needed to take place to ensure the success and growth of future projects. Most important, the LSU pilot taught Beth that a staff member’s strong personal investment in a digitization program is far more important than that person having technical expertise. A student worker at the circulation desk can be trained how to use a scanner, but it takes an extra attachment to a project to ultimately ensure that the scanned images are without handprints or folded over pages.
AALL panelist Marilyn Nicely agrees that a strong personal investment is key to the success of a digitization project. After all, she is so invested in her project that she continues to support it as a volunteer during her retirement! But Marilyn also added that forming partnerships, especially if you lack the requisite technical expertise or manpower, can ensure success. Marilyn formed a cooperative effort among the University of Oklahoma Law Center, the National Indian Law Library (NILL), and Native American tribes to provide digitized access to the Constitutions, Tribal Codes, other legal documents for the 'Native American Constitution and Law Digitization Project.' Their combined efforts have led to the digitization of over 4,000 titles and 145,000 pages so far.

Melissa Bernstein agrees that having strong partnerships with other libraries can be a tremendous help for digitization projects, especially if your academic law library is part of a larger college campus. At the AALL program, Melissa described a project conceptualized, organized and implemented by Valeri Craigle, the Access Technologies Librarian and Head of Technical Services at her library, to digitize Utah Supreme Court briefs from 1929-2000. Her library partnered with the main campus library to perform the actual scanning of the briefs (as they had the machinery and staff), and the Howard W. Hunter Law Library at BYU Law to ingest and store the briefs, as well as provide cloud-based access to them as part of their already existing Digital Commons repository. These were all separate and distinct tasks that could not have been accomplished by one library alone.

Melissa is fortunate her library is in a very collaborative state. Utah has the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC), where directors of all of the state’s academic libraries meet a few times a year to discuss, among other things, digitization projects. And while there are only three law libraries in Utah, the directors all know each other and try to work together on projects with the State Library. But, Utah is not alone, as noted by Linda Tompkins-Baldwin at the FDLP meeting, in forming state-wide partnerships. Linda’s organization, Digital Maryland, works with partner libraries across the state to facilitate the digitization and digital exhibition of documents, images, audio and video held by Maryland institutions. Her organization is always looking to form partnerships with institutions to bring unique and important items to a broader audience, and she strongly encourages anyone who is interested in a digitization effort to reach out to their respective state organization. Other states with similar digital initiatives include: Connecticut, Georgia, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maine, Minnesota, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, the Mountain West region, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Wisconsin.
Another option if you are looking to collaborate with another institution, or would like begin a dialogue that could lead to a project, is to check out the FDLP Digitization Project Registry mentioned above. You may view the list of digitization projects, click on the title of the project and then click on the "Contact Owner" link at the bottom of the project page to communicate directly with the owner of the listing.

**What are the Best Practices in Digitization?**

At both the AALL and the FDLP presentation, most questions from the audience were in regards what type of technology, equipment and expertise is needed to implement a digitization project. The most helpful feedback for those specific questions were addressed in the breakout sessions, and too numerous to describe here; however, the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA)’s website has some great tips from Valeri Craigle and Erik Beck that help cover some of these FAQ’s.

There are two major organizations prescribing standards for digitization, the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), and the Federal Agencies Digitization Guidelines Initiative (FADGI). ALCTS’s guidelines were released in June 2013 and are intended for libraries. They are based on “practices at almost 50 organizations,” including FADGI, and are endorsed by the American Library Association. The main intent of their guidelines is to help libraries produce a sustainable product, something that will not need to be re-digitized, and therefore mainly cover capture specifications. Erik Beck provided the following helpful snapshot at AALL of ALCTS’s capture standards for books and textual-based documents with or without images:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Format</th>
<th>Bit Depth</th>
<th>Quality Index</th>
<th>Spatial Resolution</th>
<th>Spatial Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>8-bit Grayscale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>300 ppi without images 400 ppi with images</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FADGI’s guidelines detail the best practices for still image materials (e.g., textual content, maps, and photographic prints and negatives) followed by agencies participating in the Federal Agencies Digitization Guidelines Initiative (FADGI). FADGI’s working group completed its most recent review draft for standards on September 10, 2015, with the hopes of finalizing the guidelines in January 2016 after an adequate comment and review period. At the FDLP Meeting, David Walls provided this helpful snapshot of FADGI’s star rating specifications, which are very similar in direction to that of ALCTS, with the exception of the 1 star rating (which David cautioned against using anyway):
In addition to capturing content, there are standards for the creation of metadata and best practices for storage, ALCTS and FADGI both mention them in the appendices of their guideline documents. The Digital Public Library of American (DLPA) also has recommended metadata standards on its website.

Finding Grant Opportunities for Digitization
Most digitization and preservation grants are funded through the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). In general, applications for these grants are in October, with awards being distributed the following year.

The Grants to States program (LSTA) through IMLS is the largest source of federal funding. (Melissa’s Law Library received an LSTA grant of $45,181 from the Department of Heritage and Arts through the Utah State Library Division to help fund its digitization project.) Using a population based formula, more than $150 million is distributed by IMLS to the State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs) every year. Each SLAA submits a plan that details library services goals for a five-year period. These plans encompass not only digitization projects, but also fund statewide library catalogs, interlibrary loan systems and library infrastructure. Since the five-year plan encompasses so much, you should meet with your state librarian or other constituencies early if you want to apply for a portion of your state’s LSTA money to put towards a digitization initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master File Format</th>
<th>1 Star</th>
<th>2 Star</th>
<th>3 Star</th>
<th>4 Star</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIFF, JPEG 2000, PDF/A</td>
<td>TIFF, JPEG 2000, PDF/A</td>
<td>TIFF, JPEG 2000, PDF/A</td>
<td>TIFF, JPEG 2000, PDF/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access File Formats</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>150 ppi</td>
<td>300 ppi</td>
<td>300 ppi</td>
<td>400 ppi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bit Depth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 or 16</td>
<td>8 or 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Space</td>
<td>SRGB, Adobe 1998, ECIRGB\textsubscript{v2}</td>
<td>Adobe 1998, ECIRGB\textsubscript{v2}</td>
<td>Adobe 1998, ECIRGB\textsubscript{v2}</td>
<td>Adobe 1998, ECIRGB\textsubscript{v2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Greyscale or Color</td>
<td>Greyscale or Color</td>
<td>Greyscale or Color</td>
<td>Color</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to LSTA grants, IMLS is also known for its Leadership Grants for Libraries. These grants are given to institutions to “develop new tools, research findings, models, services, practices, or alliances that can be widely used, adapted, scaled, or replicated to extend the benefits of federal investment.” While many libraries used to be awarded IMLS grants for small digital projects, IMLS no longer awards grants for these purposes. Rather, IMLS is now looking for proposals that “initiate radical collaborations” that enhance and build once inoperable tools and services that can be brought to a national, or even international platform. For instance, OCLC received a Leadership Grant for its partnership with DPLA, ALCTS and others to study how public libraries and community members are engaged in local digitization efforts, what obstacles are preventing digitization, and what partnerships could accelerate digitization activities.

If you have a project in mind that might meet the Leadership Grants for Libraries criteria, but you are unsure if it would work, or if you need seed money to identify and meet with partners, IMLS also offers Sparks! Ignition Grants for Libraries. These small grants ($10,000 - $25,000) encourage libraries and archives to test and evaluate specific innovations. All that is required is a two-page application that describes the project director and partners; the proposed work plan; its relevance to one of the two agency priorities (if applicable); its potential impact; its projected performance goals and outcomes; and its estimated budget.

NEH provides numerous grants for initiatives that enhance the teaching and study of the humanities, including digitization projects. The variety of grant types and criteria for applications is available from the NEH Grants website. Once you have identified a potential grant opportunity, you must register your institution with grants.gov, a process that can take around two weeks for approval. Submitted grant proposals go through a lengthy peer review process. The number of applications to an NEH grant program can vary widely from year to year, as can the funding ratio.

NHPRC grants are available to non-profit entities for the “digital dissemination of archival collections,” and can range from $20,000 to $150,000, to cover up to fifty percent of the project’s total direct or indirect costs. “Projects may focus on the papers of major figures from American life or cover broad historical movements in politics, military, business, social reform, the arts, and other aspects of the national experience. The historical value of the
records and their expected usefulness to broad audiences must justify the costs of the pro-
ject.” Applicants for NHPRC grants must first be registered in System for Award Manage-
ment (SAM) prior to submitting an application. Details on SAM registration can be found
at the System for Award Management website.

While IMLS, NEH and the NHPRC are the major grant-providers on the federal level, don’t
forget about the smaller state grants available to special, archival and museum collections.
The Council on Library and Information Resources has an excellent website detailing vari-
ous grant opportunities. In addition to the grants listed above, FDLP’s Digitization Projects
Registry also has a list of private sector grants available to institutions on its website.
GD-SIS Grants

The GD-SIS Grants Committee for 2015-2016 consists of the following members:
- Pat Behles, University of Baltimore (Chair)
- Erik Beck, University of Colorado Boulder
- Katie Lewis, Boston College

The Committee awarded two $750.00 grants to attend the 2015 Federal Depository Library Conference. The recipients were:
- Taryn Marks, Reference Librarian, Lawton Chiles Legal Information Center, University of Florida
- Charlotte Schneider, Government Documents & Reference Librarian, Rutgers Law School

In addition, the Committee awarded a grant for one GD-SIS member to attend the AALL Business Skills Clinic. The recipient of the grant was
- Bonnie Shucha, Associate Director for Public Services, University of Wisconsin Law Library

As a condition of receiving a GD-SIS grant, members are asked to write up a short article for JURIDOCXS. Congratulations to all, and we look forward to your upcoming articles.
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