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Executive Summary

As part of the Institute of Museum and Library Services “Connecting to Collections” program, the Delaware Division of Libraries (DDL), Delaware Public Archives (DPA), Delaware Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs (DHCA), Delaware Museum Association (DMA), and the Delaware Disaster Assessment Team (DDAT) developed a plan to create a statewide comprehensive conservation assessment report, initiate continuing training programs for organizational personnel, and increase public awareness of the conservation needs and concerns of and for Delaware’s treasures.

The “Delaware Collections Stewardship Project” had at its core the completion of a survey questionnaire by cultural heritage institutions within the state, and site visits by preservation consultant Thomas F. R. Clareson, Director for New Initiatives at PALINET. Working with the leaders of the Delaware institutions and associations, Clareson developed a survey questionnaire, made site visits to 40 cultural heritage institutions within the state, analyzed the previous library survey reports by the Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC) survey results and a report on statewide disaster planning by preservation consultant Julie Page, made a public presentation of the findings with opportunities for audience reaction and additions, and developed a statewide plan for preservation which is included in this report.

There were two sets of findings from the survey portion of the project. First, trends were detected from the answers provided on the “Pre-Survey Questionnaires.” These instruments were completed before site visits were made. In the answers to these questions, it was determined that almost none of the responding institutions had developed long-range preservation plan. Additionally, there was a lack of disaster plans at a great majority of the institutions as well, and, as with the Heritage Health Index, very few staff were trained to carry out the disaster plans that did exist. There were concerns expressed at many of the facilities about environmental levels (including heat, humidity, and light), as well as water leakage into the building. One very positive note was that the vast majority of the responding institutions felt that their security practices and systems were very good – a finding which this consultant has never seen before in other statewide studies.

The on-site survey findings fully supported the questionnaire results. Observations during the surveys included:

- High visible and ultraviolet light readings in many institutions, which supports the need for filtering natural and mechanical lighting.
- Roof, window, and basement leaks in various buildings, with sources including roof leaks, leaks through gutter and drainage systems, and basement leaks. This was exacerbated by the fact that some institutions were situated in flood-prone areas.
- Fire detection and especially suppression system needs were seen at almost all locations.
- At many facilities, materials were being stored on the floor, presenting an extreme hazard for damage via leaks, pests, or even tripping over the materials.
- Media materials in some of the institutions were stored near windows; these sources of light and heat can damage fragile audiovisual materials.
Most of the organizations visited did not have a full collection inventory. In fact, some institutions could not give any estimates or counts of the materials they held. Collection inventory records are very necessary for disaster preparedness and recovery (so an institution is able to know how much of their collection has been damaged in an incident); space planning and building projects; storage planning and expansion of storage areas and choices; and collection valuation and insurance issues.

In response to the survey findings, and the similar conclusions found in the NEDCC and Page reports, a Preservation Plan for the State was developed, which takes into account the great strides Delaware has made in some areas of statewide preservation planning, and serves to strengthen and expand the current preservation infrastructure. The elements of the plan include information, education, communication, identification, prioritization, conservation, renovation, and digitization.

In addition to the proposed preservation plan, information on sources of funding to move the program elements forwarded is included in the report, as are a list of institutions surveyed, information on the most important collections held in the repositories, and an estimate of holdings by material format and overall cultural heritage holdings in Delaware.

Project Background

The Delaware Division of Libraries (DDL), Delaware Public Archives (DPA), Delaware Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs (DHCA), Delaware Museum Association (DMA), and the Delaware Disaster Assessment Team (DDAT, a group consisting of members of the organizations listed above as well as staff from cultural heritage institutions from throughout the state) developed a plan as part of the Institute of Museum and Library Services “Connecting to Collections” program to create a statewide comprehensive conservation assessment report, initiate continuing training programs for organizational personnel, and increase public awareness of the conservation needs and concerns of and for Delaware’s treasures.

Prior to the beginning of the IMLS project in March of 2008, the Delaware Division of Libraries completed a statewide library preservation survey with the assistance of the Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC). This survey project reached eleven (11) libraries within the state. This information, combined with a report, “Delaware Disaster Assistance Team (DDAT): Development of Statewide Disaster Preparedness and Response Curriculum,” a National Endowment for the Humanities Preservation Assistance Grant project from consultant Julie Page, helped to form some of the infrastructure for the 2008-2009 IMLS “Delaware Collections Stewardship Project.”

The Collections Stewardship project had at its core the completion of a survey questionnaire by cultural heritage institutions within the state, and site visits by a preservation consultant. Thomas F. R. Clareson, Director for New Initiatives at PALINET, the mid-Atlantic library consortium, was the consultant for this project. Working with the leaders of the Delaware institutions and associations named above, Clareson developed the survey questionnaire, made site visits to 40 cultural heritage institutions within the state, analyzed the NEDCC survey results and Page’s report, made a public presentation of the findings with opportunities for audience reaction and additions, and developed a statewide plan for preservation which is included later in this report.
Previous Survey Findings

In a content analysis of the NEDCC site survey reports, written by Rachel Onuf, a consultant to NEDCC, and Angelina Altobellis, an NEDCC Field Service Representative, the following trends and needs were noted as prevalent in many of the libraries visited:

- **Mission plans.** The consultants urged the libraries to develop mission plans if none had been written, and to include preservation in their new or revised plans. A mission-level focus on preservation can inform both staff and users of the importance of caring for the institution’s collections.

- **Preservation Plan Documents.** Each individual institution was urged to develop a 3-5 year or longer written plan to assure the preservation of its collections.

- **Supervised use of Special Collections materials.** Monitoring patron use of rare and special collections material was suggested as a way to guard against damage or theft of these materials.

- **Budget lines for preservation.** Even if starting at a very low level, the development of core budget lines for preservation activities such as book repair, purchasing of preservation supplies, acquisition of appropriate storage enclosures or equipment, and other basic preservation activities is an important method to start the adoption of a “preservation mindset” within a cultural institution.

- **Building maintenance and problem logs.** Documentation of concerns related to the library structures can help to determine repeated trends in preservation needs such as roof leaks, air filter problems, or mold and mildew.

- **Environmental monitoring programs.** The establishment of regular practices to monitor heat, humidity, light, and particulate matter in the libraries’ storage and public use areas was strongly urged.

- **Integrated Pest Management.** The adoption of integrated pest management, a practice used by cultural institutions to monitor for, identify, and get rid of insects, rodents, and other unwanted pests without using chemical treatments and sprays which can be dangerous to humans, can be an economical way for institutions to assure a safe environment for their collections.

- **Fire Marshall visits.** Annual visits by representatives of the local Fire Department, where they are able to walk through buildings and point out fire hazards related to the buildings and cultural heritage collections, can help to prevent fires, flooding from sprinkler systems, tripping hazards, and other potential disasters in libraries and other types of cultural heritage institutions.

- **Fire drills.** Very few cultural heritage institutions hold regular fire drills, and especially do not conduct the drills with patrons/visitors present, as is suggested to give institutional staff and management a “real-life” experience in safely evacuating crowds from a facility in use.

- **Fire suppression systems.** Many of the institutions visited did not have fire suppression systems, and this type of safety system is seen as integral to the preservation of collections. Adding these systems to existing buildings during renovation projects, or the inclusion of fire suppression in new construction of cultural collection buildings is important.

- **Water detectors.** The use of water detection and alarm equipment was suggested for institutions which had basement leaks or water problems in other areas of the building. This type of equipment is relatively inexpensive, and can catch water intrusion into collection areas before it becomes a major disaster.

- **Food and drink restrictions.** Cultural heritage staff should attempt to curb the preparation, consumption, or disposal of food and beverages in areas where collections
are shelved, stored, or are being worked on by staff. This will prevent staining from foods, and will not provide an attractive environment for insects, rodents, and other pests.

- **Attending DDAT and disaster workshops.** The consultants urged cultural heritage institutional managers to allow staff and management to attend the quarterly meetings of the Delaware Disaster Assistance Team, and other educational opportunities in disaster preparedness, mitigation, and recovery. This recommendation can be expanded to include awareness-raising for volunteers, board members, and interested public.

- **Lining shelves.** Preventing abrasion to library materials, or the effects of offfgassing from paints and varnishes by lining shelves with preservation safe barrier board, mylar, glass, or other safe elements was strongly recommended.

- **Use of bookends.** To keep materials in good order and condition on the shelf, use of supportive, non-damaging bookends was suggested. Many libraries have noted that good shelf maintenance of materials results in more careful handling by users and less damage to books while they are not in circulation.

- **Disaster response kits.** The development of individual-institution kits of disaster recovery supplies was urged; another approach to consider is the gathering of shared “caches” of disaster supplies, where a centralized supply of disaster equipment is available to a group of institutions and is replaced by any of the institutions which must use the supplies and equipment.

While these findings from NEDCC were specifically from their library preservation survey visits, these findings apply to all types of cultural heritage institutions.

Julie Page’s consultant report from her April 7, 2008 meeting with Delaware Disaster Assistance Team meeting attendees contained a variety of recommendations to move forward disaster planning efforts on an institutional and statewide basis. Key recommendations are quoted below, and many of these findings are incorporated into the Statewide Preservation Plan at the end of this report.

- Delaware is ideally suited for a statewide disaster preparedness/response network (DDAT). Its size, geography, and transportation are conducive to providing assistance and sharing supplies. The three counties (in the state) serve as the logical local organizing structure for the cultural institutions to work with their county emergency management and first responders.
  - Local organization, formalization of administrative support and a steering committee of staff from each partner institution, inclusivity in membership and decisions on membership requirements, development of a mission statement, utilization of an existing listserv, and building of a “disaster response community” were additional recommendations in this area

- As the organizational structure takes shape, look for common needs in disaster preparedness and response capabilities among the state’s collecting institutions. Those identified during the April 2008 meeting were: training and information, building relationships, and shared supplies.
  - Bringing the three counties together for shared training and educational events, participation in regional disaster exercises, meetings with emergency management personnel and first responders, and development of shared supply caches were additional suggestions.

Page’s plan also outlined additional funding and information resources to help institutions and the statewide DDAT group carry out the recommended activities.
IMLS Project Survey Findings

A steering committee of key representatives of Delaware's leading cultural heritage institutions began meeting with consultant Tom Clareson in March/April of 2008 to develop a plan for the Delaware Collections Stewardship Project survey process. Clareson shared a “pre-survey questionnaire” document developed during his work at PALINET and previous position at Amigos Library Services. The Steering Committee representatives suggested a number of sites to visit, and provided Clareson information for nearly 80 potential site visits. Led by Claudia Leister of the Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs and the Delaware Museum Association, and Lisa Olson, then of the Delaware Division of Libraries, the Steering Committee circulated the pre-visit survey to 80 facilities and began to recruit institutions to complete the survey and agree to site visits.

Forty institutions completed the survey and took part in the site visits (a full listing of the survey participants appears as Appendix A to this report). The sites visited included museums, historical societies, park service sites, and historic homes. Emphasis during the visits was placed on review of building condition, a collection condition overview, and a review of existing preservation policies. These visits were much briefer than a standard site survey visit which PALINET usually offers; because of the sheer number of Delaware visits scheduled, the on-site time was held to a duration of 2.5-3 hours. Additionally, although it was not part of the original grant project, Clareson developed a report of “key findings” for each site visited; these reports averaged 2-3 pages.

There were two sets of findings from the survey portion of the project. First of all, trends were detected from the answers provided on the “Pre-Survey Questionnaires.” These instruments were completed before site visits were made. In the answers to these questions, it was determined that almost none of the responding institutions had developed long-range preservation plan. Additionally, there was a lack of disaster plans at a great majority of the institutions as well, and, as noted in the Heritage Health Index, very few staff were trained to carry out the disaster plans that did exist. There were concerns expressed at many of the facilities about environmental levels (including heat, humidity, and light), as well as water leakage into the building. One very positive note was that the vast majority of the responding institutions felt that their security practices and systems were very good – a finding which this consultant has never seen before in other statewide studies.

The on-site survey findings fully supported the questionnaire results. Observations during the surveys included:

- High visible and ultraviolet light readings in many institutions, which supports the need for filtering natural and mechanical lighting.
- Media materials in some of the institutions were stored near windows; these sources of light and heat can damage fragile audiovisual materials.
- Roof, window, and basement leaks in various buildings, with sources including roof leaks, leaks through gutter and drainage systems, and basement leaks. This was exacerbated by the fact that some institutions were situated in flood-prone areas.
- Fire detection and suppression system needs were seen at almost all locations.
- At many facilities, materials were being stored on the floor, presenting an extreme hazard for damage via leaks, pests, or even tripping over the materials.
- Most of the organizations visited did not have a full collection inventory. In fact, some institutions could not give any estimates or counts of the materials they held. Collection inventory records are very necessary for disaster preparedness and recovery (so an institution is able to know how much of their collection has been damaged in an incident); space planning and building projects; storage planning and expansion of storage areas and choices; and collection valuation and insurance issues.
During the visits, many collections needing preservation were noted. A listing of “Most Important Parts of the Collection” as self-selected by the institutions in their survey answers is included as Appendix B of this document. Overall trends included the need for preservation of many of the collection-holding historic facilities themselves, as well as preservation of object collections, photograph collections produced by a wide variety of processes from glass plate negatives to modern digital photography, newspapers, and book and pamphlet collections. Many of the institutions visited were just beginning to collect audiovisual and digital materials, and plans for preserving these formats of materials needed to be developed. Timely and appropriate storage and reformatting is especially important to these storage-sensitive materials.

Through the survey process, it was determined that there was a strong need to establish environmental control programs to monitor the destructive forces of temperature, relative humidity, light, particulate matter (dirt, dust, and soot), and water leaks and intrusions. The survey visit reports recommended some relatively inexpensive types of equipment which institutions could acquire to monitor these conditions; additionally, DDAT institutions were asked at their March 23, 2009 meeting on the IMLS project to consider developing travelling loaner “kits” of environmental monitoring equipment which could be shared among institutions in the states.

The consultant observed many urgent needs for disaster preparedness planning. While the Delaware Disaster Assistance Team is a good beginning for disaster response in the state, the DDAT group could easily be expanded to look at all areas of preservation, and cover all types of collection-holding institutions. Outreach to local and state emergency managers and first responders, through community forums such as the Alliance for Response, is a way for cultural heritage professionals to learn important disaster planning and recovery concepts, and for emergency personnel to learn important facts about our collections, buildings, and storage practices. In the individual-institution survey reports, links and references to many good disaster planning resources were named, and copies of the Heritage Preservation “Working with Emergency Responders: Tips for Cultural Institutions” posters were given to all attendees at the March 23 meeting.

Disaster plans needed to be developed for the very first time in many of these institutions, or redeveloped at facilities where they had gone out of date. Annual or more frequent practice of disaster plans was seen to be a strong need as well. Finally, development of kits or caches of disaster recovery materials was seen as a way that institutions throughout the state could be better prepared to react to disasters, but in a more economical manner.

There were many indications throughout the survey process that a greater awareness of preservation must be expanded among a wide variety of audiences, including staff, who need to be trained in collection handling and disaster recovery practices to a much greater level than they are now; volunteers, who should know preservation basics; management, administration, and Boards of Trustees members, who need to know the risks and costs associated with not preserving collections, and city, county, and state officials, who need to be supportive of preservation activities an assist cultural heritage institutions in finding preservation funding. Management and elected officials can be important players in helping us to implement preservation programs that will save local treasures and build local cultural tourism efforts.

The results of the questionnaire process indicated the need for further preservation education in a number of areas including:

- Disaster Preparedness, Mitigation, and Recovery
- Environmental Controls
- Archival Holdings Maintenance (basic care of archival materials)
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- Fundraising for Preservation
- Content Management System instruction (while many of the institutions owned PastPerfect software packages, mostly acquired through the Delaware Museum Association, few had fully implemented the system or taken advantage of its capabilities and benefits)

The consultant directed participants to a variety of organizations providing preservation information and education in the individual institutional reports and the March 2009 meeting; in addition, the utilization of volunteers for assistance in processing and protection of materials, preservation-trained interns (from museum, archives, and preservation studies programs at the University of Delaware, University of Maryland, University of Pittsburgh, and University of Texas at Austin, for example), and “circuit-riding archivists” (where multiple institutions share a part-time archivist) were suggested as other resources for assistance in building institutional and statewide preservation capabilities. Another concept to be explored further in the Preservation Plan portion of the document is to have “Best Practice Mentors” from institutions that have good preservation programs to share their resources across the state. From all these findings, the basis of a Statewide Preservation Plan was developed.

Strengthening the Preservation Infrastructure: A Statewide Plan for Delaware

There are a number of components of statewide preservation activity in which Delaware is already quite active and successful. Rather than a need to build an infrastructure for preservation within the state from the ground up, the plan below serves to strengthen the existing preservation infrastructure. The state’s preservation plan must expand upon some current activities and add others to make the program more effective. The elements of the plan include information, education, communication, identification, prioritization, conservation, renovation, and digitization.

A. Information

Wide distribution of preservation-related information – from basic policies and practices to new technical developments which can assist in increasing the lifespan of Delaware’s cultural heritage collections – is the cornerstone of an effective preservation plan for the State.

The provision of links to and examples of preservation information resources should not be limited to the times when a consultant visits an institution. A culture of preservation information provision must be further developed in Delaware.

Delaware is in an enviable geographic position in regard to the centers of preservation information. With resources such as the University of Delaware’s Museum Studies and Winterthur Programs, the nationally-recognized preservation activities of the Hagley Museum and Library, and the long-standing preservation program at the University of Delaware Libraries, there is a wealth of preservation programs with strong outreach components in the state.

Nearby is the Conservation Center for Art & Historic Artifacts (CCAHA), a Regional Alliance for Preservation (RAP) center providing preservation information through its Field Services Office, and hands-on conservation through a staff of professional conservators. Lyrasis, a new organization formed from the merger of PALINET and SOLINET, which both have strong preservation programs, is another nearby resource in the region. Additionally, such iconic resources as the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Archives and Records Administration are located nearby in the Washington, DC area, and Delaware institutions can tap into these resources for preservation information as well.
Perhaps most importantly, the most effective preservation information will be what Delaware institutions can learn from their peers and colleagues. Many of the surveyed historical societies and sites, libraries, archives, and museums are lacking written policies for preservation activities, and some do not have even more basic documentation such as mission statements including preservation, or collection policies developed with preservation practices in mind. An excellent resource in this last case is the Collections Policy of the Read House, part of the Delaware Historical Society.

Written with a strong emphasis on preservation of both the structure and collections, this document is of high enough quality to serve as a national model, and can certainly be a resource for policy development in Delaware. Mounting this document and other exemplar policies on key distributed websites, including the Delaware Division of Libraries, Delaware Public Archives, and Delaware Museum Association sites would be a method to blanket the state with high-quality preservation information. Model mission statements, disaster preparedness and recovery plans, environmental control policies, security plans, and exhibit policies must be identified and circulated widely among Delaware cultural heritage institutions, to serve as models for each repository to develop their own set of preservation policies. This “documentation of practice” can assure sustainability of preservation at the institutions, and move preservation from a set of irregular, disparate projects to a continuous program. Through preservation policy development, the cultural heritage community in Delaware can overcome one of the biggest shortcomings noted in both the survey questionnaire and the on-site visits.

In addition to simply providing information to institutions to read, which is a passive activity, the information can be brought to life and become much more active through a program of preservation education.

**B. Education**

In the first component of Delaware’s Preservation Plan, a number of important resources for preservation information were mentioned. Many of these resources particularly CCAHA, Lyrasis, and the Museum Studies/Winterthur Programs, can provide preservation education as well.

Delaware has provided preservation education on an irregular basis to those who staff its libraries, museums, and historical societies up until this point, through workshops, conferences, and other means. To better reinforce the preservation information which will be made available to the cultural heritage community within the state, a preservation curriculum, available via in-person and distance education workshops (both instructor-led or synchronous, and asynchronous, or self-paced instruction), conferences, and webinars must be planned. Because many of Delaware’s cultural institutions have no budgets for preservation, let alone preservation education, and many are short-staffed, the instruction must be offered near or in the institutions, by scheduling face-to-face workshops to be held at least once in all three counties, or by making the workshops consumable via electronic means. In addition, to attract the largest uptake among the neediest audiences, the instruction should be provided for free or a very nominal charge to attendees, meaning that some type of underwriting is necessary.

Some of the necessary topics for preservation education have been previously suggested in this report, but are presented here as components of a basic curriculum for preservation. Additional topics can be offered after these “cornerstone courses,” listed here in priority order, are presented.

- **Disaster Preparedness, Mitigation, and Recovery**: These classes would include a component which will allow each institution to develop or redevelop/revise a Disaster Plan. Also included in this training might be initiatives such as the Alliance for Response,
where cultural heritage and emergency management professionals/first responders meet to learn about each others’ practices.

- **Environmental Control:** Basic instruction on the effects and control of temperature, humidity, light, particulates, and pests.
- **Archival Holdings Maintenance:** Basics in caring for archival materials.
- **Care and Handling courses:** A series of classes focusing on preservation of different types of artifacts, ranging from books to furniture to three-dimensional objects.
- **Exhibition of Cultural Heritage Materials:** Basics in the safe display of collection materials.
- **Fundraising for Preservation:** Development of abilities to identify funders and write successful funding requests, so that institutions can become more self-sufficient in development of external funding streams for collections preservation.
- **Basics of Digitization:** Many Delaware institutions expressed interest in digitization of their collections; instruction in topics such as selection for digitization, digital creation, discovery of digital assets, and digital preservation/long-term access can provide these repositories with the knowledge to plan a digitization program which best fits their needs.
- **Collection Management Software Instruction:** Many Delaware museums and historical societies have Past Perfect or other collection management systems. Few of them, however, have fully implemented the system, or are using all of its functionalities and capabilities. Utilizing instruction by both company-based trainers and experienced users from within the state will allow institutions to fully unlock the potential of the system to assist time in care and preservation of the collections.

In addition to providing training to cultural heritage institution staff, awareness-raising and basic preservation education can be provided to other allied audiences to turn them into supporters. Volunteers need to know the basics of preservation information. Management, administration, and Boards of Trustees need to be knowledgeable and supportive of preservation activities, and be able to help institutions locate sources of preservation funding. And, city, county, and state officials also need their awareness raised to help organizations fund and implement preservation programs to save local treasures.

**C. Communication**

Communication of preservation information is an area where Delaware has recently made some great strides, and can enhance and expand an already-successful infrastructure.

The PreserveDE Listserv, managed by the Delaware Division of Libraries, has about 150 subscribers. State Librarian Annie Norman regularly posts important information about funding and educational opportunities to the list. Expanding the use of the list to questions and answers, and involving local, state, and national experts to answer some of the questions which will be posed on the listserv will increase its benefit to subscribers. Additionally, the subscriber list should be expanded to include all known cultural heritage and records-collection institutions in the state.

Another communication vehicle, the meetings of DDAT, are held quarterly and regularly attended by up to 50 people. Strong consideration of recording DDAT programs and making them available via podcasts or other electronic means would increase the utilization of shared information even further; this type of information dissemination can be done quite economically.

A communications mechanism which can become much stronger within the state is the presence of preservation information and education resources on the Web. Providing preservation information in a distributed manner, via posting on the Delaware Department of Libraries, Delaware Public Archives, and Delaware Museums Association websites is one method to saturate
the state with information; the opportunity to mount a jointly-developed, standalone website on Delaware preservation issues also deserves serious consideration.

D. Identification
Perhaps the most important step Delaware institutions can take in the preservation of their collections is the development of current inventories of their holdings. When asked in the survey how much of their collection was currently cataloged, the majority of respondents (16 of 30 total respondents, or 53%) stated that less than 20% of their collection was cataloged; additionally, many organizations were unable to provide an estimate of the total number of their holdings.

Identification, inventory, and processing, at least for the most important and unique works in a collection, is extremely important for purposes of space and storage planning, collection valuation, insurance purposes, and disaster planning and recovery (so that institutions can determine how much of their collection has been damaged in an incident). It is also the area of collection maintenance and preservation activity where Delaware institutions need the most assistance and funding.

Fortunately, programs such as the National Endowment for the Humanities’ Preservation and Access: Humanities Collections and Resources grants, and the new “Hidden Collections” grant program through the Council on Library and Information Resources can provide some funding for this type of inventorying, identification, and processing to take place. Through a statewide or individual-institution effort, applications for these grants should be made soon to increase the level of cataloging of and access to Delaware’s collections.

E. Prioritization
The prioritization and selection of materials to be preserved in individual collections and across the State of Delaware is an important next phase after identification/inventorying/processing has taken place. With the current budget situations for cultural heritage institutions, and even in the best times financially, we cannot save or treat every item in our collections, so we must select the materials which are most unique, significant, and important to our institutions, user communities, and the state. Authoring collaborative collection development guidelines for the state which target materials of importance to education, commerce, tourism, and research audiences is a key project to be developed on a collaborative basis. The writings of Janet Gertz of Columbia University, and documents such as the statewide digital collection development guidelines of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania can act as resources to aid in the development of Delaware-specific documentation.

F. Conservation
The preservation, and, if needed, conservation of important collection materials in Delaware’s cultural heritage organizations is one of the central tenets of the Connecting to Collections Grant Program. Prefacing any treatment of materials, however, must be the identification and selection/prioritization steps mentioned above.

Because of the costs of conservation treatment for many types of materials, this activity should be used on a selective basis. Again, very few institutions have the budgetary wherewithal to conserve the majority of their collections, so selection is important. This activity should be done judiciously to extend the life of the most treasured materials in Delaware’s collections.

Adding to the selective application of this program element is the fact that, in the site survey visits, the overview of collection condition at most of the institutions showed that a majority of the materials in most of the repositories were in very good condition. Furniture, artifacts, and objects are displayed and stored with the utmost of care. The format of material most widely
Photographic formats, over any others held by Delaware repositories, should be the center of information, education, policy development, identification, prioritization, and conservation treatment.

**G. Renovation**

The condition of the buildings housing cultural heritage collections in the State of Delaware, as well as the systems to control the environment within the buildings, was one of the areas of greatest concern seen in the site surveys which were conducted.

A lack of systems to properly control humidity, temperature, and light pose some of the greatest dangers to Delaware's treasures. Additionally, the lack of fire detection and suppression systems in many of the institutions threatened the buildings, the collections within, and, most importantly, the visitors and staff of the repositories.

An example of renovation of a historic building which provides an improved preservation environment for collections is at the Duck Creek Historical Society in Smyrna, Delaware. The Society’s main structure was retrofitted with a sprinkler system, which even includes sprinkler heads in such small areas as storage closets.

Now, renovation may be one of the most costly and difficult methods to improve preservation conditions within a repository, and this type of activity is likely to be applied even more selectively than conservation of important collection materials. If renovation is not possible due to budgetary constraints, institutions can at least develop knowledge of, and methods to battle damaging environmental resources. This can be done in part through providing preservation information and education, but also could be done via some statewide programs.

Some potential centralized preservation services in the state might include:

- **Environmental “Loaner Kits”:** Developing one or more kit of environmental monitoring equipment such as temperature and humidity monitors, light meters, particulate sensors, and other supplies could give institutions without the budget to afford the equipment the opportunity to utilize equipment (recommended time of loan would be three months or approximately one season) to check their environmental levels. The Texas Association of Museums has offered a long-standing and very successful program of this type.
- **Loaned Disaster Kits or “caches”:** A lead organization would develop response kits to be used by institutions impacted by a disaster and these kits would be refilled with supplies once the original materials were consumed.
- **Centralized or discounted purchasing of supplies:** A lead agency could buy a large volume of equipment such as water detectors (a supply that most of the surveyed organizations did not have, but could definitely use) and then loan or resell them at a discount to other cultural heritage organizations.
- **Centralized resource for environmental trends readings:** In Massachusetts, libraries have computerized Preservation Environment Monitors, but do not have to do the analysis of the readings from these instruments. They send the information to the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, where a preservation expert does the analysis. A similar program could be developed in Delaware.
- **Past Perfect Software support and training:** The Delaware Museum Association, who was the original purchaser of Past Perfect for several of its member institutions, could be the organizer of continual education and support of use of the software by institutions across the state.
These and many other programs could be coordinated by one or a few central organizations for the benefit of all of the repositories within the state.

**H. Digitization**

In addition to the previously-suggested components of this plan, which focus on preservation of the original item, creation of digital surrogates provides a method for wider access to the materials, and access to surrogates rather than the often-fragile originals.

Again, in the current economic climate, few institutions can digitize their complete collections, and many organizations may not have the budget, equipment, staff numbers, or expertise to digitize any part of their holdings. So, selection for digitization is an important component of any program element in this area.

In addition to information, education, and communication, digitization is a key area where leader institutions such as the Delaware Division of Libraries, Delaware Public Archives, and the Delaware Museum Association can work together. Providing digital collection development guidelines for the state can assist institutions with selection. These leaders might also provide access to state or regional digitization services which can provide digital surrogate creation, aiding those institutions without the equipment, budget, or staff to digitize materials themselves.

A caution before institutions head down the path of digitization, however. Those participating in (and especially sponsoring) such projects must realize the need for long-term maintenance/digital preservation of these digital surrogates once they are created. While no “silver bullet” for digital preservation currently exists, best practices in collaborative digital preservation, such as the MetaArchive project at Emory University, show promise as a way to keep these important resources functional.

**Funding for Preservation Program Components**

While funding source suggestions for various statewide preservation program elements were included in certain portions of the plan above, the development of a list of potential preservation funding sources is necessary to provide administrators a method to supplement their preservation budgets.

There are a number of potential financial resources for strengthening State and institutional preservation programs, and each group or institution must do research on their own funding plans. Listed below are some initial sources for consideration.

- **Establishing Preservation Budgets:** Taking information about key preservation concerns from their institution-specific reports, Delaware repositories should consider budgeting some small amount of core funding to pay for preservation supplies, equipment, or further education and assistance. Beginning with $150, and attempting to grow these budgets to $300, $500, $750 and $1000 in subsequent years, whether through core budget, Friends’ funding, or other means, should be a goal for each institution.

- **Local Foundation Grants:** Institutions can search for community, regional, and state foundations which support their institution type, or support preservation and conservation. Excellent general information on a wide variety of preservation grants is available from the Library of Congress at [http://www.loc.gov/preserv/foundtn-grants.html](http://www.loc.gov/preserv/foundtn-grants.html).

- **State Funding:** Many states have begun to offer cultural heritage institutions funding as a way of developing statewide “cultural tourism.” Delaware repositories should research the availability of these funds in their state. Additionally, further consideration of funding from state-based resources such as the Delaware Museum Association should be considered.
• National Endowment for the Humanities Preservation Assistance Grant: This funding, up to $6,000 per grant, can be used to secure additional, focused preservation consulting, preservation education, or to purchase preservation monitoring equipment or other supplies. The grants are usually due mid-May each year; Delaware institutions should be urged to apply by May 14, 2009. Lyrasis and CCAHA can offer assistance in planning these grants. Guidelines for the program can be found at http://www.neh.gov/grants/guidelines/pag.html.

• The Bank of America/IMLS American Heritage Preservation Program, a new program providing funding for conservation/repair needs, has recently been announced with an annual deadline of September 15. It is worth investigation as a source of funding for repair of key treasures from institutional collections. Please see this site for more information: http://www.imls.gov/collections/grants/boa.htm.

• Save America’s Treasures: Delaware cultural and historical buildings and the collections within them may qualify for the Save America’s Treasures program, funded by the National Park Service and administered by NEH, NEA, and the Institute of Museum and Library Services. The S.A.T. program website is: http://www.saveamericastreasures.org/.

• Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grants: This program may be useful to help institutions in flood-prone areas ensure their safety from future flooding and water damage. Information on this grant program is available at http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/pdm/.

• National Digital Newspaper Program: Some of the historical societies and libraries within the state hold bound and microfilmed collections of newspapers published in their communities. To determine the need to keep multiple copies of the collections, the ability to access the collections on microfilm or in digital format, and how these titles can be included in the Library of Congress/NEH National Digital Newspaper Program, it is suggested that a concentrated effort to make information about newspapers microfilmed as part of the previous United States Newspaper Program be made available on a statewide basis, and a meeting specifically focused on newspaper preservation and digitization be held to determine a path forward for work on this format of material, which is important to so many scholars and researchers.

• Institute for Museum and Library Services “Connecting to Collections” Implementation Funding: Delaware can make a very strong case for an IMLS statewide preservation implementation grant based on a program of strengthening its statewide preservation infrastructure through preservation policy development, preservation information and education, collections inventorying and cataloging, collections care and repair, and building repair and renovation. Many aspects of survey findings from this report, as well as the statewide preservation plan suggestions, could be utilized in an IMLS Implementation Funding proposal.
Appendix A
Institutions Visited for Delaware IMLS Preservation Surveys

- Air Mobility Command Museum
- Archeological Museum (Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs – DHCA)
- Auburn Heights Preserve (Delaware State Parks (DSP))
- Biggs Museum of American Art
- Bridgeville Historical Society
- Delaware Historical Society (DHS)
- Delaware Military Museum
- Delaware Sports Museum and Hall of Fame
- Delaware State Visitor Center and Galleries (DHCA)
- Duck Creek Historical Society
- Fort Delaware State Park (DSP)
- Fort Delaware Historical Society
- Fort Miles Unit (DSP)
- Grassdale Center (DSP)
- Indian River Life-Saving Station (DSP)
- Iron Hill Museum
- Laurel Historical Society
- Lewes Historical society
- Marshall Steam Car Museum
- Milford Museum
- Milton Historical Society
- Newark Historical Society
- New Castle Court House (DHCA)
- New Castle Historical Society
- Port Penn Site (DSP)
- Priscilla Building (DSP)
- Read House and Gardens (DHS)
- Red Clay Museum
- Rehoboth Art League
- Rehoboth Beach Museum
- Rehoboth Historical Society – Anna Hazzard House
- Seaford Historical Society, Ross Mansion Museum
- Seaford Historical Society, Seaford Museum
- Small Town Museum (DHCA)
- Tudor Park (DHCA)
- University of Delaware (UD) Disaster Research Center
- UD Education Resource Center
- UD Historic Costume and Textiles Collection
- Victrola Museum (DHCA)
- Zwaanendael Museum (DHCA)
Libraries Surveyed by NEDCC

- Corbit-Calloway Memorial Library
- Delmar Public Library
- Dover Public Library
- Georgetown Public Library
- Laurel Public Library
- Lewes Public Library
- Milton Public Library
- New Castle Public Library
- Selbyville Public Library
- Smyrna Public Library
- Wilmington Institute
Appendix B
Most Important Parts of Collection
(from Pre-Survey Questionnaires)

Air Mobility Command Museum
Photographs, negatives, slides, film, and electronic images
Videotape collection and 16 millimeter films
Aircraft
25 Aircraft

Biggs Museum of American Art
American Painting
Delaware Furniture
Delaware Silver

Bridgeville Historical Society
Postcard Collection
Silver Collection
Photograph Collection
Locally-made furniture

Delaware Historical Society
Early manuscripts related to 17th and 18th Century Delaware History
Delaware-made silver, furniture, and decorative arts
Structures

Delaware Military Museum
Archival records and images preserved in scrapbooks, diaries, and photo albums
WWII uniforms and personal gear
Delaware Air National guard collection

Delaware Sports Museum and Hall of Fame
Judy Johnson (life castings) exhibit
1880’s vintage bicycle exhibit
Hall of Fame 10-minute movie
DVD collection of old time movies
Hall of Fame inductee and nominee files
Inductee computer files

**Delaware State Parks**
*Auburn Heights Preserve*

Mansion and grounds
Furniture
Family objects (photographs, papers)

*Fort Delaware State Park*

Fort Delaware artifacts
Shoreline Artifact Recovery Project Materials

*Fort Miles Unit*

Weapons
Tools for weapons maintenance

*Grassdale Center*

Canal Map
Gun Carriage
Capt. Mlotkowski Photograph

*Indian River Life-Saving Station*

Museum building
Lyle gun, lamps, gunpowder containers, surfboat, personal effects of surfmen
Original photographs, books, and paper ephemera

*Priscilla Building*

Artifacts
Paper and electronic archives (reports, files, images, documents)

**Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs (no questionnaires)**
*Archaeological Museum*

Tools
Agricultural materials
Leather horse collars
New Castle Courthouse
No original documents
Furniture

Small-Town Museum
Silverware, plates, appliances
Richardson and Robbins Food Products
2 large working printing presses

Tudor Park
Delaware quilts
Glass and Ceramics
Furniture
Archaeological Collections
Military Collections
Vinyl records
Boxed books
USS Delaware silver
Canning company records
Victrola Museum
Victrola machines
Vinyl records

Duck Creek Historical Society
Documents (letters, merchant documents, maps)
Photographs
Postcards
Glass negatives
Group Archives (20th Century Club, Rotary, Chautauqua)

Iron Hill Museum
Mineral Collection
Fossils
Laurel Historical Society
Waller Studio Photography Collection (glass and gelatin negatives of 80-90 years in Southwestern Sussex)

200+ original late-18th/early-19th century documents including deeds, plots, and surveyor’s notebooks.

Lewes Historical Society
Col. Riley E. McGarraugh Photographic Collection (33,000 images of Lewes 1954-74)

Marshall Steam Car Museum
Automobiles

Locomotives

Milford Museum
Old pictures, documents, publications

Milton Historical Society
Archival documents, photographs, and objects

Ship Captains’ logbooks

Nautical instruments

Shipbuilding tools

Sea Protection Certificates

Button Cutter

Draper King Cole Canning Plant Archives

New Castle Historical Society
Furniture, textiles, art, documents, books related to the historic house or occupants

Overall textile collection

Photographs and archives

Newark Historical Society (no questionnaire)
Art J. Lynch paintings

Newark Post Newspapers 1910–

Oral history audiotapes

Pamphlets, school play booklets, photographs, postcards

Read House and Gardens
Laird Family bequest materials

Archaeological material

Holcomb Family Collection
Furniture, Textiles, Metal Items

**Red Clay Museum**  
1812 Yorklyn Depot Museum

Wilmington and Western Railroad Right of Way

Rolling Stock and Steam Engines from Early 1900s

Railroad and Red Clay Valley artifacts

**Rehoboth Art League**  
Fine Art Collection

Pater Marsh Homestead

Paynter Studio

**Rehoboth Beach Museum**  
Photographs and works on paper

**Rehoboth Historical Society – Anna Hazzard House**  
Building Structure

**Seaford Historical Society, Ross Museum**  
Ross Furniture

Family Papers

Family Photographs

**Seaford Historical Society, Seaford Museum**  
Library

Artifacts

Dorfman Museum Figures

**University of Delaware Disaster Research Center**  
Print Materials used in everyday research

Original DRC document/publications

Historical Records of Field Research

Historical Film Footage

**University of Delaware Education Resource Center**  
Children’s Trade Books

Curriculum materials

Equipment and electronics
University of Delaware Historic Costume and Textiles Collection
Clothing and Accessories from 18th Century to present

Peruvian Hat (Pre-Colombian)

1837 Men’s Presentation suit

1845 Women’s Wedding Dress

Zwaanendael Museum (no questionnaire)
Shipwreck materials (25 boxes)

Archaeological collections
NEDCC Reports – Key Collections

Corbit-Calloway Memorial Library
Delawareana collection contains 11,000 items; no breakout on formats, rarity, or value

Delmar Public Library
“Train Room” material

Documents, bound manuscripts, scrapbooks, ephemeral photographs, graphic materials, objects

100 books, some rare

Local history of Delmar

Bound volumes of Bi-State Weekly Newspaper, 1949-62 (1938-64 microfilmed as part of Del Newspaper project)

Charles Twitt Oral History

Dover Public Library
“Several hundred volumes in Delaware Collection”

Most archival donations given to Delaware Public Archives

Skull of Patty Cannon

Georgetown Public Library
Delaware collection – 500 volumes

Bound copies of Sussex Post – 1974 to June 1998 (does not say if microfilmed)

Cache of unprocessed donated books (number not given)

Laurel Public Library
Delmarva collection – 200 books, 100 rare books, newspapers

Also photos, manuscripts, newspapers

Lewes Public Library
200 rare books in Delaware collection

A few photographs, manuscripts, scrapbooks, maps, videos, DVDs, paintings, art on paper

Astronaut scrapbook

Valuable collection of paintings, needs inventory, documented, appraised, and insured

Most rare materials to Lewes High School

Milton Public Library
Delmarva local history collection = 960 volumes
New Castle Public Library
"Several hundred books and pamphlets"

Originals of local newspaper

Smyrna Public Library
650 items in Delaware collection

500 volumes in Rare Book collection

Small amount of manuscript material

Selbyville Public Library
Senator Townsend documents, photographs (albums), and artifacts

Library’s archival records

Delaware collection bill shelves of books, pamphlets, videos, and photo albums

Wilmington Institute
No count or formal breakout available
Appendix C
Collections Held and Estimated Counts
(from Pre-Survey Questionnaires)

As part of the Pre-Survey Questionnaire, institutions were asked to provide estimated counts of the materials they held, and an estimated total number of items in their collection. While most institutions answered with numbers of items or volumes, some questions allowed for answers in linear feet, so the total number of items held may not agree with the sum of collections by format. Additionally, this table notes the number of institutions holding certain formats, so that those formats might receive priority attention for further preservation action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format of Material</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Reporting</th>
<th>Estimated Count of Holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artwork</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books (volumes)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>133,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1584 + 5139 linear feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14,440 + 195 linear feet + three file cabinets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Posters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>608,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3560 + 5 linear feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual Materials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>923 + 5 linear feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ceramics, Glass, Paper Patterns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Objects Reported 17* 1,212,625

* Seven institutions did not know or did not report collection totals