



The CONNservator

Newsletter of the Office of the Public Records Administrator

September 2005

Volume 5 Number 2

State Library Board

- Mollie Keller, Ph.D., Chair
- Robert D. Harris, Jr., Vice-Chair
- John Barry
- Daphne Anderson Deeds
- Judge Joseph P. Flynn
- Judge Francis X. Hennessy
- Allen Hoffman
- Joy Hostage
- Larry Kibner
- Fran Rabinowitz

Library Administrative Staff

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

Grant Program Staff

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

Inside this issue:

<i>Five Year Perspective</i>	2
<i>Setting Priorities</i>	3
<i>List of Grantees</i>	5
<i>State Archives Notes</i>	7
<i>Reminders for Applicants</i>	7
<i>Financial Report</i>	8

2006 Cycle I Grant Recipients

The Office of the Public Records Administrator announces one hundred and nine grants totaling \$939,000 from the Historic Documents Grant Programs. This year's grants range from \$7,000 to \$17,000. The awards consist of \$22,501 for Inventory and Planning grants to conduct Records Management or Disaster Planning Surveys; \$388,460 for Organization and Indexing to improve indexing or automate the retrieval process; \$384,967 for Preservation/Conservation grants; \$15,000 for Program Development grants to implement a town wide records management program; and \$128,072 for Storage and Facilities grants for upgrading records storage and environmental monitoring equipment.

For a complete list of grantees, please turn to page 5.

Notes from the Public Records Administrator

Eunice G. DiBella, Public Records Administrator

NEW PHASE OF GRANT PROGRAM TO BEGIN

The Historic Documents Preservation Grant Program will enter a new phase in fiscal year 2007. Up to this point, the program has focused on targeted grants with fixed amounts based upon a municipality's population. This part of the program will remain in place. The State Library staff is reviewing the grant amounts and population tiers, which may be adjusted to provide a more equitable distribution of the targeted funds. The new phase will add competitive grants of up to \$50,000. The State Library will use \$300,000 set aside from the Historic Documents Preservation Fund during the past few years for this purpose. The competitive grants will be awarded based on the merits of the proposed project. The grant amount will not be tied to population, although the minimum grant amount will have to be more than a town's targeted grant amount. The staff held a planning meeting at the end of August to review the targeted grant allocations as well as the proposed competitive grant requirements.

The competitive grants are not designed to

replace the targeted grants, but rather to enhance the grant program. When the State Library first proposed the competitive grants, it decided that only municipalities that had completed a records management, preservation, facilities assessment or disaster recovery survey as part of a previous targeted grant would be eligible to apply for a competitive grant. The initial grant categories are based on the recommendations made in the final reports of those surveys. Grant program staff analyzed those reports to determine common areas of need. By limiting the initial grants to these areas, the reviewers will be judging similar projects. Members of the State Historical Records Advisory Board (SHRAB), who are professional archivists and historians from across Connecticut, will provide an independent evaluation of the grant applications. The State Library will review these evaluations, and make awards based on the recommendations in them.

In addition, municipalities will be required to make some type of matching contribution. Expenditure of town funds as part of the project will meet this requirement, as will in-kind

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)

services (such as town staff assigned to the project as part of their duties, use of existing equipment, or other town provided assistance). A higher proportion of matching contributions would give greater weight to an application than one from another town that had less.

The competitive grant guidelines and application form will be available by January 1, 2006. The application deadlines will also be earlier for the competitive grants than the targeted grants to allow enough time for the independent reviewers to complete their evaluations. The State Library grant staff will conduct **mandatory grant training** for all competitive grant applicants after the forms and guidelines are distributed.

Finally, if a town applies for a competitive grant it cannot apply for a targeted grant in cycle 1. Successful competitive grant applicants will not be eligible for a targeted grant in the same fiscal year. However, if a grant application is denied or

there is not enough money to fund all the competitive grant projects, then a town can apply for a targeted grant in cycle 2.

LOCAL DOCUMENT PRESERVATION FUNDS

On another note, I am still receiving complaints regarding the allocation of the \$1.00 portion of the fee that is retained by the municipalities. If you are having any problems, I can contact the administrative head of your municipality, as I have done many times in the past, to point out the intention of the legislation. It is also important that you make sure that the dollar that you collect is put into a separate account, and is not made part of the general fund of your town. The intent of the legislation establishing this program is that money that you collect from the historic preservation fee be used for historic preservation, and not for the general operating expenses of the town.

Preserving The Past, Protecting The Future: A 5-Year Perspective

LeAnn Johnson, Public Records Grant Program Specialist

A review of grant project evaluation/expenditure reports from the past five years and site visits to Town Clerks' offices throughout the state reveal the grant program's impact on the town clerks' ability to make significant improvements in daily operations. It has enabled municipalities to preserve original local historical records and to improve access to and management of town records.

The program's first priority is conservation and preservation of municipal records such as land records, vital statistic records, and survey maps. It is also many towns' top priority. These historical and legal records are critical operational records for the towns and were often in poor condition due to deteriorating paper or frequent handling. Treatments including preservation photocopying and microfilming, deacidification, mending, re-binding and reformatting have greatly extended their lifespan.

The planning surveys have provided many towns with an assessment of current conditions and a plan of direction for future grant projects. Some towns have completed a comprehensive town-wide records management survey resulting in a well-organized records management program benefiting both the town and the citizens it serves. The preservation surveys set forth short, medium and long-term priorities to guide the decision-making processes in setting preservation goals. In addition, the survey reports form the foundation for the upcoming competitive grant program phase.

In the area of records management, many towns purchased hardware and software to automate their recording procedures. Automated recording and indexing systems provide searchable electronic indexes of land records. Re-indexing projects create more accurate computer generated indices and facilitate the

use of the earlier town land records as well as current records. The computerized systems provide a means of researching land records in a faster and more efficient manner.

Equipment purchased through the grant program has advantages for both preservation and records management. Wide format map copiers and microfilmed maps converted to CD improve access and reduce copying costs. In addition, the original



permanent maps are better protected now that the need to handle them has decreased. Mobile shelving units, locking cabinets for vital records and veteran's discharge papers, map cabinets, and roller shelving for land record books assist in organizing and protecting the records stored in town vaults. Maximized use of floor space creates a more efficient work area.



Town minutes and vital books have been preserved, microfilmed and converted to an electronic imaging system. Municipalities have converted land record volumes from microfilm to digitized images. During the verification process, the

(Continued on page 8)

Choosing What Matters Most

Jane Cullinane, Preservation Librarian and Kathy Makover, Field Archivist

SETTING PRIORITIES

Many town clerks have been using Historic Documents Preservation grants for multi-year projects focused on a specific record series, such as land records or vitals. As current projects near completion, it can be a challenge to decide which projects are the most important to tackle next.

If you have many preservation projects in mind, try this technique to help set your priorities. By assessing three factors—**impact**, **urgency**, and **feasibility**—you will be applying a tool used that helps you choose the most important, timely, and effective projects.

Begin by listing the projects competing for your attention. As you consider each project, rate it for its level of impact, urgency, and feasibility, using 1 for “low,” 3 for “medium,” and 5 for “high.” Consider those projects with the highest overall scores for your first priorities. The bulleted sections below show how each factor might be applied to a typical project, and the chart on the next page illustrates the results, once all the projects have been evaluated according to these three factors.

THREE FACTORS

IMPACT: Impact refers to the extent that a project will improve the preservation of your records. Will this project help to preserve all of the records, rather than just a few? Or, of several potential projects, is this the project that will make the biggest difference in long-term preservation?

- After a disaster such as flood or fire, having a completed Disaster Recovery Plan helps you respond quickly and with the best methods to salvage your records. The plan lists your records, priorities, and resources and provides detailed instructions. The process of developing the plan may also identify existing risks, such as critical records stored in a basement prone to flooding that can then be addressed before a disaster occurs. A project to write the plan, with the help of a consultant, rates high for impact, because a Disaster Recovery Plan affects the security of all the records.
- Monitoring vault temperature and humidity allows you to identify immediate problems and to document overall patterns. It provides the data needed for proper adjustment or replacement of your HVAC system and can help head off hazards such as mold growth. Temperature and hu-



midity directly affect record longevity. In addition, the competitive grant program will require applicants to submit one year of monitoring data for any future vault renovations or HVAC system upgrades when those projects become eligible. A project to purchase a datalogger to continuously record temperature and relative humidity in a vault or storage area rates high for impact, because environmental monitoring helps preserve all the records.

- For a particular set of records, such as your town’s meeting minutes, you might consider either sending volumes for conservation, or scanning and creating a backup microfilm of the series. While conservation will improve the physical condition, scanning and filming will better preserve and protect the information as well as improve accessibility for you and the public. Film lasts longer than paper, and by storing film off-site, the information is more likely to survive even catastrophic loss of the original records. In evaluating these two projects, scanning and filming receives a higher rating for impact than conservation.

URGENCY: A project has a higher level of urgency if delaying it will lead to increased problems or a missed opportunity. Is a set of records in such poor condition that unless treated soon, information could be permanently lost? Will one project become more difficult or more expensive if not done at the same time as another project?

- In a project to conserve a multi-volume set of records, you might decide to tackle the project in parts, sending a few volumes at a time to a qualified conservator. It might seem logical to start with volume one and work forward. However, if some volumes are more deteriorated due to poor materials or heavily used you would send these volumes first. The most fragile items are more susceptible to further damage than those in relatively better condition. These volumes would rate highest for urgency, and be sent first for conservation, regardless of numerical order.
- If you are planning for a set of records eventually to be both filmed and scanned, it is more efficient to do both projects at the same time. The microfilm can be created directly from the scanned images. If you are encapsulating a set of records that have not yet been filmed, it is better to film them first, before they are encased in Mylar. In these two cases, one project’s rating for urgency increases because of its relationship to another project.

FEASIBILITY: Perhaps a project would have a high impact,

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

and perhaps it is even urgent, but is it realistic to do it at this time? Do you have the necessary resources in terms of time, money, staff/vendor availability, staff/vendor expertise, and management support?

- If cramped space in your vault is leading to poor storage conditions for your records, a project to reconfigure the vault and add new shelving and cabinets may be beneficial. While grant money is available for a space consultant and storage equipment, other factors will also impact the success of the project. You will need to have time for the move and staff available to assist with the project. In reconfiguring a records storage area that includes other departments' records, you will need to have the cooperation and assistance of staff from these departments. If you can be assured of these additional resources, then the feasibility of your project will be high.
- In creating a town-wide records storage center, again, many resources will be needed for the project to succeed. The availability of a suitable space, the ability to staff the center, the implementation of new policies and procedures, and the support of town management will all be required. While the project may be very important and even urgent, if these resources are unavailable, the project will receive a low rating for feasibility.

PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER

After evaluating and rating each project for impact, urgency and feasibility, add the scores. The chart below shows how this might look. In this example, the highest ranking has gone to developing a Disaster Recovery Plan. Projects to monitor the vault conditions and to scan and film the minutes have also received high scores. The indication is that these three projects would have the greatest benefit for the money spent and

the time invested. While it may not be practical to rate each project using a formal chart like the one below, considering projects according to this framework can provide direction towards choosing what matters most.

“Time and accident are committing daily havoc on the originals deposited in our public offices. ... The lost cannot be recovered; but let us save what remains ...”

Thomas Jefferson, February 18, 1791

STARTING WITH THE BIG PICTURE

To choose what is most beneficial for the town's records, it is important to start with a broad overview. This overview should include an inventory of the records, an assessment of their conditions, a review of current storage conditions, and a master list of potential projects. If the town has not yet reviewed its records preservation needs from this broad perspective, consider applying for a targeted grant to fund a Preservation Survey.

An experienced consultant will review your town's records and his or her report will include detailed analysis and recommendations. It will describe and prioritize potential projects, using some of the same basic principles described here, so that the steps are clear and manageable. A Preservation Survey can provide a strong foundation for records care and preservation, now and far into the future.

REFERENCE: “Considerations for prioritizing” by Sheryl Ogden. In: *Preservation of Library & Archival Materials: a manual*. 3rd ed. Rev. and expanded. Andover, Mass. : Northeast Document Conservation Center, c1999. p. 19-22. Available at <http://www.>

PROJECT RATINGS

1=low 3=medium 5=high	Develop town-wide Disaster Recovery Plan	Monitor environment in vault and storage areas	Conserve town minutes	Scan and create micro-film back-up of town minutes	Reconfigure vault storage	Create off-site records center
Factor						
Impact	5	5	1	5	5	5
Urgency	5	3	1	3	3	3
Feasibility	5	5	5	5	3	1
Total	15	13	7	13	11	9

2005 Cycle I Grant Recipients

TOWN	PROJECT	AMOUNT	TOWN	PROJECT	AMOUNT
Andover	On-line access and retrieval Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00	East Hampton	Codification	\$ 7,000.00
Ansonia	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00	East Hartford	Document Reformatting Land Records Verification	\$12,000.00
Ashford	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00	East Haven	Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$12,000.00
Avon	Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	East Windsor	Document Reformatting	\$ 7,000.00
Barkhamsted	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00	Easton	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00
Berlin	On-line access and retrieval Paper Conservation Archival Supplies	\$ 7,000.00	Ellington	Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00
Bethany	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00	Enfield	On-line access and retrieval Archival Supplies	\$12,000.00
Bethel	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00	Essex	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Bloomfield	Document Reformatting w/ Imaging	\$ 7,000.00	Farmington	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Branford	Archival Supplies Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$12,000.00	Franklin	On-line access and retrieval Preservation Microfilming	\$ 7,000.00
Bridgeport	On-line access and retrieval Preservation Microfilming	\$17,000.00	Glastonbury	Index Re-creation	\$12,000.00
Bridgewater	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00	Greenwich	Index Re-creation	\$12,000.00
Bristol	Paper Conservation	\$12,000.00	Griswold	Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00
Brookfield	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00	Groton	On-line access and retrieval	\$12,000.00
Brooklyn	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Haddam	Archival Storage Equipment Archival Supplies	\$ 7,000.00
Burlington	Document Reformatting Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Hamden	Index Re-creation	\$12,000.00
Canaan	Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	Hartford	Preservation Survey Preservation Microfilming	\$17,000.00
Canterbury	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00	Hartland	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Canton	On-line access and retrieval Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Hebron	Paper Conservation Preservation Microfilming Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00
Cheshire	Records Management Survey Archival Storage Equipment	\$12,000.00	Killingworth	Index Re-creation Preservation Microfilming	\$ 7,000.00
Clinton	Paper Conservation Preservation Microfilming	\$ 7,000.00	Lisbon	Archival Supplies Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00
Colchester	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Litchfield	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Cornwall	Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	Lyme	Preservation Microfilming Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00
Coventry	Preservation Survey Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	Madison	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00
Danbury	Archival Supplies Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment	\$12,000.00	Manchester	On-line access and retrieval	\$12,000.00
Darien	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00	Mansfield	Archival Supplies Records Management Survey	\$ 7,000.00
Derby	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Marlborough	Records Management Survey	\$ 7,000.00
			Meriden	Paper Conservation	\$12,000.00
			Middlebury	Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

TOWN	PROJECT	AMOUNT	TOWN	PROJECT	AMOUNT
Middlefield	On-line access and retrieval Document Reformatting Paper Conservation Archival Supplies	\$ 7,000.00	Seymour	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00
Middletown	Records Organization Project Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment	\$12,000.00	Shelton	Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment	\$12,000.00
Milford	Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm Records Management Survey Alarm Security System	\$12,000.00	Sherman	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Montville	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00	South Windsor	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Morris	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00	Southington	Index Re-creation	\$12,000.00
New Britain	On-line access and retrieval Archival Storage Equipment	\$12,000.00	Sprague	On-line access and retrieval Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00
New Fairfield	Document Reformatting Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00	Stafford	Paper Conservation Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00
New Hartford	Paper Conservation Archival Supplies Preservation Microfilming Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	Stratford	Document Reformatting Paper Conservation	\$12,000.00
New Haven	Index Re-creation	\$17,000.00	Thompson	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
New Milford	Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment	\$12,000.00	Tolland	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Newington	On-line access and retrieval	\$12,000.00	Torrington	Archival Supplies Paper Conservation Document Reformatting w/ Imaging Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$12,000.00
Newtown	Paper Conservation	\$12,000.00	Vernon	Index Re-creation	\$12,000.00
Norfolk	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Voluntown	On-line access and retrieval Document Reformatting	\$ 7,000.00
North Canaan	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Warren	Index Re-creation Archival Supplies	\$ 7,000.00
Norwalk	On-line access and retrieval Archival Storage Equipment	\$12,000.00	Waterbury	Archival Storage Equipment	\$17,000.00
Norwich	On-line access and retrieval Preservation Microfilming	\$12,000.00	Waterford	Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00
Old Saybrook	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00	West Hartford	Paper Conservation	\$12,000.00
Orange	Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00	Westport	On-line access and retrieval	\$12,000.00
Oxford	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00	Wethersfield	On-line access and retrieval Archival Supplies	\$12,000.00
Plainville	Document Reformatting w/ Microfilm	\$ 7,000.00	Willington	Document Reformatting Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00
Pomfret	On-line access and retrieval Index Re-creation	\$ 7,000.00	Wilton	Paper Conservation Archival Supplies	\$ 7,000.00
Portland	Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	Winchester	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00
Preston	Document Reformatting Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	Windham	On-line access and retrieval	\$ 7,000.00
Redding	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Windsor	Paper Conservation	\$12,000.00
Rocky Hill	Paper Conservation	\$ 7,000.00	Woodstock	On-line access and retrieval Archival Supplies Preservation Microfilming Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00
Salem	Paper Conservation Archival Storage Equipment	\$ 7,000.00	TOTAL		\$939,000.00

A Word from the Archives

Mark H. Jones, State Archivist, Connecticut State Library

THE FLOODS OF '55 VIRTUAL EXHIBIT

The State Archives currently has posted on the State Library's web site a virtual exhibit entitled, "The Floods of '55: A Fifty-Year Perspective." The exhibit contains over 60 photographs from three collections in the State Archives. Photographs show the devastation of Nature's fury in Torrington, Winsted, Naugatuck, Ansonia, Norwalk, and Putnam from two major floods caused by Hurricanes Connie and Diane in August and heavy rains over a three-day period in October. One can see the images at www.cslib.org. Click on "New and Noteworthy" and then on "The Floods of '55."

CSL IN RICHMOND FOR NATIONAL MEETING

From July 20-23, Public Records Administrator Eunice DiBella, City of Bridgeport Archivist and Chair of the State

Library Board Mollie Keller, and State Archivist Mark Jones attended a joint meeting of the National Association of Government Archivists and Records Administrators (NAGARA) and Council of State Archivists (COSA) in Richmond, VA. Attendees included employees and officials from the National Archives, state archivists and records managers, and persons in charge of local government records programs.

The featured speaker was the head of the National Archives, Archivist of the United States, Dr. Allen Weinstein. He promised to consult more with state archives and to support a national initiative to fund preservation of historical records at the state and local levels. Dr. Weinstein has been touring State Archives around the country. We invited Dr. Weinstein to visit the Connecticut State Library, the official archival repository for the State of Connecticut, so that he can see the important records that we hold, and learn about the archives and records management programs in our state.

Reminders for Grant Applicants

Kathy Makover, Field Archivist, Connecticut State Library

As the Cycle 2 deadline approaches, the grant staff would like to remind applicants to check the following points before submitting their grant applications. Avoid the time and effort associated with resubmitting corrected applications by reviewing these elements:

1. **Two Narrative Sections:** For the **Project Summary/Objectives**, state in your own words **what** your project is and **why** it is important to the town. For the **Work Plan**, state **how** it will be done, **who** will do it, and **when** it will be carried out. Remember that the project must begin after the grant is awarded and end by June 30, 2006. Note that vendor documentation supports your application, but does not replace these two sections, which are written from the applicant's perspective. Feel free to write these brief statements on an attached page rather than on the form, if that is easier.
2. **Budget:** Double-check **your own** and the **vendors'** math calculations. It is surprising how often we find math errors within the vendors' quotes. Please find and correct any errors prior to submitting the application.
3. **Documentation:** Attach appropriate supporting documentation for all funds requested—**vendor proposals/quotes** for services and/or products and a **breakdown of staff hours/pay rates** for any personnel costs. If a vendor proposal includes more work than is intended for this grant, clearly indicate the portion of work intended for this grant project. Check that the dollar amounts given in your budget match the dollar amounts in your documentation.
4. **Date order and signatures:** On the second page of the application you will be filling in dates for a series of items. These items are presented in the order in which they must be dated. Each item must be dated the **same as** or **later than** the date of the preceding item. Also note that the only optional section here is that for designating the town clerk as the applicant. All other sections are required, and signatures must be by the MCEO or Town Clerk, as specified; no other individual may sign the application.
5. **Resolutions:** If you are using a continuing or one-time resolution **dated in 2005**, complete the resolution on the application and do not attach any additional paperwork concerning the resolution. However, if you are using a continuing resolution **dated prior to 2005**, complete the resolution on the application and also attach a copy of the minutes containing the resolution. Note that a continuing resolution must have been passed within the last four years and within the current MCEO's term.
6. **The Seal:** Please be sure you have applied the seal before submitting the application.

If you have any questions or need assistance with your application, please feel free to contact LeAnn Johnson, Public Records Grant Program Specialist, at (860) 566-1100 x 301 or by email at ljohnson@cslib.org.

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

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

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

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

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

Financial Report

As of June 30, 2005

Total Receipts:

Town filings	\$9,434,305.00
Interest	<u>\$ 201,084.85</u>
	\$9,635,389.85

Disbursements

Grants awarded	\$4,093,066.07
Operational expenses	<u>\$1,643,835.48</u>
	\$5,736,901.55

Set Asides

Disaster Recovery Grants	\$ 100,000.00
Competitive Grants (future)	<u>\$ 300,000.00</u>
	\$ 400,000.00

Balance

\$3,498,488.30

Committed Funds FY2006

Grants (169 towns)	\$1,413,000.00
Operational expenses (est.)	\$ 696,055.00
State Library preservation projects	<u>\$ 358,999.30</u>
	\$2,599,055.00

Available Balance

\$1,030,476.55

(Continued from page 2)

vendor identifies any missing or out of sequence pages and/or deteriorating film and works with the Town Clerk to correct the errors and create a complete archival microfilm backup, free of splices and deterioration, and in the proper sequential order. In the event of a disaster, a town would be able to resume operations quickly.



In conclusion, the towns have accomplished much over the past five years. Now, the clerks must decide where to be five years from now. It is important to set goals and have a plan to keep the big picture in mind. Setting manageable tasks will make these goals attainable. Eventually you will see the projects through to their completion and the impact they will have on your offices, your town, your customers, and most importantly to you, the Town Clerk! You are indeed preserving the towns' past and your records will remain an invaluable resource for the future.

Reminder Dates/Upcoming Events

Grant applications for Cycle 2 must be postmarked by September 30, 2005 to be eligible for consideration.