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Executive Summary
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California is home to one of the most diverse and expansive cultural collections in the world. These collections are spread across thousands of institutions who are the primary keepers of local and tribal history and art.

These entities serve as the state’s collective memory. Their collections capture the stories of our natural environment, societies, communities, and the events and people that shape them. They teach us. The incalculable value of these resources is widely known, drawing tourists, filmmakers, educators, researchers, and others from around the nation and world.

Despite all of this, the state has failed to make a coordinated and sustained effort to understand the nature and condition of its collections. While the general need for collection protection is known, questions remain around the extent and disposition of collecting institutions, the threats facing their collections, and the adequacy of their collection protection practices. This knowledge gap has limited the state’s ability to design and gain support for policies, programs, and investments to ensure its collections remain protected and accessible.

The need for action has never been more important as the state and its collections face significant risk from natural disasters exacerbated by climate change, inadequate storage facilities, scarce resources, and simple decay over time.

In 2020, the California State Library and its cultural heritage partners embarked on the California Cultural Collections Protection Survey to answer this call-to-action.

The survey marks an important milestone in improving the state’s understanding of its collections and, with it, a first step in better protecting its cultural touchstones. The survey aimed to identify and learn more about the state’s collecting institutions and their holdings, establish a coalition of organizations with a common interest, and develop the tools and framework needed to meet its immediate and long-term objectives.

At the same time, the State Library coordinated a parallel effort to assess the preservation readiness of institutions throughout the state to gain an “on-the-ground”
perspective to help inform the statewide survey results through individual case studies. Assessments were done for nearly 20 individual organizations stewarding various types of cultural heritage collections.

The following report offers a high-level summary of the initial findings from the California Cultural Collections Protection Survey. It is organized into sections that align with each of the project’s five overarching research questions, followed by a series of recommendations for consideration. The state will use the resulting data to perform additional and more granular analysis and gain further insight into its collections, collecting institutions, and their needs.

**Research, Approach & Methodology**

The California Cultural Collections Protection Survey was developed by the State Library in coordination with an advisory task force representing diverse sectors of collecting institutions. Data was collected on the tangible cultural collections of non-profit and government organizations physically located in California. The 2014 Institute of Museum and Library Services Heritage Health Information Survey served as a model upon which to base the survey and allows for a comparison of California and national data.

Survey participants were asked to answer between 70 to 120 questions aimed at learning more about the current state of California’s cultural heritage collections and the extent to which collecting institutions prioritized, planned for, and resourced collection protection.

The survey was conducted online from November 2020 through February 2021. While difficult to confirm the extent of its impact, the coinciding pandemic and wildfires appeared to suppress survey participation.

Ultimately, 455 institutions participated in the survey. Based on research performed in preparation for the survey, it is estimated there are as many as 4,000 non-profit and public-serving collecting institutions in California. Nevertheless, the breadth of responses gives the state confidence that the survey data provide insight into the general status of cultural heritage protection in California. To facilitate this high-level analysis, participating institutions were grouped by type and size.

**Participating Institutions by Size & Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Archives</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Museums</th>
<th>Scientific Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California's Cultural Heritage Landscape

The main driver of the survey was to help the state better understand the nature and current state of its tangible cultural heritage collections. The short answer is that California’s collections are voluminous, take many forms, and are in significant need of space, resources, and training to ensure their protection and public access.

The 455 participating institutions reported holdings of over 240 million material objects, including physical and born-digital artifacts. Archival materials alone account for more than 115 million items, followed by scientific collections at 65 million. Libraries hold the most born-digital collections of all the institution types.

Of note, unbound sheets, which make up the largest amount of artifact type, can be challenging from a protection perspective. Though large institutions comprise only a quarter of survey respondents, they account for nearly 90 percent of the materials reported.

According to the survey data, California collecting institutions of all types and sizes do not have adequate storage capacity or the furniture and equipment to meet the needs of their collections.

Approximately 22 percent of surveyed institutions report being over capacity. Another 57 percent are close to capacity. Archives have the most urgent storage needs, while scientific collections show the greatest need, including a near-universal lack of appropriate furniture or equipment to store collections not on display.

Overall, 70 percent of respondents report needing similar upgrades to storage furniture or equipment.

Of the institutions surveyed, 29 percent report experiencing damage or loss to their holdings in the past two years. Almost 60 percent of scientific collections report loss, followed by museums at 35 percent. Of those organizations reporting loss, 77 percent say the two most common causes of damage and loss are improper storage conditions and handling. Other significant causes are water/moisture damage (74 percent) and pests (66 percent) -- both of which may be predicated on or exacerbated by improper storage conditions.

Collection Protection Priorities

The survey asked participants a series of questions to understand what security and environmental controls are in place to protect against the threats identified above.

Apart from relative humidity, more than half of surveyed organizations control for security, temperature and light levels within some or all their exhibitions and on-site and off-site storage spaces – a rate slightly above national averages.

Historical and cultural societies are at the lower level of the range while museums and scientific collections tend toward higher levels of coverage of security and environmental controls.
However, all California collecting institutions lag their national counterparts in performing key activities associated with collection protection. California’s collections appear to be in much greater need of intellectual control such as cataloguing, inventorying and finding aids than national averages. Further, these collections appear in much greater need of conservation treatment than the national averages, particularly those residing within historical societies or similar organizations. Of note, scientific collections report the highest needs in all but two categories.

Preservation & Emergency Planning

An evaluation of institutional preservation planning rates reveals a pattern consistent with the findings cited in earlier sections of this report:

California collecting institutions have significant preservation planning weaknesses, both overall and relative to national data.

According to survey data, the vast majority of institutions (84 percent) lack a written, long-range preservation plan, regardless of institution type and size. Furthermore, only one-third of those institutions with a plan keep it updated every five years.

The one exception is that California institutions appear to include conservation and preservation in their annual budgets at a rate higher than the national average.

Half of surveyed institutions report performing general condition assessments and emergency plans, leaving significant room for improvement.

Collection digitization is one area of particular note. California’s collection digitization efforts lag behind the rest of the country. Given California’s reputation for creativity and technological sophistication, these data are discouraging and speak to a need for training and tools to enhance institutions’ awareness of the value of data preservation and the special concerns relative to born-digital collections.

Assigning Preservation Priorities

The survey asked respondents about how they staff their ongoing preservation activities. Data indicate that most institutions lack in-house or contracted conservation support. However, more than half of respondents report staffing their preventative conservation and preservation management roles. This suggests there is a general awareness across institutions of the importance of a proactive approach to protecting collections, though the data do not provide detail on the actual investments and staff resources allocated to these activities. There appears to be no relationship between staffing and those institutions that experienced damage or loss within the past two years.

Themes & Eras

California’s institutions and collections are as diverse as its population. The survey asked respondents to identify the minor and major themes defining their collections, including specific ethnic histories and cultures. Respondents were also able
to provide any additional themes not offered by this list in a follow-up question, and provide tribal affiliation details, when appropriate.

Responses demonstrate no trends, but rather describe a number of unique responses that will be useful to researchers in the future. At a minimum, the findings indicate the richness of the materials that are threatened with damage or loss.

Similarly, respondents were asked to describe what eras are represented in their collections. Generally, the institutions surveyed are far more likely to have collections that focus on California post-statehood, though very few are solely dedicated to only one or two of the identified eras.

Call-to-Action

The state may wish to consider seeking additional input from cultural heritage entities in a post pandemic environment to augment these findings.

But based on initial findings, it is clear much can – and must -- be done to better protect California’s cultural collections and mitigate the risks identified by the survey.

Among the actions the state should consider taking now:

- Provide ongoing assistance to local institutions in conducting collection assessment, developing disaster preparedness strategies, and establishing emergency protocols.

- Improve preservation and emergency planning through direct assistance, training, and “toolkits.”

- Develop more opportunities for preservation-quality digitization of collection items.

- Assist in ensuring collection storage and exhibition areas meet quality environmental standards.

- Support training for staff to monitor environmental conditions and maintain collection inventory and documentation.

- Promote appropriate collection handling techniques.

- Invest in training in management of digital records as well as born digital material’s unique preservation requirements.

- Target historical and cultural societies and scientific collections for support.

- Partner with libraries and across institution types to leverage strengths, capabilities, and knowledge resources.
Introduction
INTRODUCTION

As smoke clouds gathered above the Town of Paradise one November morning, a curator setting up a new exhibit at the Golden Nugget Museum was forced to flee and leave the collection behind.

Within an hour, the community-funded and volunteer-run museum was burned to the ground. There is no surviving inventory of the museum’s contents.¹

According to reports, the wildfire that devastated the town destroyed 95 percent of its historical artifacts. Such natural disasters, exacerbated by climate change, pose an increasing threat to California’s communities and their artistic and cultural collections.²

Meanwhile, cultural collections held by institutions ranging from archives to zoos are falling victim to the less conspicuous but just as existential threats posed by time and environmental conditions. Citing combinations of inadequate storage, funding, and staffing, countless organizations have similar stories about the most significant threats facing their collections. Risks that could be mitigated with improved resources and education.

Unfortunately, many of these threats have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, as collecting institutions have been forced to close and lose critical financial

---

and staff resources — particularly public benefit organizations and those in small and rural communities already considered most at-risk.³

In response to these mounting threats, in 2020, the California State Library and its cultural heritage partners embarked on the California Cultural Collections Protection Survey. The survey marks an important milestone in improving the State’s understanding the nature, condition, and preservation needs of the collections across its many museums, libraries, archives, historical societies, and scientific institutions.

At the time of the survey, the state lacked a centralized database of collecting institutions and had little insight into their holdings, conditions, and challenges. The lack of data has hampered efforts to educate decision-makers on the need for and value of investing resources in the protection of arts and cultural heritage.

The Cultural Collections Protection Survey represents the first step in establishing such a framework and dataset. This report provides high level findings that support a call to action.

In total, 455 collecting institutions participated in the survey, representing a wide range of organization types and sizes. Research done in preparation for the survey suggests there are at least 4,000 collecting institutions across the state, though outreach efforts and survey participation appeared to be hindered by closures and other pandemic-related challenges. These institutions include archives, historical and cultural societies, libraries, museums, tribal nations and scientific collections of all types, sizes, and holdings.

The survey was based generally on the 2014 Institute of Museum and Library Services Heritage Health Information Survey and Report, which should facilitate the comparison of state and national data.

Survey participants were asked to answer between 70 to 120 questions depending on the nature of their collections and responses. Each of these questions aligned with one of the following five overarching research questions (RQs) that help organize this report:

- **RQ1:** What is the current state of tangible cultural heritage collections?
- **RQ2:** To what extent have institutions prioritized collection protection?
- **RQ3:** To what extent have institutions developed emergency plans to protect collections?
- **RQ4:** To what extent have institutions assigned staff responsibilities in caring for collections?
- **RQ5:** What is the nature of these collections, in terms of intellectual content? What time eras and themes are represented in these collections? What stories can they tell?

The responses received and summarized in this report provide a snapshot of the state of California’s collections in late 2020 and early 2021. The data provides valuable new

---

information on collections and conditions that can support more informed policymaking, as well as serve as a baseline against which to measure progress.

At the same time, the survey represents just the beginning of a long-overdue effort by the state to better understand, connect, and protect its rich and diverse cultural heritage assets. For the data to continue to hold value, the State Library and its partners should continue to update and expand upon it in the future.

Looking ahead, the State Library and other researchers can now use the survey data to gain new insights into the nature and state of California’s collections. In the long-term, this effort should further evolve into what the State Library hopes will be a robust protection and sharing program akin to a cultural Heritage Census.
Research, Approach & Methodology
RESEARCH, APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

Scope

The survey was developed in close coordination with the California State Library and project Advisory Task Force representing diverse sectors of collecting institutions. Following a series of in-depth discussions and workshops, a Survey Requirements Document was developed and approved to delineate the breadth and scope of the project (see Appendix A). It was determined that the survey would focus on those institutions that met the following criteria:

- They were physically located in California,
- They held tangible cultural heritage collections, and
- They were a non-profit, 501(c)3, or government organization.4

During the scoping phase, the 2014 Institute of Museum and Library Services Heritage Health Information Survey and associated report5 was identified as a model upon which to base the survey, and one that would allow for a comparison of California and national data. The survey, user’s guide, and glossary were then developed and pretested three times – by the State Library, the Advisory Task Force, and a sample of collecting institutions – and refined prior to release.

Research Questions

In addition to building an initial dataset for the state to document heritage collections, four primary research questions were established following conversations with the California State Library, the project Advisory Task Force and a review of the 2014 national Heritage Health Information Survey. Research Question #5 was separately added upon the request of the State Library to probe into contents of the collections more deeply.

---

4 For the purposes of this survey, responses from libraries were requested at the library system level to avoid duplicative, uneven, and inconsistent reporting across individual branches.
1. What is the nature and current state of tangible cultural heritage collections? What entities hold cultural heritage objects within the state and what is the nature of those collections? What is the size and scope of the material and what are the threats to their safety and preservation?

2. To what extent have institutions prioritized collection protection? What are the significant issues and problems?

3. To what extent have institutions developed emergency plans to protect collections?

4. To what extent have institutions assigned staff responsibilities in caring for collections?

5. What is the nature of these collections, in terms of intellectual content? What time eras and themes are represented in these collections? What stories can they tell?

Outreach & Registration

The survey was conducted online between November 1, 2020 and February 28, 2021. The extended timeframe was provided to allow increased awareness and participation given the obstacles presented by the pandemic, which forced the temporary and permanent closure of many institutions across the state, as well as coinciding wildfires and significant national events. While difficult to confirm its extent, this environment appeared to suppress survey participation. This period allowed for increased outreach to hard-to-reach organizations, which was required in the absence of a statewide database of collecting institutions.

Coordinated outreach efforts included having advisory task force entities promote participation via email and social media, followed by targeted outreach to individual collecting organizations. To build the database of collecting institutions, the survey included a registration process to collect and vet participant contact information and prevent duplicate entries. Once an entity registered, it received a unique link to the survey that allowed for survey re-entry and for multiple staff members to enter data on its behalf.

Participation

Of the 617 unique entities that registered for the survey, 455 entities (74 percent) participated in the California Cultural Collections Protection Survey. Based on research performed in preparation for the survey, it is estimated there are more than 4,000 non-profit and public serving collecting institutions in California. To put this into context, the

---

6 The sample size (n) of each question is included throughout the report and may vary between questions because participants were not required to provide answers to all survey questions.

7 This initial estimate is based on a combination of various lists of non-profit and public institutions likely to hold cultural collections. Sources include the Institute of Museums and Library Services, The Official Museum Directory, California Arts Council, California State Library, California
number of entities that participated in this survey is about one-quarter of the 1,714 participants in the 2014 Institute of Museum and Library Services survey, which was used to extrapolate findings to over 31,000 collecting institutions across the country. This gives us confidence that the survey data in this report can provide insight into the general state of cultural heritage protection in California.

Table 1, Sample Description, below, describes the characteristics of the participating institutions, based on the size and type groupings used in the national Heritage Health Information Survey (see Table 2, Heritage Health Information Survey Institutional Definitions). For the purposes of this report, responses were often analyzed using Heritage Health Information Survey definitions to facilitate data comparison. Further, these groupings provided a useful way to present survey results of an otherwise very broad range of institutions.

Table 1, Sample Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Archives</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Museums</th>
<th>Scientific Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis & Reporting

This report summarizes top level findings from the survey data based on the five research questions listed below. The State Library and other researchers can use the entire survey dataset to identify additional connections and correlations and further its understanding of the nature and condition of cultural collections across the state. In addition, the State Library now has a developed survey instrument, baseline data, a better understanding of the nature of state collecting institutions, and the beginnings of a database of institutions to build upon.

Department of Parks and Recreation, California Historical Society, California Association of Museums, and tribal directories. Actual numbers may vary significantly from these lists as many organizations may not be included and survey outreach efforts were not able to confirm the status or holdings of listed institutions.
### Table 2, IMLS Heritage Health Information Survey Institutional Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archives</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>&lt; 1,000</td>
<td>1,000 - 4,999</td>
<td>&gt; 5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear Feet, Unbound Sheets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Societies (historic societies, cultural/tribal centers)</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Societies</td>
<td>&lt; $500,000</td>
<td>$350,000 - $1,500,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries (academic libraries, public libraries, independent research libraries, and special libraries)</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic &amp; Research Libraries</td>
<td>&lt; 250,000</td>
<td>250,000 - 1,499,999</td>
<td>&gt; 1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Volume Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>&lt; 25,000</td>
<td>25,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>&gt; 99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museums (art museums, youth centers, general museums, historic houses, history museums, and specialized museums)</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>4 - 10</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time Paid Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Specialized Museums</td>
<td>&lt; $500,000</td>
<td>$500,000 - $1,500,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Children Museums</td>
<td>&lt; $300,000</td>
<td>$300,000 - $1,500,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Collections (arboretums, archaeological, natural history, parks, planetariums, observatories, scientific research, zoos, tech museums)</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td>&lt; $300,000</td>
<td>$300,000 - $1,500,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History Museums</td>
<td>&lt; $350,000</td>
<td>$350,000 - $1,500,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Centers</td>
<td>&lt; $350,000</td>
<td>$350,000 - $1,200,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Tech Museums</td>
<td>&lt; $1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000 - $7,500,000</td>
<td>&gt; $7,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: When an entity neglected to complete size related questions, researchers used online data to assign the entity to a size category.

---

Research Question 1: California’s Cultural Heritage Landscape
RESEARCH QUESTION 1: CALIFORNIA’S CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE

Research Question 1: What is the nature and current state of tangible cultural heritage collections? What entities hold cultural heritage objects within the state and what is the nature of those collections? What is the size and scope of the materials and what are the threats to their safety and preservation?

Collection Types by Institution Type

Table 3, Collections Type by Institution Type, on the next page, indicates the overall scope of the collections surveyed.

- The total number of material objects represented in this survey is 240,690,574 from the total 455 institutions participating in the survey.
- Of the total, archival materials represent the single largest category of individual material items surveyed at more than 115 million individual items.
- At just under 66 million individual objects, scientific collections is next highest in total volume. These include large volumes of archeological materials, natural science specimens and historical and ethnographic materials.
- Libraries and museums comprise the next tier of material holdings at 30 million and 24 million individual items, respectively.
- Historical and cultural societies hold approximately 5 million individual items.
Table 3, Collections Type by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collection &amp; Measurement Unit</th>
<th>Total (n=434)</th>
<th>Archives (n=50)</th>
<th>Libraries (n=131)</th>
<th>Museums (n=165)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n=28)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Societies (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unbound Sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of items</td>
<td>131,309,667</td>
<td>103,653,921</td>
<td>12,502,126</td>
<td>12,428,217</td>
<td>458,751</td>
<td>2,266,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubic feet</td>
<td>19,288</td>
<td>18,565</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear feet</td>
<td>33,415</td>
<td>20,125</td>
<td>10,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually catalogued</td>
<td>3,077,263</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>293,920</td>
<td>2,717,200</td>
<td>65,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk catalogued</td>
<td>3,135,099</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>348,013</td>
<td>2,725,567</td>
<td>61,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book/bound volumes</td>
<td>10,766,233</td>
<td>210,666</td>
<td>8,997,497</td>
<td>1,177,717</td>
<td>245,020</td>
<td>135,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic</td>
<td>24,373,878</td>
<td>11,154,935</td>
<td>5,408,546</td>
<td>4,836,169</td>
<td>509,259</td>
<td>2,070,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving image</td>
<td>243,734</td>
<td>29,536</td>
<td>131,118</td>
<td>75,408</td>
<td>4,894</td>
<td>2,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded sound</td>
<td>159,054</td>
<td>16,122</td>
<td>103,932</td>
<td>21,796</td>
<td>12,640</td>
<td>4,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art objects</td>
<td>607,363</td>
<td>165,923</td>
<td>13,781</td>
<td>410,573</td>
<td>6,679</td>
<td>10,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and ethnographic</td>
<td>3,352,092</td>
<td>34,581</td>
<td>21,409</td>
<td>1,786,789</td>
<td>1,233,579</td>
<td>275,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science specimens</td>
<td>59,809,460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2,111,875</td>
<td>57,696,405</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born-Digital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of items</td>
<td>3,856,731</td>
<td>52,975</td>
<td>2,968,114</td>
<td>458,243</td>
<td>100,540</td>
<td>276,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigabytes of storage</td>
<td>57,670</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>42,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>240,690,574</td>
<td>115,714,155</td>
<td>30,146,800</td>
<td>23,948,720</td>
<td>65,710,534</td>
<td>5,170,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Collection types are defined in the Survey Glossary (Appendix A) and User’s Guide (Appendix B)

Collection Items by Type & Entity Size

Figure 1, Percent of Total Collections by Collection Type, below, illustrates the clear proportions of the collections surveyed by type as noted above. **55 percent of the collections surveyed were comprised of “unbound sheets” of material; 25 percent of “natural science specimens”; 10 percent of “photograph collections”** and single digit categories of all other surveyed materials (books, archaeological, and “other”). Libraries were the clear leaders with respect to born-digital collections. The prevalence of “unbound sheets” in the overall collections mix is of interest, as many materials that are present in this form tend to be of an ephemeral nature – newspapers, posters, tear sheets, letters or other paper materials – which can be challenging from a preservation perspective.

As depicted in Figure 2, Percent of Total Collections Surveyed by Entity Size, **nearly 90 percent of the material referenced by survey participants was held by “large” entities/organizations**, which represented only one-quarter of the organizations responding to the question. That most of the material is held by “large” institutions can be seen as a positive from the standpoint that their collections are likely safer from
threat, as larger institutions tend to have more resources available to devote to protection. While the relatively low relative percentage of holdings from small and medium institutions is noteworthy, these institutions may be underrepresented due to the difficult times during which the survey was executed. Larger institutions were more likely to have staff working during the pandemic, which may have made them more likely to complete the survey. While the true impact of this on survey participation is difficult to know, it is important to acknowledge.

*Figure 1, Percent of Total Collections by Collection Type*

Note: Unbound sheets shown here do not include collections measured in linear or cubic feet. “Other” includes Moving Images (.10 percent), Recorded Sound (.07 percent), Art Objects (.25 percent), Historic and Ethnographic (1.39 percent), and Born Digital (1.60 percent) items.
Collection Storage Capacity by Institution Type

As shown in Table 4, Collecting and Storage Capacity by Institution Type, the survey queried institutions on their current storage capacity and future needs. In addition, institutions were asked about the related need for additional storage furniture and equipment to ensure the care of those items not on display.

Table 4, Collecting and Storage Capacity by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Storage</th>
<th>Total (n434)</th>
<th>Historic &amp; Cultural Societies (n60)</th>
<th>Archives (n50)</th>
<th>Libraries (n131)</th>
<th>Museums (n165)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have space left to collect</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to collecting capacity</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average estimated years of collecting space remaining</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently over capacity</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average additional square feet required to bring to capacity</td>
<td>11,695</td>
<td>3,786</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>4,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In need of additional storage furniture or equipment for units of collection not currently on display?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n406)</th>
<th>Archive (n49)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n59)</th>
<th>Libraries (n125)</th>
<th>Museums (n150)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data reveal that:

- **22 percent of respondent institutions in California are currently over capacity and another 57 percent are close to reaching their collecting capacity.** It is not clear if this means that entities require additional physical space or whether improved storage equipment and furniture could meet additional storage needs.

- Archives report needing the greatest increase in storage space on a per square foot basis and have the shortest timeline in years of collecting space before requiring additional space to meet growth demands.

- Of those institutions with collecting space available, museums reported the longest time remaining during which they can continue to adequately house collected materials.

- The scientific collections surveyed reported having the least space left to collect (14 percent) and most likely to be close to (61 percent) or over (25 percent) collecting capacity. Nearly all (96 percent) of these institutions reported needing additional storage furniture or equipment to store collections not currently on display, a rate that exceeded the other institution types by 20 percent to 40 percent.

- 70 percent of respondent institutions are in need of upgrades to storage furniture or equipment for their collections.

**Collection Damage & Threats**

The series of survey questions on damage and threats to California’s cultural heritage collections revealed some of the more interesting and actionable findings. Survey participants were asked if they had experienced collection damage or loss in the past two years. Table 5, Reported Damage or Loss in Past Two Years by Institution Type, provides a breakdown of their responses by institution type. Notably, **29 percent of surveyed entities reported experiencing damage or loss to their holdings in the past two years. Scientific Collections and Museums and reported the highest incidence of damage within the last two years at 57 percent and 35 percent, respectively.**

**Table 5, Reported Damage or Loss in Past Two Years by Institution Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of institutions that reported damage/loss within the past two years</th>
<th>Total (n406)</th>
<th>Archive (n49)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n59)</th>
<th>Libraries (n125)</th>
<th>Museums (n150)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those institutions that reported experiencing damage or loss were then asked to identify the cause of that damage, with the ability to select all applicable causes. The results of this question are summarized in Table 6, Reported Damage/Loss by Cause, on the next page. Among the institutions surveyed, the two most common causes of damage and loss to California’s cultural heritage collections over the last two years is improper storage conditions and handling, both accounting for the damage experienced at 77 percent of surveyed institutions.

Other significant causes include water/moisture damage (74 percent) and pests (66 percent), both of which may be predicated on or exacerbated by improper storage conditions.

Also noteworthy is that museums experienced significantly higher levels of vandalism (75 percent) in comparison to other institutional types, perhaps reflecting that parts of their collections may be less secured in an outdoor environment or in a more porous operating environment. Scientific collections reported the highest level of damage by wildfire (54 percent) as well as several other categories of causes, relative to other institutional types.

Table 6, Reported Damage/Loss by Cause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Damage/Loss</th>
<th>Total (n118)</th>
<th>Archive (n12)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n12)</th>
<th>Libraries (n28)</th>
<th>Museums (n53)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Causes of Damage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Moisture</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airborne Particles</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pests</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Causes of Damage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Storage</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Treatments</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Causes of Damage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Natural Disaster</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All survey respondents, not just those that experienced damage or loss, were asked to identify what they perceive to be the greatest threat to their collection. The results are summarized in Figure 3, Greatest Perceived Threat by Threat Type, below. Improper storage was the highest perceived threat, which aligned with the data on actual
experience. Interestingly, the second most significant perceived threat was natural disasters, though data suggests that the true threat posed by natural disasters is significantly less. Floods, wildfires, and other natural disasters accounted for approximately 40 percent of experienced damage. “Handling” was at the top of experienced threats (77 percent), but widely perceived as a low threat (7 percent).

This data suggests not only that there is a gap between actual and perceived threats facing California collections, but that the biggest threats appear to be human-induced or environmental causes, rather than catastrophic events like earthquakes, wildfires, and floods. This is important insofar as there are relatively more opportunities for targeted resources and training to effectively mitigate threats posed by human-induced or environmental causes.

Figure 3, Greatest Perceived Threat by Threat Type

![Threat Type Chart]

*Note: Natural Disaster in this case includes wildfire, flood, earthquake, and other natural disasters.*

Recent Damage or Loss by Ethnic Group Significantly Represented in Collection

One area the state was particularly interested in was to understand if ethnically specific collections had experienced a higher incidence of damage or loss in the past two years. Table 7, Reported Damage/Loss in Past Two Years by Significantly Represented Ethnic Group shows that the approximately 20 percent of these organizations experienced loss, a lower rate than other the overall average of the surveyed group.

Table 7, Reported Damage/Loss in Past Two Years by Significantly Represented Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group Significantly Represented in Collection</th>
<th>Percent Experiencing Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Survey Respondents</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Only includes collection theme data for entities that answered “yes” to “Over the past 2 years, has your entity experienced any damage or loss to its collection?”
Research Question 2: Collection Protection Priorities
RESEARCH QUESTION 2: COLLECTION PROTECTION PRIORITIES

Research Question 2: To what extent have institutions prioritized collections protection? What are the significant issues and problems?

Environmental Controls & Preservation

Environmental controls, such as security systems, light, and temperature/humidity controls, are among the most basic and fundamental indicators of preservation investment. This section of the survey sought to understand the extent to which these preservation tools are being used by cultural institutions in daily practice. Figure 4, Environmental Controls, below, shows that most California organizations control for security, light levels, and temperature specifications within some or all their exhibitions and on-site and off-site storage spaces. Relative humidity is slightly less controlled, overall. This is slightly higher than the national levels as reported in the 2014 Heritage Health Information Survey. While better than national averages, 59 percent of surveyed organizations still do not control for relative humidity in any collection spaces.
Figure 4, Environmental Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls in Place</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Archive</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Museums</th>
<th>Scientific Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature Controls (n448)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humidity Controls (n442)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Control (n438)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security System (n412)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Security (n128)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Temperature, Humidity, and Light Levels (n448), Security System (n408).

Security & Environmental Controls by Institution Type

This section of the survey seeks to understand which institutional types have the least amount of monitoring and security controls for their collections. The data summarized in Table 8, Security and Environmental Controls by Institution Type indicate that Historical and Cultural Societies are at the lower level of the range while Museums and Scientific Collections tend toward higher levels of coverage of security and environmental controls. At the aggregate level, California, overall, performs slightly better than the national rate identified in the 2014 Heritage Health Information Survey, except for humidity control, which was similar to the national average.

The good news is that most organizations are aware of the need for and commitment to providing security and environmental stability to their collections — and that these institutions are knowledgeable about their own shortcomings and are striving to do better. The next section describes more completely the identification of specific preservation needs.

Table 8, Security and Environmental Controls by Institution Type
Preservation Needs by Institution Type

Table 9, Preservation Improvement Needs Cited by California Institutions by Type summarizes the data from respondent answers regarding their perceptions of their own preservation needs. The data reveals that:

- **General condition assessments and inventorying/cataloguing are the top two preservation needs when considering all institution types.** This need also relates directly to the issue of emergency preparedness — an institution needs to know its priority protocols for an evacuation or post-event mitigation.

- **Scientific collections reported the highest needs in every category, with the exception of reduction to light exposure and preservation of born-digital collections.**

- **California’s preservation needs for all institutions are higher across every category when compared to the needs cited nationally.**

- California’s collections are in much greater need of intellectual control such as cataloguing, inventorying and finding aids than national averages.

- California’s collections are in much greater need of conservation treatment than the national averages, particularly those residing within historical societies or similar organizations.
Table 9, Preservation Improvement Needs Cited by California Institutions by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation Needed</th>
<th>All Inst. Nationally (HHIS)</th>
<th>All Inst. California</th>
<th>Archive</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Scientific Collection</th>
<th>Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General condition assessments</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventorying</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloguing of collections</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental controls</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of digitized collections</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation treatment (include specimen preparation)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Aids</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of born-digital collections</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security systems</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in light exposure to collections</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated pest management</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "N/A" indicates not asked by IMLS HHIS survey and "*" indicates combined as single item in HHIS; n393.

Commitment to Conservation/Preservation

Each institution’s dedication to conservation and preservation was evaluated based on the conservation and preservation activities and planning in which they reported participating. Their commitment was defined, and then evaluated, as depicted in Table 10, Organizational Commitment to Conservation and Preservation Definitions, below.

Table 10, Organizational Commitment to Conservation and Preservation Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Strongest Commitment</th>
<th>Partial Commitment</th>
<th>Weakest Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition Assessment</td>
<td>An assessment of the entire collection has been completed and it is regularly updated every five years.</td>
<td>A general condition assessment of institution’s collections has been done</td>
<td>No condition assessment reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Written Plan</td>
<td>There is a preservation plan that has a regularly scheduled update.</td>
<td>Institution has a formal written long-range preservation plan for care of its collections.</td>
<td>No plan reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11, Organizational Commitment to Conservation and Preservation, California vs. Nation, below, reveals a pattern consistent with the findings cited in earlier sections of this report: that **California collecting institutions have significant preservation planning weaknesses** — both overall and relative to national Heritage Health Information Survey data.

**Table 11, Organizational Commitment to Conservation and Preservation, California vs. Nation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Commitment</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>National (HHIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition Assessment (n412)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongest Commitment</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Commitment</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakest Commitment</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Written Plan (n414)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongest Commitment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Commitment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakest Commitment</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Includes Conservation/Preservation (n387)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongest Commitment</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Commitment</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakest Commitment</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: HHIS used slightly different questions to measure level of commitment in the category of budget.*

These data reveal:

- **Overall, few institutions show a strong commitment to conservation and preservation, as measured by these criteria.**
- California’s condition assessment rates are relatively in line with national Heritage Health Information Survey results, but California institutions appear to have a higher commitment to budgeting for conservation and preservation that their national counterparts.
- The areas of conservation and preservation in which institutions reported the weakest commitment have little to do with physical infrastructure allowing some major needs to be addressed by investing in professional development (with respect to the needs articulated in Table 9 – several of which are directly related to knowledge and expertise) and in sharing planning expertise and resources with institutions to support their preservation and emergency planning.
Research Question 3: Preservation & Emergency Planning
RESEARCH QUESTION 3: PRESERVATION & EMERGENCY PLANNING

Research Question 3: To what extent have institutions prioritized collections protection? What are the significant issues and problems?

Preservation Planning Activities by Institution Type

This section of the survey sought to understand the range and extent of collection protection planning that institutions have undertaken and learn more about how frequently they are updated.

Table 12, Presence of a Formal Written Long-Range Preservation Plan by Institution Type shows the vast majority (84 percent) of survey respondents lack a written, long-range preservation plan in their preservation toolkit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total (n414)</th>
<th>Archive (n50)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n60)</th>
<th>Libraries (n124)</th>
<th>Museums (n153)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 12, Presence of a Formal Written Long-Range Preservation Plan by Institution Type, Table 13, Preservation Plan by Institution Size, below, the size of the institution did not have a significant impact on the likelihood of a long-range preservation plan. Across the board, less than 20 percent of institutions in each size range had preservation plans in place.

**Table 13, Preservation Plan by Institution Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Small (n246)</th>
<th>Medium (n93)</th>
<th>Large (n116)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14, Preservation Plan Status by Institution Types shows that, of those institutions with a formal, written long-range plan, there is a mixed record of consistent updating. Most institutions responding to this question are aware of the need to update the plan or at least link it to other planning resources. At the most fundamental level, Californian collecting entities’ attitudes towards and prioritization of preservation planning and activities underlie improving the state of preservation of an institution’s collections. Following a commitment to prioritizing these efforts, important work can be completed without significant financial investments other than staff time.

**Table 14, Preservation Plan Status by Institution Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Preservation Plan</th>
<th>Total  (n67)</th>
<th>Archive (n11)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n8)</th>
<th>Libraries (n13)</th>
<th>Museums (n29)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My entity has a preservation plan that is updated regularly (at least every five years).</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My entity has a preservation plan, but it is not updated regularly.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My entity includes preservation in other planning documents</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My entity is developing a preservation plan</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, there is little difference across type of institution for the presence or absence of a preservation plan. The data in Figure 6, Preservation Planning Activities by Institution Type, below, makes it clear that there is an across-the-board need for collecting institutions in California to better understand and apply preservation planning processes to safeguard their collections for the future.

A preservation plan is a critical part of the overall collections policy and planning documents that codify an institution’s intentions and approach with respect to caring for their holdings in public trust. It reflects the institution’s commitment to its fiduciary responsibility as a public benefit organization, ensuring that materials collected will be cared for in accordance with professional standards “in perpetuity.”
Figure 6, Preservation Planning Activities by Institution Type

Collections Assessment, Records & Emergency Disaster Plans

In this section of the survey, questions were asked about the institution’s assessment of its collections and whether it has an emergency preparedness plan. We have also included responses to questions about the state of collections documentation, both to understand the relationship between available collections information and disaster preparedness, as well as ability to share information publicly. The results are in Table 15, General Assessment Status by Institution Type.
### Table 15, General Assessment Status by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total (n412)</th>
<th>Archive (n49)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n60)</th>
<th>Libraries (n125)</th>
<th>Museums (n152)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data above indicate an even proportion of institutions which have and have not completed general condition assessments of their collections. Generally, archives, museums and scientific collections were more likely to have completed condition assessments. Libraries and historical and cultural societies were less likely to have completed condition assessments.

Table 16, Nature of the General Assessment by Institution Type shows that, of those institutions that had performed a general assessment of the collection, only 44 percent of these assessments were of the entire collection, and three quarters of all assessments (partial and complete) were not being updated regularly every five years.

### Table 16, Nature of the General Assessment by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Characteristics</th>
<th>Total (n206)</th>
<th>Archive (n35)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n19)</th>
<th>Libraries (n54)</th>
<th>Museums (n81)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of only a portion of the collection was completed, and it is regularly updated at least once every five years</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of only a portion of the collection was completed, but it is not updated regularly</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We completed an assessment of the entire collection, but it is not updated regularly</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We completed an assessment of the entire collection, and it is regularly updated at least once every five years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collections Records & Status of Digitization

Related to collection assessment is the extent to which a collection is documented — a critical step to understanding what is held by an institution and what it needs to plan for. The extent to which collected materials are documented and adequately cared for is often connected to collections digitization (since materials are examined in order for them to be photographed and their records digitized).

In the 2019 Heritage Health Information Survey, the top preservation planning need identified was “finding aids/catalogue.” As the data in Table 16 and Figure 7, Percentage of Collection Catalogued by Institution Type, indicate that half of all reporting institutions estimate that they have catalogued more than 60 percent of their collections. Libraries, museums, and scientific collections lead in catalogue completion as compared to historical and cultural societies. Archives report at the higher end of the scale, with 47 percent reporting catalogue completion of more than 60 percent of their collections.

*Table 17, Percentage of Collection Catalogued by Institution Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Collection Catalogued</th>
<th>Total (n390)</th>
<th>Archive (n47)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Societies (n59)</th>
<th>Libraries (n120)</th>
<th>Museums (n143)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7, Percentage of Collection Catalogued by Institution Type*
Generally, California entities are working to digitize their collections. Of the institutions surveyed, 26 percent reported having digitized more than 80 percent of their collection, and 51 percent of those records contain images. Only 47 percent of digitized records contain the necessary accompanying metadata, which indicates a significant opportunity for growth and improvement. It is important to note that these numbers are slightly lower than the 2014 Heritage Health Information Survey responses, in which two-thirds of institutions reported being involved in collection digitization activities. Compared to the national Heritage Health Information Survey, California’s collection digitization efforts lag behind the rest of the country.

Figure 8. Status of Digitization Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digitization Efforts</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your entity make its catalogue available online?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the next 2 years, does your entity plan to make its collection available to be searched online by the public?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The question “Does your entity make its catalogue available online?” received 363 responses, while the question “Over the next 2 years […]” received 187 responses.

The responses captured in Figure 8, Status of Digitization Efforts indicate that about half of the institutions surveyed make their collections available on-line, although the degree to which the entire collection is available is unspecified.

As another data point to assess digital collections preservation considerations, respondents were asked about the preservation planning activities that applied to their “born-digital” collections — collection items that exist as digital materials only and were created digitally. These results are depicted in Figure 9, Born-Digital Status, below.
The responses indicate that born-digital elements are not included in the preservation planning of 72 percent of respondents. These figures are significantly lower than those found by the Institute of Museum and Library Services’ Heritage Health Information Survey in which only 24 percent of respondents reported not currently undertaking activities to preserve born digital collections.

In California, a state renowned for creativity and technological sophistication, these data are discouraging and speak to a need for training and tools to enhance institutions’ awareness of the need for data preservation as it relates to digital born collections.

Executing a higher level of digitization overall is a step that many institutions can take to mitigate the risk of information loss if not material loss of collections – a digital record is better than no record if the original material is lost. This is an important consideration for the state as it explores ways to support the advancement of the preservation of California’s cultural collections.

Emergency/Disaster Planning

Table 18, Emergency/Disaster Planning by Institution Type, below, presents an overview of the state of emergency/disaster planning across institutional types. The Heritage Health Information Survey data indicate that California is challenged to the same extent as the rest of the country to create and maintain emergency/disaster plans. The data for “yes” and “no” are almost identical to results from the collection protection survey. A key finding of the national heritage survey data is that “In general, based on both main indicators of emergency preparedness (emergency disaster plans and collections records), small institutions were less likely than large/medium ones across all five types to be prepared for emergencies/disasters.”
Table 18, Emergency/Disaster Planning by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q&amp;A</th>
<th>Total (n411)</th>
<th>Archives (n49)</th>
<th>Libraries (n125)</th>
<th>Museums (n151)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n26)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Societies (n60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your entity have a written emergency/disaster plan that includes the collection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which best describes your entity’s written emergency/disaster plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing plan</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have plan that is updated at least every five years</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have plan but it is not updated regularly</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the appropriate local emergency organization incorporated your emergency needs into their plans?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Institution only included for n count if they responded to emergency/disaster plan question.

Collection assessment and cataloguing interface with emergency disaster planning in order to have a triage protocol for quickly removing key holdings to safer locations. Knowing what is in the collection, where the most important objects/materials are located, and their condition (to know their degree of fragility) is critical to successful evacuation. Without a clear understanding of the collection’s relative priorities, disaster planning is much less effective in a real emergency, when decisions must be made very quickly. According to data in Table 19, Emergency/Disaster Plan Status by Institution Type, Historical and Cultural societies seem to have the greatest need for prioritizing emergency planning. However, overall, fewer than half of the responding institutions have emergency plans that include their collections.

Table 19, Emergency/Disaster Plan Status by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total (n411)</th>
<th>Archive (n49)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n60)</th>
<th>Libraries (n125)</th>
<th>Museums (n151)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who had a written emergency disaster plan, most update it every five years (except for archives at 42 percent). The table below indicates that of those entities that have emergency plans in place, 56 percent keep them active and updated.
Table 20, Emergency/Disaster Plan Updates by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Updates</th>
<th>Total (n174)</th>
<th>Archive (n26)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n14)</th>
<th>Libraries (n56)</th>
<th>Museums (n62)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan updated regularly (at least every five years)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan not updated regularly</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently developing a plan</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21, Incorporation into Local Emergency Plan, below, shows that, of those institutions with emergency/disaster plans, only half have worked to have these plans incorporated into local emergency plans. Coordination with local emergency organizations provides an additional layer of protection and awareness of the existence and needs of the collection and simplifies disaster response for all parties. Archives and historical societies appear far less likely that libraries and museums to have taken this step.

Table 21, Incorporation into Local Emergency Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total (n170)</th>
<th>Archive (n24)</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Cultural Society (n14)</th>
<th>Libraries (n55)</th>
<th>Museums (n62)</th>
<th>Scientific Collections (n15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional preservation and emergency planning was also analyzed based on whether the institution had minor or significant collections related to select ethnic and societal subgroups. The data in Table 22, Commitment by Group Type Featured in Collection, below, show that the institutions with these select minor or significant themes experienced similarly low rates with regard to long-range and emergency planning.

Table 22, Commitment by Group Type Featured in Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respons e</th>
<th>African American (n176)</th>
<th>Native American (n254)</th>
<th>Latino (n248)</th>
<th>Asian American (n108)</th>
<th>Other indigenous, ethnic, or racial history and culture (n164)</th>
<th>LGTBO+ (n72)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your entity have a formal, written long-range preservation plan for the care of its collection?</td>
<td>Yes 19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your entity have a written emergency/disaster plan that includes the collection?</td>
<td>Yes 51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: As a clarifying example, 176 of the 455 entities reported “African American” as a minor or significant theme within their collection. 19 percent of those 176 reported having a formal, written long-range preservation plan for the care of its collection. Additionally, 51 percent of those 176 reported having a written emergency/disaster plan that included their collection.
Research Question 4: Assigning Preservation Responsibilities
RESEARCH QUESTION 4: ASSIGNING PRESERVATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Research Question 4: To what extent have institutions assigned staff responsibilities in caring for collections?

Staffing Preservation Activities

The survey asked respondents about how they staff their ongoing preservation activities. As shown in Table 23, Staffing Preservation Activities, below, the data indicate that most institutions lack in-house or contracted conservation support. However, more than half of respondents reported staffing their preventative conservation and preservation management roles. This suggests there is a general awareness across institutions of the importance of a proactive approach to protecting collections, though the data do not provide detail on the actual investments and staff resources allocated to these activities. Those areas in which institutions are not resourcing key preservation roles may reflect that the skills and tools needed to perform that work is out of reach for many institutions.

Table 23, Staffing Preservation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/Activity</th>
<th>In-House Staff Only</th>
<th>External Contractors Only</th>
<th>Both In-House Staff and External Contractors</th>
<th>No Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventive conservation</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation management</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation treatment</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation reformatting</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We investigated further to better understand if staff type had any impact on preventing loss. Of 116 entities that experienced damage or loss within the last two years:

- 32 percent reported either no conservation/preservation staff or only volunteer staff.
- 44 percent had some combination of paid conservation/preservation staff/professionals, and no volunteers whatsoever.
- 18 percent had only conservation/preservation staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation of audiovisual media and playback equipment</th>
<th>31%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Note: n401*
Research Question 5: Themes & Eras
RESEARCH QUESTION 5: THEMES & ERAS

Research Question 5: What is the nature of these collections, in terms of intellectual content? What time eras and themes are represented in these collections?

Collection Themes

California’s institutions and collections are as diverse as its population. The survey asked respondents to identify the minor and major themes defining their collections, including specific ethnic histories and cultures. Respondents were able to provide any additional themes not offered by this list in a follow-up question. Any respondents reporting holdings relating to Native Americans or other cultural groups received a follow-up question requesting more information. These themes and their extent are summarized in Figure 10, on the next page.

Table 24, Significant Themes by Level by Percentage of Total Collection by Institution Type, on page 33, summarizes the minor and significant collection themes by institution type. The table indicates percentage of theme (minor, significant or none) by entity as a percentage of the full sample. For example, libraries comprise 13 percent of all entities preserving African American History and Culture materials as a minor theme of its collection.

Institutions were also asked to describe “other” themes represented in their collection that were not listed in the survey to provide further insight. Three main themes emerged from “Others” listed: military history, very local history (town, city, county) and science & technology. The rest were unique responses such as local authors, COVID-19, or cannabis.

We also asked responding institutions to indicate whether their collections hold material related to Native American history and culture and, if known, what is the tribal affiliation of the Native American component of the collection. This field had 226 distinct responses. Many entries included multiple Native American Groups; the most frequently cited were Tongva (16), Chumash (12) and Ohlone (17). Other groups with multiple responses included Cahuilla, Kumeyaay, Luiseno, Miwok, Nisenan, Pomo, and Yokuts.
A final question zeroed in on collections that hold material related to another specific ethnic or racial history and culture (e.g., German, Croatian, Basque, Pacific Islander). The responses to this question demonstrated no trends, but rather described a number of unique responses that will be useful to researchers in the future.

Figure 10, Significant and Minor Collection Themes
### Table 24, Significant Themes by Level by Percentage of Total Collection by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Theme</th>
<th>Total (n358)</th>
<th>Library (n103)</th>
<th>Scientific Collection (n20)</th>
<th>Archive (n45)</th>
<th>Museum (n135)</th>
<th>Historical/Cultural Society (n55)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M N</td>
<td>S M N</td>
<td>S M N</td>
<td>S M N</td>
<td>S M N</td>
<td>S M N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American History &amp; Culture</td>
<td>9% 42% 51%</td>
<td>3% 13% 13%</td>
<td>1% 2% 4%</td>
<td>2% 6% 5%</td>
<td>1% 16% 20%</td>
<td>1% 6% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American History &amp; Culture</td>
<td>15% 47% 38%</td>
<td>5% 14% 10%</td>
<td>1% 1% 3%</td>
<td>2% 7% 4%</td>
<td>5% 18% 15%</td>
<td>2% 7% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino History &amp; Culture</td>
<td>25% 44% 32%</td>
<td>8% 15% 6%</td>
<td>2% 1% 3%</td>
<td>4% 5% 4%</td>
<td>8% 15% 15%</td>
<td>4% 8% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American History &amp; Culture</td>
<td>24% 46% 32%</td>
<td>6% 15% 8%</td>
<td>3% 2% 4%</td>
<td>1% 8% 4%</td>
<td>11% 14% 12%</td>
<td>4% 7% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indigenous, Ethnic, or Racial History</td>
<td>13% 33% 54%</td>
<td>3% 11% 14%</td>
<td>1% 1% 3%</td>
<td>2% 4% 7%</td>
<td>5% 12% 20%</td>
<td>2% 5% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Rights</td>
<td>6% 23% 73%</td>
<td>3% 8% 18%</td>
<td>0% 1% 5%</td>
<td>1% 5% 8%</td>
<td>1% 7% 30%</td>
<td>1% 2% 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American West: Settlement &amp; Immigration</td>
<td>49% 27% 22%</td>
<td>14% 8% 5%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
<td>6% 3% 3%</td>
<td>18% 9% 11%</td>
<td>9% 4% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>32% 37% 32%</td>
<td>7% 11% 10%</td>
<td>1% 1% 3%</td>
<td>4% 6% 4%</td>
<td>17% 11% 9%</td>
<td>3% 7% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts (Music, Theater, Dance)</td>
<td>14% 37% 48%</td>
<td>5% 11% 12%</td>
<td>0% 1% 5%</td>
<td>3% 5% 5%</td>
<td>4% 13% 21%</td>
<td>3% 7% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>25% 35% 40%</td>
<td>8% 12% 9%</td>
<td>1% 1% 4%</td>
<td>4% 4% 5%</td>
<td>9% 12% 16%</td>
<td>4% 5% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>15% 36% 48%</td>
<td>7% 12% 10%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
<td>1% 5% 6%</td>
<td>3% 12% 22%</td>
<td>2% 5% 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Social History</td>
<td>49% 34% 19%</td>
<td>15% 11% 4%</td>
<td>3% 1% 2%</td>
<td>10% 5% 3%</td>
<td>15% 13% 10%</td>
<td>9% 6% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>41% 32% 29%</td>
<td>13% 12% 4%</td>
<td>1% 2% 3%</td>
<td>5% 5% 5%</td>
<td>14% 9% 14%</td>
<td>7% 4% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>28% 37% 32%</td>
<td>9% 13% 6%</td>
<td>1% 2% 3%</td>
<td>4% 6% 5%</td>
<td>14% 11% 13%</td>
<td>4% 6% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography, Environment, &amp; Natural Science</td>
<td>26% 40% 33%</td>
<td>9% 13% 6%</td>
<td>3% 1% 1%</td>
<td>2% 5% 5%</td>
<td>28% 15% 15%</td>
<td>4% 6% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Industry</td>
<td>11% 30% 58%</td>
<td>3% 12% 13%</td>
<td>1% 1% 4%</td>
<td>1% 5% 7%</td>
<td>5% 9% 23%</td>
<td>2% 4% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Design</td>
<td>25% 40% 37%</td>
<td>7% 13% 9%</td>
<td>1% 1% 3%</td>
<td>4% 5% 4%</td>
<td>9% 16% 13%</td>
<td>4% 5% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Rush</td>
<td>17% 36% 48%</td>
<td>6% 12% 10%</td>
<td>1% 2% 4%</td>
<td>1% 4% 7%</td>
<td>6% 13% 19%</td>
<td>3% 4% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>7% 36% 58%</td>
<td>3% 12% 14%</td>
<td>0% 1% 4%</td>
<td>1% 5% 7%</td>
<td>2% 11% 25%</td>
<td>1% 7% 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection Eras

Similarly, we asked respondents to describe what eras are represented in their collections. Table 24, the final table in this section, presents the responses received by institutional type, prevalence, and era. Generally, the institutions surveyed are far more likely to have collections that focus on eras post-statehood, though very few are solely dedicated to only one or two of the identified eras.

Table 25, Collection Era by Percentage of Total Collection by Entity Type (Number of Entities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (n334)</td>
<td>0-19%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>0-19%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-39%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-79%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Collections</td>
<td>0-19%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>0-19%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-39%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Museums</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History and Cultural Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-19%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Anecdotes & Examples Available**

In addition to charting the time periods and themes of the collections, several narrative response questions invited participants to describe key objects and stories from each collection. The responses were not analyzed, but rather compiled for future reference and quotation. At a high level, these responses consisted of examples that provide support and context to the data in this report like which special artifact is now decaying in a box out of public view. These qualitative responses and ‘stories’ are likely to be most useful as illustrative anecdotes from the field for future publications, proposals, and research.
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CONCLUSIONS & CALL-TO-ACTION

Conclusions

As noted in the Introduction, the California Cultural Collections Protection Survey is intended to provide a starting point for further, detailed analysis of the preservation challenges facing California’s collecting institutions. The primary deliverable of the project is the survey itself and the resulting dataset, from which future and periodic updates can be made and progress assessed.

This survey was hindered by the global pandemic and its impacts on organizations statewide. At the same time, these obstacles heighten the importance of the survey, as many collecting organizations find themselves in distress. However, with the baseline dataset and the survey instrument and the ongoing data analyses of this effort’s findings, the State now has critical tools to monitor and update these findings as warranted.

Several key findings point to field-wide issues of concern for collecting institutions statewide:

- Comparisons made to the Heritage Health Information Survey indicate that California generally lags behind the rest of the country in several key areas (Table 26, Preservation Improvement Needs Cited by California Institutions by Type, page 17 of this report) — including collection assessments, documentation, and staff training.

- Storage inadequacies are a pressing issue for many institutional types — 22 percent of institutions reported being at “over capacity” and 57 percent report being “near” capacity. This is especially true for Scientific Collections. However, these data varied widely by institutional type and it is unclear the extent to which collections storage is utilized efficiently and effectively, or if suitable equipment or furniture would make a substantial difference.

- Sub-optimal preservation conditions for collections storage are widespread. “Improper storage” topped the list of perceived threat to collections preservation, followed by water/moisture, handling and pests. In fact, the data indicate that
preventable human-induced and environmental causes — storage, handling, pests, water, and the like — are greater immediate threats to collection preservation than a natural disaster or other major catastrophe. It is important to note that although a relatively small number of collections have been affected by catastrophic loss in the past two years, wildfire is a growing threat to California’s cultural heritage and the communities whose stories it tells.

- Primary causes of damage to collections are within the institutions’ control to a much greater degree than assumed. While catastrophic threats are real, the likelihood of damage by much more insidious factors, such as improper storage, water/moisture, handling and pests, are far greater threats on a day-to-day basis. This is not to say that California’s collections are not threatened by natural disasters, but that there are many ways that the state’s cultural patrimony can be protected from incremental threats to which they are exposed on a daily basis.

- Overall, Historical and Cultural Societies and Scientific Collections as institution types appear to have the greatest need for support with respect to preservation challenges. Scientific collections have experienced the highest incidence of damage overall (57 percent) and due to catastrophic event (wildfire at 54 percent).

- As with many institutions across the country, low levels of preservation and emergency planning — and integration with emergency services — are major challenges for collecting institutions in California. The capability of institutions to plan proactively and act upon those plans varies widely and may be more influenced by operating budget and staffing than by institution type. The IMLS Heritage Health Information Survey data supports this assertion, and this survey’s data show low rates of planning across institutions of all sizes.

- The cultural holdings represented in the collections of the responding institutions are widespread and highly varied. Subsequent updates to this survey will likely capture even more undiscovered treasures as additional organizations come back on-line and can participate. It is also an indication of the richness of the diversity of materials that are threatened with damage or loss — and whose loss can be prevented or mitigated to a greater degree than anticipated through strategic action.

**Call-to-Action**

There is much that can be done to advance the preservation of California’s cultural collections and mitigate the risks identified in the survey:

- *Provide ongoing assistance to local institutions in conducting collection assessment, developing disaster preparedness strategies, and establishing emergency protocols.* Developing a disaster response plan is key to preparedness. Collection assessments and emergency protocols flow from the process of preparing for the worst. The survey shows multiple challenges faced by cultural entities of all kinds. They will need help in becoming disaster ready. Drills, simulations, and hands-on scenarios are also critical learning opportunities to improve response in an actual emergency.
• **Improve preservation and emergency planning through direct assistance, training, and toolkits.** Most staff who work in cultural and heritage organizations care deeply about the preservation of the materials in their care. Creating toolkits for professionals and providing them at low- or no-cost supports the professional development of collections workers and spreads awareness of best practices and appropriate safety protocols. For some lesser resourced institutions, direct assistance may be necessary. For others, peer assessment may be sufficient. The Advisory Task Force members’ organizations are also great conduits and partners to help their own constituencies upskill in these challenging times. A collaborative toolkit approach may be possible by funding organizations ready to support projects with long-term impacts.

• **Develop more opportunities for preservation-quality digitization of collection items.** Scaling up programs like the State Library’s California Revealed and Digital Concierge programs can increase the ability to digitize more at-risk physical collections sooner. Grant programs to support local programs or provide training may also be helpful in that many smaller institutions lack the capability to do the work themselves.

• **Assist in ensuring collection storage and exhibition areas meet quality environmental standards.** Understanding the “improper storage” issue (as noted in Table 6 and accompanying narrative) is key to advancing the preservation of California’s cultural collections. Many institutions, large and small, lack sufficient storage. Other states, the federal government and other countries have invested in high-density archival storage in automated storage retrieval systems (ASRS). Typically, these facilities also include conservation and digital imaging labs, gallery spaces, and reading rooms to offer both collection protection and access to the items stored there. While not every institution can develop their collections preservation capabilities to the full extent needed, collaborative and/or shared resources may help them meet their most acute needs.

• **Support training for staff to monitor environmental conditions and maintain collection inventory and documentation.** Small actions can have big ripple effects. Promoting best practices for environmental monitoring and mitigation as well as collections record-keeping are critical actions in preparing effectively for an emergency. They are also sound business practices. Many new and emerging professionals may be lacking in these skills and knowledge as they take on collection responsibilities. The California Association of Museums has offered these trainings and information-sharing events for many years; a partnered approach to extending museum association’s reach into other Task Force constituencies would take advantage of an existing knowledge and experience base and make it available more broadly.

• **Promote appropriate collection handling techniques.** A surprising finding was the extent to which handling was responsible for damage or loss. A collections handling primer is basic to the collection manager and exhibition preparer’s toolkit in most museums and archival settings; as such, knowledge and techniques can be shared
with other institutions who may not be resourced to the same extent. Perhaps a collaborative arrangement between larger and smaller institutions would help share knowledge and appropriate techniques to mitigate this loss.

- **Invest in training in management of digital records as well as born digital material’s unique preservation requirements.** Digitization is the last barrier to total loss in the event of a catastrophic event, such as the wildfire described in the introduction to this report. Digitizing physical collections records, including photos, and appropriately storing and protecting born digital materials is at least some insurance against total loss.

- **Target Historical and Cultural Societies and Scientific Collections for support.** Of the entities examined in this survey, “Historical and Cultural Society” and “Scientific Collections” are the categories that struggle the most with collections preservation issues and hazards. In deciding what the most important thing to do right now after disaster planning and preparedness, Historical Societies and Scientific Collections may require a special, prioritized effort — perhaps through a collaboration among Advisory Task Force members — to advance their capacity to professionally steward their holdings.

- **Partner with libraries and across institution types to leverage strengths, capabilities, and knowledge resources.** While not all communities have museums, archives, or an historical society, almost all of them have a library. As noted earlier in this report, libraries lead many institutional types with respect to their record-keeping capabilities (including cataloguing, digitization), and their preservation plans (see Table 14). These skills are easily transferable to other collecting institutional types and would promote collaboration across institutional types within a community or region. With the State Library’s leadership, their potential as conveners and supporters of collaborative, community-based preservation strategies are truly potent and bears further development.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A – SURVEY REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT

This CSL Survey Requirements Document was developed in coordination with the State Library and Advisory Task Force over the course of multiple workshops in preparation for the California Cultural Collections Protection Survey. The language that follows defines the survey scope, approach, and objectives, and was approved by CSL in July 2020.

Overview
This document defines key aspects of the Cultural Collections Protection Survey project to ensure CSL and the Consultant Team share an understanding of project activities, expectations, and outcomes. Once finalized and approved by CSL, it will be used to guide the project and updated to track changes.

Survey objectives
Per the CSL Request for Offer, the Consultant Team is tasked with overseeing and implementing a comprehensive cultural survey that provides the State a guide to properly identifying cultural assets held by California’s museums, libraries, archives, galleries, and private collections. The CSL wants to use the database and survey findings as a guiding framework to inform the creation of a robust protection and sharing program for the State’s culturally significant assets.

Long term vision
The initial utility of this database is to establish a baseline understanding of the nature of California’s cultural collections to support CSL’s and California's decision-making, policy development and resource allocation. In the mid-term, this data may be used and expanded to shape policy and funding strategies. The long-term vision for this database is to support recommended systems for regular updating and the development of a publicly accessible resource. These objectives, while outside the scope of this project, may still inform CSL’s desired approach to this survey.

Survey stakeholders
The State of California (e.g., elected officials, agencies, departments, and their staff)
Higher level and umbrella cultural agencies (e.g., Cultural Cabinet, Advisory Task Force)
The cultural heritage community (e.g., entities, advocates, and collection holders)
With the goal of eventually supporting funding entities, researchers, educators, students, and the public.

**Defining the scope of the survey**
The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) recognizes different categories of “cultural heritage”. *Tangible* cultural heritage includes movable cultural heritage (paintings, sculptures, coins, manuscripts); immovable cultural heritage (monuments, archaeological sites, and so on); and underwater cultural heritage (shipwrecks, underwater ruins, and cities). In contrast, *intangible* cultural heritage includes oral traditions, performing arts, rituals.

**The CSL Cultural Collections Protection Survey will focus on collecting data on the tangible cultural collections of organizations physically located in California.**

- **Tangible**: Things that can be digitally or physically stored or accessed.
- **Cultural**: The set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, that encompasses, not only art and literature, but lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions, and beliefs (UNESCO, 2001).
- **Collections**: A set of materials that has been accessioned, assembled, classified, and selected and preserved. It is limited to permanent holdings (not those held on loan or non-circulating) and includes backlogs. This does not include private, corporate, or commercial collections at this time.
- **Accession**: The formal legal process of accepting an item into a library, museum, or other collection.
- **In California**: The collection must be physically located within the State.

This definition includes materials such as, but not limited to, non-circulating books, recordings, works of art, artifacts, archives, monuments, and historically significant buildings. For the purposes of this project, the survey will identify the presence of natural heritage collections but will not probe these collections in depth. The survey will not include uncollected intangible culture (e.g., unrecorded folklore, traditions, dance, language, and knowledge). Under this definition, other examples of excluded items include circulating collections of public libraries, museum education collections and municipal active records (not yet archived).

Based on the scope agreed upon, CSL may consider revising the name of the survey and project to reflect its focus more accurately. For example, under the draft definition provided above, the project could be named the “California Cultural Collections Preservation Survey.”

**Survey participants**
The Consultant Team aims to survey organizations that have collections that meet the criteria defined above. Survey participants will be asked to identify significant, non-commercial collections held by corporations and/or individuals of which the state should be aware.
Survey format
Data will be collected using an online survey software that uses survey logic to guide participants through the most efficient pathway for survey completion to minimize fatigue. While the actual design of the survey will follow the finalization of requirements, at this point we expect the survey to offer separate paths for the different types of collections. For example, responses to information about archival material may differ from, but map to, data concerning artworks. The Consultant Team will create a glossary for participants to reference while completing the survey and include guiding language for the participants within the survey itself. This glossary will ensure that like objects, defined by different terms by different institutions, are grouped in like categories, regardless of the metadata schema used.

Survey assumptions
All surveys will be completed online. No paper submissions will be accepted. All prospective participants have some level of existing data on their collection holdings. CSL is not expecting organizations to catalogue their collections for the purposes of this study. The survey will be provided and completed in English.

Note: These assumptions pertain to the majority of survey respondents; however, participants will be given the opportunity to identify the need for accommodation to complete the survey successfully as part of the registration process.

Considerations for survey data classification
Below are examples of the types of information CSL may want to collect as part of this project. The purpose of this list is to assist the CSL Team in a discussion that will provide the Consultant Team with the information it needs to begin drafting the survey instrument.

Organization Information
Institution Name
Institution Type
Institution Details (staff, budget range, year founded, funding source(s) governance, visitorship)
Address/Location/County
Primary Contact
Preservation/environmental infrastructure
Cataloguing system
HVAC/security etc.
Risk level of collection (storage and environmental factors)
Priority Preservation requirements
Basic Collection information
Size of collection
Primary collection
Additional categories of collections
Languages (if text is present)
Description of Collection by Material (% and conservation need level)
Description of Collection by Time Period %
Description of Collection by Theme/Cultural origin (% and conservation need/risk level)
Collection deployment/use - (education programs, exhibitions, research etc.)
Qualitative narrative response questions, exploring areas such as:
Awareness of a significant private or corporate collection
Culture-specific questions
Partnerships
Object Stories
APPENDIX B – GLOSSARY

BORN-DIGITAL
Items which are created, managed, and preserved in digital form. This is in contrast to physical items of which a digitized version is created.

CAPACITY
A collecting entity's storage is considered to be at capacity when all collections for which the entity accepts preservation responsibility are stored, with spaces for all objects or materials within established standards for space for items.

CATALOGUING OF COLLECTIONS
Cataloguing is the process of entering informational data or "metadata" about an object into a collection catalog or database. This process involves assigning unique identification numbers to individual objects, or in the case of archives, fonds, and attaching relevant accompanying documentation to the item such as curatorial worksheets, photographs, condition assessments, and accession or deaccession information. This can be carried out in analog or digital form. Objects which have been accessioned, but not yet catalogued are considered to be within the entity's collection, but part of their records backlog and are at significant risk of disassociation.

CONSERVATION TREATMENT
Conservation treatment is hands-on, alternative ("interventive") work performed in order to preserve and/or restore objects. Only trained conservators who have experience in the appropriate material (such as paintings, textiles, furniture, photographs, books, paper, archaeological objects, ethnographic objects, natural history specimens) should perform conservation treatments on objects.

DIGITAL ASSET MANAGEMENT (DAM) SYSTEM
A DAM is a system that stores, shares, and organizes digital assets in a central location. It assists in the activities associated with the creation, storing, retrieving, and backing up of digital assets.

DIGITIZATION
The process of replicating a non-digital (analog) item in digital form. This is typically accomplished through the use of scanning equipment and/or digital photography. The process also typically encompasses the creation of administrative, descriptive, and other information ("metadata"- see below) that accompanies the resulting digital
representation, in order to facilitate its preservation and usability. Digitization projects can be ongoing or ad hoc, depending on the needs of the entity.

**EMERGENCY/DISASTER PLAN**
A comprehensive, systematic, emergency preparedness plan provides a means for recognizing and preventing risks, and for responding effectively to emergencies.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROLS**
Environmental controls provide an appropriate climate for collections items depending on their material and types of damage that can affect them. Environmental controls protect collections whether in storage or on exhibit including lighting, heating, air conditioning, dehumidifying, and humidifying.

**EXHIBITION/PUBLIC SPACES**
Spaces where collection material is viewable and accessible to the public on display, this may include visible storage in addition to spaces with exhibitions and interpretive materials.

**EXTERNAL CONTRACTORS OR CONSULTANTS**
An external contractor or consultant is someone who is not a permanent or temporary employee of an organization who can be contracted to conduct conservation or preservation activities.

**FINDING AIDS**
Finding aids are tools that help user find information in a specific record group, collection or series of archival materials. Examples of finding aids include published and unpublished inventories, container and folder lists, card catalogs, calendars, indexes, registers, and institutional guides. Formal publications that help a user find information regarding a record group, collection, or series of archival materials are also finding aids.

**FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)**
The FTE units, or equivalent employees, working at your institution. The ratio of the total number of hours worked during a period, whether part time, full time, temporary, or contracted, by the number of working hours considered to be full-time employment. To ensure comparability, 40 hours per week has been set as the measure of full-time employment. In other words, one FTE is equivalent to one employee working full-time, equal to 40 hours of work per week. For example, if three employees work part-time at 20 hours of work per week, this is equal to 1.5 FTEs.

**FULL TIME STAFF**
Workers at the entity that are working at least 30 hours per week. This can include staff paid on either an hourly or salary basis.

**GENERAL CONDITION ASSESSMENT**
An assessment based on visual inspection of the collection and the areas where it is exhibited or stored.
GOVERNANCE
Refers to the systems and structures which are used to define the oversight body for an organization. The oversight body will define policy, provide leadership, manage, coordinate and monitor procedures and resources, and to develop long-term strategy and direction for an organization.

GOVERNING AUTHORITY
The overarching or parent organization which your institution makes up a part of. While your collection is managed in relation to your specific site, your governance is ultimately overseen by this authority (i.e., you are one of the California State Parks, or a University Museum, reporting to the University).

HUMIDITY SPECIFICATIONS
Depending on the material of the collection item, humidity levels within the environment need to be adjusted to control for deterioration or damage. Actively monitoring this aspect of storage spaces, and exhibition spaces is needed to provide a complete picture of your institution's humidity levels and controls.

INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT
Integrated pest management strategies encourage ongoing maintenance and housekeeping to ensure that pests will not find a hospitable environment in a cultural heritage entity. Activities include building inspection and maintenance; climate control; restriction of food and plants; regular cleaning; proper storage; control over incoming collections to avoid infestation of existing collections; and routine monitoring for pests.

INVENTORYING
Inventorying is the process by which an itemized list of objects that an entity has accessioned or received via loan(s) and accepted preservation responsibility for, is checked against the physical location of the objects by an examiner. A complete one hundred percent inventory should be carried out periodically to ensure that the entity is operating under best practices for security purposes.

LIGHT LEVELS
Controlling light levels can include UV protection screens on windows, UV blocking sleeves on tubular fluorescent lights, window shades or covers, storing items in boxes for protection, LED lights in exhibit cases, storing items away from windows, exhibiting items especially prone to damage away from direct light or glazing with UV blocking glass, and turning off the lights in areas that are not occupied.

LOCAL EMERGENCY ORGANIZATION
This may be your municipality, city, or county emergency services. Best practices dictate that your institution's emergency/disaster plan and collection needs be incorporated into the overarching emergency response plan for your location.

LONG-RANGE PRESERVATION PLAN
A document that describes a multi-year course of action to meet an institution’s overall preservation needs for its collection.
METADATA
A summary of basic information akin to that found in catalog records to facilitate finding, storing, and managing digital objects. Created manually or by automated processes, types of metadata include administrative, descriptive, preservation, rights management, structural, and technical.

OFF-SITE
Off-site storage can by physical, or cloud storage that contains collections items separate from the primary location of the entity. Off-site storage can be either owned by the entity or rented for the purpose of collections storage.

ONSITE
Onsite storage can be physical or network-based storage that contains collection items on the main site or at a branch location of the organization which is also a place for research or includes public facing activities.

OUTDOORS
Outdoors in relation to collections are any spaces that do not have both permanent walls and roofs shielding them from the elements.

PART TIME STAFF
Regular workers at the entity that are working less than 30 hours per week. This can include staff paid on either an hourly or salary basis.

PRESERVATION MANAGEMENT
Preservation management involves keeping a balance between collection-level activities such as environmental control, which can be difficult and/or costly to manage but provide the greatest long-term benefit for the most materials, and item-level activities such as conservation treatment, which are often more easily understood and managed but can have limited effect, especially if the items are returned to a damaging environment.

PRESERVATION OF AUDIOVISUAL MEDIA AND PLAYBACK EQUIPMENT
Following the manufacturer’s instructions for keeping playback machines clean and well maintained.

PRESERVATION REFORMATTING
Preservation reformatting is the action by which at-risk materials are copied to new formats, such as microfilm, paper facsimile copies or digital reproductions.

PREVENTATIVE CONSERVATION
The mitigation of deterioration and damage to cultural property through the formulation and implementation of policies and procedures for appropriate environmental conditions; handling and maintenance procedures for storage, exhibition, packing, transport and use; integrated pest management emergency preparedness and response; and reformatting/duplication. Preventative conservation is an ongoing process that continues throughout the life of cultural property and does not end with interventive preservation treatments.
RELATIVE HUMIDITY SPECIFICATIONS
Depending on the material of the collection item, humidity levels with the environment need to be adjusted to control for deterioration or damage. At times, such as during the summer or winter, less or more humidity may be required to prevent deterioration. Actively monitoring this aspect of storage and exhibition space is needed to provide a complete picture of your institution’s humidity levels and controls.

SECURITY SYSTEM
A security system is a wide-ranging task in which a series of mutually complementary measures are suggested to provide a layered approach to risk by reinforcing a collecting institution against intrusion, controlling access and circulation, and protecting its contents. Not all of these measures may be in place at your organization. The recommended process for the best security system would include: 1) physical measures such as quality locks, robust doors and windows to prevent, deter and delay intrusion at the perimeter; 2) electronic systems such as intruder alarms to detect any breaches of the perimeter and facilitate a response; 3) the combined use of physical barriers, access control, CCTV and security officers to maintain safety and protect property while the premises are open to the public, and; 4) the use of physical and electronic systems to ensure the safety of individual exhibits and prevent theft from display casings.

SIGNIFICANT DAMAGE OR LOSS
Change(s) in an item's physical or chemical state necessitating major treatment or reformatting or resulting in total loss of access.

STAFF TRAINING
Staff training could be provided either by internal or external experts in conservation and preservation and could cover a wide range of topics from digital preservation, handling, mount making, etc. Staff training can be considered to be needed if there are essential basic skills or knowledge related to preventative conservation missing within your staff team.

STORAGE FURNITURE OR EQUIPMENT
Storage furniture or equipment are protective enclosures made of chemically stable materials that provide both physical support and chemical protection for objects. Examples include: Shelving, drawers, freezers, cabinets, etc.

TEMPERATURE SPECIFICATIONS
Depending on the material of the collection item, temperature levels within the environment need to be adjusted to control for deterioration or damage. At times, such as during the summer or winter, colder or hotter temperatures might be required to prevent deterioration. Actively monitoring this aspect of storage spaces, and exhibition spaces is needed to provide a complete picture of your institution's temperature levels and controls.

UNKNOWN CONDITION
Material has not been recently accessed by staff for visual inspection and/or condition is unknown.
URGENT NEED
Material needing major treatment or reformatting to make it stable enough for use, and/or the material is located in an enclosure or environment that is causing damage or deterioration. For machine-readable collections, deterioration of media and/or obsolescence of play-back equipment or hardware/software threatens loss of content.

VOLUNTEERS
Volunteer workers are defined as those who complete work for free. Their work is offered without promise, expectation, or receipt of compensation.
APPENDIX C – SURVEY USER’S GUIDE

DIGITAL COLLECTIONS
Your digital collections may include digital images of some photographs that are in your collection. Consider whether these digital copies are a permanent part of your collection for which you take preservation responsibility. The original photographs should also be recorded under "Photographic Collections."

THE ONGOING PROCESS OF PRESERVATION
The California State Library understands that preservation is an ongoing process. All other questions should be answered for the current situation and condition of your collections unless the work is already in progress. For example, you should report on current preservation staff, not staff you plan to hire or who no longer work with you. The estimate of condition should, again, reflect the current state of your collections unless improvement is in progress (e.g., black and white photographs currently being rehoused in appropriate sleeves and boxes).
If your entity has undertaken a major conservation treatment project this year, and your staffing levels are higher than usual, report this figure even if it is not typical. The survey is meant to be a snapshot of current activities, and we expect to capture dips and peaks. While your entity’s expenditures may not be typical, this provides important information about the level of preservation activity.

TEMPORARY WORKERS
Temporary workers such as paid, part time student workers should be included in your response to this question as part-time staff.
Example, if you have 3 part-time people who each work 12 hours a week, they would, together, work 36 hours a week or 80% of a 40-hour week.

TRAINED VOLUNTEERS
Trained volunteers who assist with the care of collections should be counted.

CONTRACTED PROVIDERS OR CONSULTANTS
Estimate the number of weeks/per year in total that any number of contracted providers or consultants worked with your collection in the past year.
PROVIDING YOUR ESTIMATES
Even if you have not undertaken a general condition assessment of all or part of your collections, provide your best estimate in each category, based on your working knowledge of the materials.

REPORTING YOUR BUDGET
Whether or not your entity has a specific budget line-item for preservation and conservation, complete this question if you use budgeted funds for staff and/or supplies.

LEVEL OF PRESERVATION ACTIVITY
If your entity has undertaken a major conservation treatment project this year, and your conservation/preservation budget and staffing levels are higher than usual, report this figure even if it is not typical. The survey is meant to be a snapshot of current activities, and we expect to capture dips and peaks funding levels. While your entity's expenditures may not be typical, this provides important information about the level of preservation activity.

MATERIAL CATEGORIES
- **Books and Bound Volumes**: Items such as books, periodicals, bound manuscripts, published or unpublished, etc.
- **Unbound Sheets**: Items that have never been bound such as newspapers, letters, maps, records etc.
- **Photographic Collections**: Includes daguerreotypes, photo albums, personal and art photographs.
- **Moving Image Collections**: Items such as video tapes, films, etc.
- **Recorded Sound Collections**: Includes items that capture music and performance, oral histories, bird sounds etc.
- **Historic or Ethnographic Collections**: Items including textiles, tools and furniture, protest signage. All tangible objects that express a living or historic cultural heritage or moment.
- **Archeological, Individually Catalogued**: Objects that are assigned accession numbers individually.
- **Archaeological, Bulk**: Objects that are part of a group of object in which the group is assigned an accession number.
- **Natural Science Specimens**: All preserved botanical or zoological specimens.
- **Born Digital Material**: Art, cultural, historical or ethnographic materials which are created, managed, and preserved in digital form. This is in contrast to physical items of which a digitized version is created.

THEMATIC CATEGORIES
Every entity organizes its collection in a way that is meaningful to them. Therefore, the categories listed for this question may not exactly match the system you use. If you have collections simply cannot fit in the specified categories, please use the appropriate
"other" category. Even an estimate is useful in determining the scope of preservation needs.
APPENDIX D – LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS
18th Street Arts Center
A.K. Smiley Public Library
Academy Museum of Motion Pictures
Aerospace Museum of California
Agua Caliente Cultural Museum
Alameda County Library
Alpine County Library & Archives
Alta District Historical Society
Altadena Historic Society
Altadena Library District
Amador County Archives
Amador County Library
American Indian Cultural District
American Legion Post 26
American Museum of Telephony / JKL Museum of Telephony
Anaheim Public Library
Annenberg Foundation Trust at Sunnylands
Antelope Valley Indian Museum State Historic Park
Antelope Valley Rural Museum of History
Archives and Special Collections, UC Davis Library
Archives of the Archdiocese of San Francisco
Arne Nixon Center
Art, Design & Architecture Museum
Arts Consortium
Autry Museum of the American West
Bade Museum of Biblical Archaeology
Baker Street West
Bakersfield Museum of Art
Banning Library District
Benicia Historical Museum
Berkeley Historical Society
Blue Lake Museum Society
Bohart Museum of Entomology
Bonita Museum & Cultural Center
Bowers Museum
Brea Museum & Historical Society
Burlingame Public Library
Butte County Library
C.N. Gorman Museum at UC Davis
Cal Poly Special Collections and Archives
California Academy of Sciences
California Botanic Garden
California College of the Arts Libraries
California Governor's Mansion State Historic Park
California Historical Society
California Institute of the Arts Library Institute Archives
California Law Enforcement Historical Society
California Museum
California Oil Museum
California Ski Library
California State Indian Museum
California State Library
California State Parks
California State Parks, Angeles District
California State Parks, Santa Cruz District
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona Special Collections and Archives
California State Railroad Museum
California State Railroad Museum Library & Archives
California State University Bakersfield Walter Stiern Library Historical Research Center
California State University, East Bay University Archives and Special Collections
California State University, Fresno, Special Collections Research Center
California Surf Museum
Caltech Archives and Special Collections
Camarena Memorial Library
Camptonville Historical Society
Capitola Historical Museum
Carmel Public Library (Harrison Memorial Library)
Carolyn Campagna Kleefeld Contemporary Art Museum
Cartoon Art Museum
Catalina Island Museum
Center for Sacramento History
Center for the Study of Political Graphics
Cerritos Library
Charles M. Schulz Museum and Research Center
China Lake Museum
Chumash Indian Museum
City of Brisbane, Historical Community
City of Calabasas Library
City of Covina Public Library
City of Los Angeles Sanitation
City of Trac Cultural Arts Division - Grand Theatre Center for the Arts
City of Watsonville Library
City of West Hollywood Archives
Clarke Historical Museum
College of Environmental Design Visual Resources Center
College of the Sequoias
College of the Sequoias Art Gallery
Colusa County Historical Preservation Commission
Commemorative Air Force Southern California Wing
Confederated Villages of Lisjan
Corona Public Library
Coronado Historical Association
Coronado Public Library
Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation
County of Santa Clara Archives
Crocker Art Museum
Daly City Public Library
DANA Adobe & Cultural Center
Death Valley Conservancy
Del Mar Historical Society
Dell'Arte International
Dolores Huerta Foundation
Donaldina Cameron House
Dudley Knox Library Naval Postgraduate School
East Bay Regional Parks
East Los Angeles College
Edna Kimbro Archive, Friends of Santa Cruz State Parks
Educational Communications, Inc.
El Cajon Historical Society Inc. (Knox House Museum)
El Centro Public Library
El Dorado County Historical Museum
El Dorado County Library and Museum System
El Segundo Public Library
Ella Strong Denison Library, Scripps College
Elverhoj Museum of History and Art
Environmental Design Archives
Eureka Heritage Society
Fallbrook Historical Society
FANHS Museum
Fiddletown Preservation Society
First Mayors House of Salinas 1868
Folsom Historical Society
Fort Bragg-Mendocino Coast Historical Society
Free Speech Movement Archive
Freedom Archives
Fresno Art Museum
Fresno City & County Historical Society
Fresno County Public Library
Friends of the Joaquin Moraga Adobe
Friends of the Pasadena Playhouse
Fullerton Public Library
Galt Area Historical Society
Gilb Museum of Arcadia Heritage
GLBT Historical Society
Glendale Library, Arts & Culture
Glendale Library, Arts & Culture, Glendale Central Library
Glendora Public Library and Cultural Center
Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Grace Hudson Museum & Sun House
Greta Valley Museum
Guardians of the City, San Francisco
Henry W. Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry
Heritage Museum of Orange County
Historical Society of the Upper Mojave Desert
Historical Glass Museum Foundation
Historical Society of Pomona Valley
Historical Society of South San Francisco
Historical Society of Winters
History Center of San Luis Obispo County
History San Jose
Hoffmitz Milken Center for Typography at Art Center College of Design
Hollywood Heritage Inc.
Humboldt Area Peoples Archive
Humboldt County Historical Society
Humboldt County Library
Humboldt State University Permanent Collection of Art
Huntington Library, Art Museum, and Botanical Gardens
Imperial County Free Library
Imperial Valley Desert Museum
Indian Valley Museum
International Art Museum of America
Inyo County Free Library
Irwindale Public Library
J. Paul Getty Museum
Jack Mason Museum of West Marin History
Japanese American Historical Society of San Diego
Japanese American Museum of San Jose
Japanese American National Museum
Jedediah Smith Society
Jurupa Mountains Discovery Center
Kennedy Mine Foundation
Kern County Law Library
Kern County Library- Beale Memorial Library
Kimberly Crest House & Gardens
Kings County Library
Korean American National Museum
Kronos Quartet/Kronos Performing Arts Association
Kuniholm Museet
La Historia Historical Society
La Jolla Historical Society
La Mesa Historical Society
La Quinta Historical Society
La Senora Research Institute
Labor Archives and Research Center, SFSU
Laguna Art Museum
Lake County California Museum
Lake County Library
Lanterman Historical Museum Foundation
Larkspur Library
Lava Beds National Monument
Lemon Grove Historical Society
Letterform Archive
Levi Strauss & Co. Archives
Lincoln Public Library
Little People of America, Archive
Livermore Public Library
Loma Linda History
Lompoc Museum Associates, Inc.
Long Beach Public Library
Los Altos History Museum
Los Angeles Contemporary Archive
Los Angeles County Department of Arts and Culture
Los Angeles County Department of Military & Veterans Affairs, Bob Hope Patriotic Hall
Los Angeles County Records Management and Archives
Los Angeles Maritime Museum
Los Angeles Public Library - General Collection
Los Angeles Public Library - Research Collection
Los Angeles Unified School District Art & Artifact Collection/Archive
Los Californianos
Los Gatos Library
Lucretia Little History Room, Mill Valley Public Library
Malki Museum, Inc.
Manilatown Heritage Foundation
March Field Air Museum
Maria Carillo High School Library
Marin County Free Library: Anne T. Kent California Room
Marin History Museum
Maritime Museum of San Diego
Marysville Chapter Japanese American Citizens League
MCRD Museum
Mechanics’ Institute
Mendocino County Library
Meriam Library, California State University Chico
Miners Foundry Cultural Center
Mingei International Museum
Mission Inn Foundation and Museum
Mission San Luis Obispo
Mission Viejo Library
Modoc County Library
Monterey Art Museum
Mono County Library
Monrovia Historical Museum
Mono County Free Libraries
Monterey County Historical Society
Monterey History and Art Association
Monterey JACL Heritage Center/Museum
Monterey Park Bruggemeyer Library
Monterey Peninsula College Archives and Special Collections
Monterey Public Library
Morgan Hill Historical Society
Morris Graves Museum of Art
Morro Bay Museum of Natural History
Mountain View Historical Association
Mountain View History Center at City of Mountain View Public Library
Mt. Shasta Sisson Museum
Murrieta Public Library
Museo Italo Americano
Museum of American Heritage
Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego
Museum of Performance + Design
Museum of Photographic Arts
Museum of Riverside
Museum of Us
Museum of Ventura County
Museum of Western Film History
Museum on Main
Napa County Library
National City Public Library’s Kile Morgan Local History Room
National Park Service
Nevada County Community Library
New Museum Losa Gatos
Newport Beach Public Library
Nihonmachi Little Friends
North Lake Tahoe Historical Society
Northern California Veterans Museum &Heritage Center
Novato History Museum
Oakdale Museum & History Center
Oakland Museum of California
Oakland Public Library
Oceanside Historical Society
Oceanside Museum of Art
Old Mission Santa Barbara
Old Riverside Foundation
ONE Archives at the USC Libraries
Ontario City Library, Robert E. Ellingwood Model Colony History Room
Orange County Archives
Orange County Historical Society
Other Minds
Pacific Battleship Center - Battleship IOWA Museum
Pacific Grove Public Library
Pacific Pinball Museum
Pacific Railroad Museum
Pajaro Valley Historical Association
Palmdale City Library
Palo Alto City Library
Palo Alto Historical Association
Palos Verdes Library District, Local History Center
Parks Modern Repository and Archive
Pasadena Museum of History
Paso Robles City Library
Patrick J. Dowling Library
Pechanga Cultural Resources Department
Pepperdine University Libraries
Pescadero History Project
Petaluma Wildlife and Natural Science Museum
Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, UC Berkeley
Placentia Library District
Placer County Library
Pleasant Valley Historical Society
Plumas County Library
Point Arena Lighthouse Keepers, Inc.
Point Lobos
Point Lobos Foundation
Presidio Trust
Preston Castle Foundation
Providence Mountains State Recreation Area
Rancho Bernardo Historical Society
Rancho Camulos Museum
Rancho Cucamonga Library
Rancho Los Alamitos Historic Ranch & Gardens
Rancho Los Cerritos
Rand Desert Museum
Redondo Beach Public Library
Redwood Genealogical Society
Richmond Public Library
Riverside County Library System
Sacramento Modern (aka SacMod)
Salinas Public Library
Sam and Alfreda Maloof Foundation for Arts and Crafts
San Anselmo Historical Museum
San Bernardino County Museum
San Bernardino Public Library
San Clemente Historical Society
San Diego Archaeological Center
San Diego Botanic Garden
San Diego Chinese Historical Museum
San Diego Natural History Museum
San Diego Public Library
San Diego County Library
San Francisco African American Historical and Cultural Society
San Francisco Botanic Garden
San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library
San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
San Francisco State University NAGPRA Program
San Jose Museum of Quilts & Textiles
San Jose Public Library California Room
San Leandro Historical Railway Society
San Lorenzo Valley Museum
San Luis Obispo Museum of Art
San Mateo County Historical Association
San Mateo County Libraries
San Pablo Historical and Museum Society
Santa Ana Public Library-Santa Ana History Room
Santa Barbara County Archive
Santa Barbara Historical Museum
Santa Barbara Mission Archive-Library
Santa Barbara Public Library
Santa Clara City Library
Santa Clara County Library District
Santa Clarita Public Library
Santa Cruz County Law Library
Santa Cruz Public Libraries
Santa Fe Springs Heritage Park
Santa Maria Public Library
Santa Monica History Museum
Save Our Heritage Organisation
Self Help Graphics & Art
Shasta Historical Society
Sierra County Historical Society
Simi Valley Public Library
Siskiyou County Library
Siskiyou County Museum
Sisters of the Presentation Archives
Solano Beach Civic and Historical Society
Solano County Historical Records (aka Solano County Archives)
Sonoma County Library
Sonoma Valley Historical Society Inc.
Sourisseau Academy for State and Local History
South Gate Museum and Art Gallery (City of South Gate)
The Museum of the San Ramon Valley
The Putnam Foundation / DBA Timken Museum of Art
The San Diego Model Railroad Museum, Inc.
The Society of California Pioneers
The Thomas Kinkade Museum
The USS Sea, Air & Space Museum
The Wallis Center for Performing Arts
The Wende Museum
The Woman’s Club of Hollywood, CA
The Workman & Temple Family Homestead Museum
Thousand Oaks Library
Timber Heritage Association
Torrance Art Museum
Torrance Public Library
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley
Tulare County Library
Tulare County Museum
Turtle Bay Exploration Park
Twentynine Palms Historical Society
UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center
UCSF Library
University and Jepson Herbaria
University Heights Historical Society
University Library, California State University, Sacramento
University of California, Merced Library
USC Pacific Asia Museum
USS Hornet Sea, Air & Space Museum
Vacaville Heritage Council
Vailima Foundation
Vallejo Naval and Historical Museum
Ventura County Library, EP Foster Branch
Veterans Memorial Building of San Ramon Valley
Victorian Preservation Center of Oakland/Cohen Bray House
Vista Historical Society
Visual Communications
Warnecke Institute INC.
Washington Township Museum of Local History
West Antelope Valley Historical Society
West County Museum
Western Nudist Research Library
Western Railway Museum Archives
Western Workers Labor Heritage Festival
Whittier Public Library
Wildling Museum of Art and Nature
Willows Public Library
Wilmington Historical Society
Woodland Public Library
Writers Guild Foundation
Yolo Count Archives and Records Center
Yolo County Historical Collection
Yorba Linda Public Library
Youth Science Center
Yucaipa Valley Historical Society