Attendees: Janet Reyes (R), Dawn Collings (D), Mike Smith (SD), Tom Brittnacher (SB) - convener, Susan Powell (B) - recorder, Louise Ratliff (LA), Michele Tobias (D), Lucia Orlando (SC), David Michalski (D), Julie Sweetkind-Singer (Stanford), Kim Durante (Stanford), David Medeiros (Stanford), G. Salim Mohammed (Stanford), Ann Hubble (SC), Amy Work (UCSD), Julia Gelfand (UCI), Heiko Muhr (UCB),

- Finalize language from Conspectus & Collection Development Agreement
  - Decision: Keep agreement as is. This gives us time to address our concerns in a revised agreement.
  - For future:
    - Remove references to “Part II” from collection development agreement
    - Revise bullet 2 to give campuses leeway to collect at levels below commitment levels
  - Question: Does this document need to exist? Why does it exist?
    - Helpful to have campus statements about what they collect
  - Is it an “aspirational” document?
  - Maybe the real focus of this document is now less on global/US collaborative collection development and really on California
  - Concerns about about UC-Stanford group responsibilities for collecting current CA spatial data/maps
  - Possibility to write letter expressing concern about collecting California for future research and teaching about current state of campus' capabilities for managing maps and spatial data. Document consequences of not doing anything. - Julia G. is interested in writing this (other people?)
  - It is important to have commitments signed (esp. by collections officers) to help make case for acquiring materials, but also for putting data into campus library data repositories
  - Susan, Julie, Kim can work on fleshing out CA county collections spreadsheets this summer to bring back to group for comment -- anyone else interested please let us know
  - Write vision statement for this group. How does it fit into campus research needs?
  - Develop use cases that illustrate examples of how maps/spatial data will be used for research and teaching

- FIMO -
  - Report back from David from Davis, differences from Proquest:
    - The maps are in color
    - They've georeferenced the index maps
    - Other fire insurance maps (non Sanborns) are also included
- Annual subscription. Davis is leaning towards California subscription, may also be interested in full US, depending on funds.
- FIMO is very open to possibility of consortial subscription.
- Report back from Stanford:
  - Impressed with site
  - Different costs depending on whether or not you’re able to download the high-res maps
- 3 year embargo from date of scanning at LOC and then they may be building a
- FIMO is also willing to segment by urban areas
- Only includes out-of-copyright images
- Each campus that’s interested will set up demo and/or trial, and we’ll table discussion of consortial purchase until after that