Advisory Board Meeting NEH Grant
February 8th 2013

Advisory Board members present:
Carl Halbirt, City Archaeologist, St. Augustine
Herschel Shepard, Retired Architect, FAIA

UF Project Team members present:
Thomas Caswell, PI, Unearthing St. Augustine
James Cusick, Co-PI, Unearthing St. Augustine
Mark Sullivan, Systems Programmer, DLC
John Nemmers, Archivist, Special and Area Studies Collections
Matt Armstrong, Project Manager, Unearthing St. Augustine
Matt Peters, Project Programmer, Unearthing St. Augustine

Guest(s) present:
MisCha Johns, City Archaeology Program assistant, St. Augustine

- The current agenda and minutes from the Nov. 2, 2012 meeting were accepted and approved.

- Project Manager update by Matt A.:
  - To date (not including the material from Herschel) he has scanned and processed about 2,025 items thus far.
  - Has been working on progress photos (large format) from the archaeological sites at the Government House.
  - He has secured two volunteers for extra help with the project. They are students from Flagler who will be using the collection for a social media project which will give the collection more visibility.
  - They have also digitally ingested about 540 drawings and 1,100 photos of Herschel's collection.
  - Tom C. mentioned the original project goal is to image about 10,000 items which is about 1,500 images a quarter so they are doing better thus far than projected.

- Matt A. brought up a concern about each "block." Some sites are larger and include many buildings. He asked if it would be easier to categorize each site by block, not by lot.
  - John N. mentioned that because an address can change for a site that they should also include street names for each block.
  - Mark S. said that for each building authority record, the lots should be linked to each block.
  - Herschel S. agreed this would be much more simplified if the lots were linked to each block.
  - Mark S. said that they were working on coordinates for each block - to add additional information to each item.
  - Carl H. said that they should use the 1923 lot/block map for reference.

- Tom C. said that they should be able to scan it soon.
- Mark S. said they are looking for data points for the rough data.
- John N. agreed that the 1923 lot/block could be used as the basis for all the others – a jumping point.
- Carl H. said that they have the originals of these (about 30 pages) and that they tie in with other things from the past – the standard map when referencing property – the basic lot/block map for St. Augustine from the early 19th century to the 20th century.
- Herschel S. asked if this is related. Are these the limits regardless of how they have been separated now? Can they relate? Carl H. said "yes" and that the city has parcel maps now too that they can use to see how it is divided.
- John N. questioned the items already scanned – can they have access points and coordinates to locate the block/lot? For instance, can things that have already been added from Herschel's collection have this information added later?
- Mark S. said that yes, they can be added later.

➢ Project Programmer/Developer update by Matt Peters:
- Gave handout of progress.
- Up to speed thus far.
- Working on continuing education for himself.
- Will add a function to process data.
- Will discuss custom map tools as they are developed.

➢ Matt Armstrong had a question about keyword searches and the display of materials.
- Jim C. asked what exactly would appear during a search.
- Matt P. said that from the block one could zoom in to see the lots and if there is information linked to that lot, it will appear as you zoom in.
- Jim C. asked about default images.
- Mark S. said that several views for each would appear and the resulting list would be next to the map. Patrons would click a section and the corresponding thumbnails would appear.
- Jim C. asked if the list will display next to the map.
- Mark S. said categories and the map would appear simultaneously.
- Matt P. said it is possible to toggle from section to section when viewing a block.
- Mark S. asked if the group could think of all the materials going in and if it would be possible to create 5 sections that will cover all the information – a genre term
- Herschel S. stated that there are 3 basic categories for Historical Preservation –
    - ❖ History
    - ❖ Archeology
    - ❖ Architecture

(He also stated that there are sub categories of other important information that should be included – various forms of testing etc.)

- John N. said that the group needs to figure out what these categories will be soon so they won't have to add metadata after the images have been scanned – they need to define the terms now to make it easier as they scan and process items.

- Matt A. asked about adding time periods and John N. said they could be added later. Mark S. agreed and said that a drop down menu of the ages could be added.
- Tom Caswell asked how they would separate the ages.
- John N. said it was a slippery slope.
- Tom C. asked if it would be the date designated to the property but Herschel S. said that can be arbitrary.
- Carl H. stated that while the elements of history and reconstruction are important and time is critical – what about the function of each site – was it a house, did it have a trash pit, etc.? Time period and the function of each site should be included and able to be searched / cross referenced.
- Mark S. said that the map and results with a time line at the bottom could appear when something is searched – the date of each in ages and years.
- Carl H. said that there are general periods in time that are meaningful and asked how they would be arranged.
- Jim C. asked the programmers if basic information could be entered into a search engine and still produce results – would the search engine be able to figure out how to search – i.e. date range for all structures from one period to another – would it know to look for structures that still exist or would they have to create the list?
- John N. said that they would have to create the list of structures but it would be easy if they have the dates and buildings.
- Jim C. said that it can get complicated – standard structures and archeological sites have a Spanish component - they would need a matrix to accomplish this – it would be a lot of work but it could be done for every site.
- MisCha commented that it will be easier to add the matrix as items are being processed rather than adding information to the record afterward – it's more time consuming after.
- Jim C. agreed that the matrix needs to be decided now.
- John N. said that after the matrix has been decided it will be easy to make sure that checks are marked. The Archeological sites will be more difficult than the structures.
- Carl asked how the timeline should be broken down. There needs to be a timeline that is meaningful. Something that both academics and lay people can use – lay people might need more assistance with searches.
- MisCha stated that lay people will probably search for items differently – i.e. is it a hospital, military, or religious site?
- Carl H. stated that the timeline needs a function.
- Herschel S. stated that the standard survey form has already mapped that out and established a common survey of the data. The group should try to interpret the data and decide now what the guidelines are so that the programmers don't have to decide.
- MisCha suggested that they create a PDF form with boxes next to the information that should be included on each item for the programmers to use when entering data – a check list of sorts.
- Carl H. mentioned that it will be up to the person providing the item to get the right information entered into the system.

- MisCha agrees with Carl H.
- Mark S. said that they would need to see some of the primary documents to see what information is included on them.
- Jim C. said they can't rely on existing surveys.
- Herschel S. agreed.
- Jim C. suggested that they look at the existing surveys and use them as a basis for a checklist that assigns things to time periods and key words associated to that site.
- John N. said that wouldn't be impossible.
- Jim C. said the programmers should link the forms to make a search viable. There needs to be a form otherwise there wouldn't be a good search.
- Tom C. suggested using the Florida Master Site Files as a jumping point.
- Carl H. agreed that would be a good jumping point.
- Jim C. mentioned the Historic Records Survey as a standard.
- Herschel. S. said the Master Site Form is the closest to a consistent record and the whole purpose of a check list is to lead a patron to the information they might need.
- John N. agreed.
- Mark S. said that they need to do it now or it will have to be retroactively added.
- Jim C. said it could be added at the end but it would be better to add the information sooner than later so that they can test the results of a patron searches.
- Mark S. said they could use an intern to add information retroactively.
- Jim C. said that geographical searches will be most common but others will need a date range when searching and there needs to be a way to differentiate.
- Herschel S. asked if there will be 1 form covering the 3 types of searches.
- Jim C. stated that people that want something other than a specific time limit will want a specific building type to search and the group could design a form with less than 50 boxes to check and even add keywords too.
- Tom C. said that once the form has been created they should pass it around for everyone to look at and review.
- Jim C. said that they can pull from forms that already exist – no need to reinvent the wheel.
- John N. and Herschel S. both agreed that the block and lot for each site should be used as the beginning point.
- Jim C. said that each site has the block and lot recorded for archeological sites. The Master Site File has the name of the site and address of the site (BDAC) and they need to be connected together so they function together.
- MisCha said that keywords could pull information up for a site without the block and lot.
- Carl H. uses the BDAC and address of a site as an easy retrieval device when he's searching for an item and said that they need all those numbers for find it – he agrees with Jim C.
- Jim C. said that a patron might not necessarily know the block and lot number when searching.
- John N. asked from a data entry point of view – what is the one number that needs to be included? Can that be added afterwards by the programmers?

- Mark S. said that the block and lot number is most important.
- Jim C. reiterated that patrons might not necessarily know the block and lot number for a site.
- Herschel S. said that block and lot should be used as the starting point.
- Jim C. said that it would be OK to add those numbers later but that they needed to be included.
- John N. asked if the numbers have changed over time.
- Herschel S. said that yes, the block and lot number for a site can and does change.
- Jim C. asked if there was a base number that stayed the same.
- Carl H. said block and lot numbers relate to a specific site – an address/place and could be used as a reference point.
- Jim C. stated that there are lots of site reports out there and new comers would use them instead of block and lot numbers since most don't know the block and lot numbers for any particular site.
- Tom C. said that the block and lot numbers are the hooks that they have been hanging the records on originally.

- All agree that each authority record should have ALL the numbers that relate to any given site included in it.

- Mark S. stated that the coordinates for a site would be the absolute best way to discriminate but for now they would use the block and lot as a starting point.
  - John N. asked for a list of all projects that are going on and the coordinates for all sites to use as a reference.
  - Matt A. said that he had something he could email to John N.
  - Mark S. said that using coordinates for a site implies that they are using a level of precision that they are not currently using. They should discuss.
  - John N. said they are dealing with specific things but also have platforms with many sites included. Where do they stop when adding coordinates? The site? The well?
  - Mark S. said that the going is not to build a comprehensive list of all things at St. Augustine – there isn't enough time.
  - Tom C. said the group should be looking for the lowest common denominator when deciding what to include in each record.
  - Herschel S. asked if everything they record will have a block and lot number.
  - Matt A. said that not all do – the government owned properties don't have block and lot numbers. And asked if all have site numbers.
  - Carl H. said that all lot and blocks have subdivision names.
  - Jim C. stated that they should just be aware of the problem and deal with exceptions as they arise.

- Carl H. shows the group a map with lots and blocks for reference.

- Tom C. said they need to come up with a form that is standard.

- Carl H. and Jim C. are going to confer about the standard for this project and talk to Herschel S. to create a common form.
    - Mark S. suggested that they put the form online so if there are mistakes that are found at a later date, they can just uncheck the box next to the incorrect data and thus fix the record.
    - Herschel S. said to create a form that will refer to every particular lot and block and asked if they will have a form that applies to the site.
    - Jim C. suggested that they create a list that is comprehensive enough to cover most (80%) of the patron's inquiries.
    - Herschel S. said there needs to be a generic idea of what happened at a particular site.

- Tom asked the group to have a form by the end of the month for the programmers to use when processing data.
    - Mark S. asked for the information as soon as possible for them to use when entering information for each site.
    - Herschel said they should get together on this soon to figure out what the programmers will need.
    - Jim C. said that he could have something together in a couple of weeks.

- Tom C. asked Jim C. to take the initiative on creating a form for the programmers to use when entering scanned data.
    - Jim C. needs clarification of archeological sites – each site has many numbers associated with it. Asked that they prioritize the sites and take the harder sites first.

- There is a discussion of the more complicated sites – they should sample the projects to be sure they have a good sampling. They need to make a list of items that they don't want to miss for this project (the smaller sites).
    - John N. said they have the big sites but need the smaller ones – i.e. Native American sites.
    - MisCha said they have a site file of all that they've done at the center for St. Augustine - by zone in chronological order, when it was done, the order excavated, zone in the city and that it's a HUGE list.
    - Jim C. said that they could use a "list by zone" Excel spread sheet and asked Tom if all current sites from the city archeology could be processed after the Government House stuff had been scanned if there was time/money.
    - Tom said yes, that was part of the proposal.

- Herschel S. stated that once they get the check list done if he were to search for a list of structures (i.e. American territorial period) what would he get in his search.
    - Would the information he got be a list of sites? Could he point to one particular site in that resulting list to get something more specific?
    - MisCha stated that the patron would want to give as much information as possible to limit the results from any search.

- Herschel S. said that it should be a 2 step process – the patron should be able to enter the block and lot number to get an answer – he doesn't want to have to enter all the information for each site at first when searching.
- Mark S. said that could be an option. The more information you give in a search the more specific the results. He mentioned having a keyword search in the authority list.
- Herschel S. wanted to know what information would be obtained in a search and expressed his concern to the amount of material that could be returned from any search – it might be overwhelming.
- John N. asked the group to think about what the default will be.
- MisCha said that depends on the information entered into the search engine. The less you enter the more results one would get.
- Herschel S. stated again that he doesn't want too much information from each search at first.
- Tom C. said that the results list comes down to how the patron would conduct the search. Facilitated searches will give more specific results.
- Mark S. said that the search results should bring up the primary sites.
- Herschel S. reiterated that too many results can be overwhelming.
- Tom C. said that facets on the tech side of the search will help reduce the amount of return for each search.
- Herschel S. said they need to sit down and work on the form.

- Jim C. – most images in the collection are digital now. Once they go back to photos and slides, who enters the data?
  - Tom C. – Matt. A. will go back and enter the information.
  - Matt A. – if there is no information for something to be digitized – what should they do?
  - Jim C. – weed those out if there is no information listed.
  - John N. asked how many slides/photos are from the Government House.
  - Jim C. – there are between 10-20,000 slides.
  - John N. – is there itemized data for each slide?
  - Jim C. – yes.
  - John N. – so each slide has a unique description?
  - Carl H. – yes, each slide has a physical description and location and some are grouped by a particular site.
  - Matt A. – can we group by series?
  - Jim C. – the problem with grouping by series is that if someone needs something specific then there will have to be identifiers for each specific level for each item.
  - John N. – if you don't group then the search results will be enormous.
  - Jim C. – need to have each item listed so you'll know what you're looking at.

- Discussion about what level the search is going to include.
  - John N. and Mark S. - need to group by site and not each item – authority work is done once then each part is listed after the group is found for the search.
  - Jim C. – that's more work.
  - Carl H. – there is no master list.

    - Matt A. – what about a photo album? Does he pull out each item and scan it and list each one or the entire album?
    - John N. – the album is the item.
    - Mark S. – will email everyone to figure this out and get feedback in order to make a decision.

- Matt A. asked about whether or not images of human remains should be included in this project.
    - Carl H. said stay away from posting such images that there are moral issues.
    - Jim C. agrees.
    - Matt A. asked if items that had been published in the newspapers could be included.
    - Carl H. and Mark S. both agree that it's OK if the images were published but no personal images of human remains should be included in the project.
    - Tom C. said they would dark archive these.

- Herschel S. asked if there could be a sample of records on a laptop for the next meeting so they could have a sample of what was being scanned.
- Mark S. – can look at material.
- Carl H. – start working on a list.
- Herschel will confer with Carl H. to begin working on a list.
- Jim C. and John N. will look at historical sites to see how they were documented.

- Tom C. asked if they should augment the board – several names were introduced as potential candidates:
- Jim C. mentioned the Florida Anthropological Society that will be meeting this May – there is a poster session – perhaps the group should have a presence.
    - MisCha is on the board – it's hosted by the local chapter in St. Augustine this year (on May 10th 2013).
    - Tom C. will be at the Florida Trust.
- The board will meet again April 5th, 2013.