Morning: 10:15-12:15

1. Review of notes from last meeting in December 2013 – Questions? Revisions?

   The minutes have been approved and posted on the LibGuides website.

2. EVGeoCloud: Are campuses interested in it, and maybe how they would use it?

   Mike Peters from East View provided a webinar for the UC campuses on May 22. The UC campuses also have a two-month trial that runs until July. There was much discussion about how EVGeoCloud works with OpenGeoPortal (OGP), how it fits into geospatial digital project priorities on different campuses, whether it could be used to host local or third-party data, and other questions that people had about it. Further evaluation is needed.

   Action items:
   - UC librarians will continue to evaluate the trial and think about how EVGeoCloud would fit into the geospatial projects on their campuses.
   - Brian will schedule an email or phone discussion after the trial to determine which campuses are interested and how to move forward.

3. Sanborn map scanning at the Library of Congress

   Julie provided a review of past discussions about working with the Library of Congress Geography & Map Division to scan public domain Sanborn maps of California in their collection.
Campuses were very interested in this project but we were not able to work out payment and contractual issues to make it happen. Recently Julie received a phone call from a vendor that is working at LC on scanning Sanborn maps for another state. He was wondering whether we were interested in contracting with him to scan the Sanborn maps of California for us. This would involve scanning about 18,000 maps.

There is broad interest among the campuses in this project depending on details such as the costs and terms. Everyone agrees that we would have to be able to make these public domain maps freely available online and provide copies to LC. Another issue would be creating the metadata for the maps. UCB, UCLA, UCSB, UCSC, and Stanford all indicated that they could probably contribute money to this project over a number of years. We could also try to get an LSTA grant to pay for developing the metadata and a joint website.

Action items:
- Julie will talk with the vendor and with Colleen at LC to get more details for the group to discuss.

4. CalGeoHydra group

The CalGeoHydra group consists of Stanford, UCB, UCSB, and UCSD. These campuses are implementing GeoHydra or OGP on their campuses and are interested in collaborating on geospatial data collection. Kim gave a brief overview of the GeoHydra project at Stanford, which is using Fedora and GeoBlacklight. The benefit of this approach is that it uses the same infrastructure as their other digital library projects.

Metadata is often the bottleneck in these projects but it is needed to make the data available. The group is trying to find a way to centralize the metadata records so institutions can share them a la OCLC. The goal is to have a repository of metadata to pull from whether that is for OGP or GeoBlacklight.

Other campuses provided updates on the current status of their repositories and geospatial data collections.
- UCB has an instance of OGP but they have not added data to it for several years. Their short-term focus is on updating their local data sets, documenting workflow processes, and making them more sustainable.
- UCSB has decided to implement GeoHydra. Jon has been collecting data from counties, which is in a dark archive waiting for metadata and ingestion into Fedora. Tom has joined UCSB as their Spatial Data Curator so this will help move things forward. He is interested in being included in the CalGeoHydra discussions.
- SANDAG is making the most recent data available at UCSD, but the library has been saving all of it going back 10-15 years depending on the layer. The archived layers are available in the GIS Lab only.

There are a lot of questions for the group to discuss around collection development and digital data. Can we collaborate on sharing data and metadata so that multiple campuses are not duplicating the same work? Can campuses with geospatial repositories host public data on behalf of campuses that do not? Could CDL help by implementing and hosting a geospatial repository for campuses that do not have one? Do campuses have the staff to collect digital data...
for their counties of responsibility in California? Do we need to redistribute county responsibilities among campuses where digital data is concerned? The group needs more information from campuses to inform these discussions.

Action items:
- Kim will send a copy of their metadata workflow to the group.
- Kim will also share a list of the open data they have collected. Other campuses will share their own lists as they develop them.
- Brian and Susan will develop a quick survey of the campuses on (a) what staffing they have for collecting data, (b) what kinds of data they are collecting, (c) what they are doing about metadata, and (d) where they are storing the data and how they are making it available. They will develop a white paper from the results.

5. ESRI licensing: How are the different campuses managing ESRI licensing, particularly site licenses and ArcGIS Online?

All UC campuses except UCSB are part of the system-wide license. UCSB has a separate site license. Stanford also has its own license. Here is a summary of who manages the licenses on each campus:
- UCB: College of Environmental Design
- UCD: GIS Specialist in a Department
- UCI: Office of Information Technology (OIT)
- UCLA: Software Central
- UCR: Computing & Communications Dept – because of agreements between ESRI & UC Extension, UCR doesn’t participate in the UC site license (use a station-by-station license, with recharge by C&C – may ask to revisit the issue to allow users to use ArcGIS without paying a fee to C&C (Lizbeth)
- UCSB: Map & Imagery Laboratory (Jon)
- UCSC: GIS Lab
- UCSD: Academic Computing & Media Service (ACMS)
- Stanford: Stanford Geospatial Center (Patricia & David)

Though ArcGIS Online is included in the academic site licenses, most campuses are not providing access to it yet because of concerns over the credits and cost models. Jon will give access to users at UCSB if they send him an email. Patricia will also provide access at Stanford after determining the need and expected usage. If there is a group that will use ArcGIS Online heavily, she works with Angie Lee at ESRI to get the group their own account so it does not count against the site license credits.

6. Should this group reach out to other librarians (for example business librarians)?

Julia wondered whether we need to reach out more to other groups such as the business librarians and government document librarians. We have purchased many products recently that would be of interest to these groups. How do we work with these groups on joint purchases and let them know about them?
Yesterday Jon distributed a draft letter to SAG3 about the group’s place in the new advisory structure. One suggestion in the letter is to form a Common Knowledge Group (CKG). This would be open to all staff so librarians from other bibliographer groups could choose to become involved. What do people think about forming a Common Knowledge Group (CKG)?

People felt like they need more information. There is a Visual Resources Common Knowledge Group, which seems comparable. On the other hand, SAG3 has drafted a proposal to redefine and recharge the bibliographers groups within the new advisory structure. We may want to see the details on the new bibliographer groups before making a decision.

This discussion was tabled until our next meeting when we should have more details on the new bibliographer group structure.

Lunch Break: 12:15-1:30

Afternoon: 1:30-3:00

7. Thiry interactive map indexes

Chris Thiry held a webinar where he showed his index project. Several people attended. Stanford, UCB, and UCSB all indicated interest in contributing to the project; Louise at UCLA has created an index as a proof of concept but is not sure whether UCLA will contribute. One obstacle for some campuses has been the lack of ArcGIS Online accounts. Jon has contacted Angie Lee at ESRI about a WAML account, which all could use in the future.

Jon indicated that all the staff and students in MIL have basic GIS skills that were developed through ESRI Virtual Campus and training from Jon. He hopes to gear up on the index project this year. Stanford would like to do some test indexes in the late summer or early fall. Berkeley hopes to have a graduate assistant this fall who can work on this.

UCB will also be starting to make their scanned map sets available through their Map Viewer. They plan to work with five sets this year to figure out the workflow. Stanford will share with Berkeley the information they have on contacts and permissions they obtained from many countries to post their historic topographic maps.

In summary, we should all keep each other informed about how things are progressing, and the group should discuss this topic again at our next meeting.

8. RLF copy of the California topos

The group is still interested in creating a shared print copy of the California topos for archival purposes. Brian talked with Emily Stambaugh after the last meeting but there is not a process in place for submitting shared print proposals. Because of the interest in this project, however, it was agreed that we would still develop a proposal for a shared print set.

UCSC has almost completed storage of their 15-minute quads of California. UCSB has a duplicate set of California topos that they would like to contribute to the project. UCB has many
duplicates that they can contribute to the project as well. Some issues to consider in the proposal are inventoring, cataloging, processing costs, and shipping costs.

There was also some discussion about the procedures for storing maps at NRLF. They are pretty strict about the procedures. UCSC has written down their procedures, and UCB may have some written procedures as well, which we could use to create documentation on storing maps at NRLF. The procedures for SRLF may be different.

Action items:
- Cynthia will share her written procedures from UCSC with the group.
- Brian and Susan will use the UCB and UCSC procedures to develop written documentation on map storage procedures for NRLF.
- Brian, Jon, and Susan will start working on the shared print proposal. Brian will schedule a phone call to discuss.

9. Round Robin updates – Additional comments and/or questions

   Campus round robin reports are attached as an appendix.

   The group wished Carol La Russa and Cynthia Moriconi congratulations on their upcoming retirements! We also thanked them for all the work they have done for the group.

   Action item:
   - Mike will send out an email asking for updates to the ILL list.

10. Planning for next meeting – December 2014 or at WAML (Sep.3 - Sep.7, 2014, University of California Los Angeles)? Convener and note-taker?

   There will likely be time for a short two-hour meeting on Wednesday afternoon during WAML. Everyone agreed that it would be worthwhile to meet in-person if possible.

   Julia (Irvine) will be the next convener. We will need to pick a note-taker at each of our meetings this year.