

LIMITS TO ACCESS YOU CAN LOOK BUT DON'T TOUCH*

By David Cobb

Improving access to materials should be one of the goals for all librarians and all libraries. Generally speaking there is little disagreement related to this goal. Many collection development policies eloquently refer to open access and, in the United States, official U.S. government depository libraries are required to provide access to government documents and to provide public access to those collections. And yet collectors, however well meaning, will realize upon further study that there are limits to access and map collections are no exceptions. It is the larger collections that may have more restrictions for it is often their sheer size that creates limits. While most everyone believes that our new digital age and the concept of the shrinking world will open access to all materials, digital access is actually increasing limits to access as well. I will use this essay to outline these limits. Some are obvious and all types and sizes of map collections suffer from some of these limits.

The most obvious of these are library hours. Many map collections are often one person operations, sometimes only part-time, and this will limit access to professional reference service. Many other map collections limit user access to the map file drawers for the purpose of preservation and the safety of users and material and I believe this is a good policy but then requires more staffing. Those map collections that are associated with Government Document units, at least in the United States, usually have more access hours into the evening and on weekends. The more specialized collections often have no evening hours nor weekend access.

A more serious limitation is often the fragile nature of maps. As collections grow, and age, the fragility of the format becomes more apparent. The fact that maps are not protected by bindings or boxes make them an inherently weak format. The ravages of time, a poor environment, and handling are serious threats to a single sheet of paper. In addition, few map collections have either preservation funds or staffing and certain maps may have to be withdrawn from public access. While digital reformatting is a possibility some of our maps are in such a deteriorated

* Paper presented at the 67th IFLA General Conference, Boston USA, August, 16-25 2001. Section on Geography and Map Libraries.

state that they require conservation to be readable. There are also several issues related to digital reformatting which I will address later in this paper.

Next is the level of cataloging. According to the 1990 *Guide to U.S. Map Resources*¹ 60% of the collections surveyed were cataloged. In reality, this meant that some collections were being cataloged and not that 60% of the collections had complete cataloged collections. A closer examination reveals that many research libraries only have single digit percentages of maps actually cataloged although several have classified larger percentages of their collections. Again, this classification is almost always internal, not represented in the library's online catalogs, and seldom includes newly acquired digital information. Harvard's Map Collection may be a typical example. Prior to 1990 Harvard's collection was almost completely classified although it should be noted that there were three different classifications: one for books, one for antiquarian maps, and another for current maps. All of these classifications were internal meaning that a potential researcher was required to physically visit the Map Collection, review the card catalog, and then request a specific item. While progress and access has improved I must admit that it remains a part-time effort and it will be sometime before we are able to provide online access to nearly a half million cartographic items. The books and atlases have been reclassified and are now in our online catalog using the Library of Congress classification; new maps added to the collection are cataloged using OCLC and the LC classification; but only a few of the retrospective materials will be found in the online catalog.

Then there is the issue of access and cataloging of digital information. Like many libraries we collect published CDs and various aggregates of unpublished digital geospatial information. For example, the *Atlas of Florida*² was published as a CD in 1994 by Florida State University and the Florida Department of Education. It is included in our online catalog under its appropriate title and author, however, its one subject heading is "Florida—Maps." This CD has numerous data layers showing: camping sites, coral reefs, crime rates and many others but we are limited in our ability to archive and access digital information in library catalogs. The importance of a digital data set is, not the sum of its parts, but the individual parts themselves and knowledge of these "layers" is critical to the use of such geospatial information.

Several libraries are reviewing and experimenting with Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) standards for metadata and their compatibility with library catalogs. A similar project has been underway at Harvard and the Harvard

¹ Guide to U.S. Map Resources. Ed. By David A. Cobb et. Al. Chicago: American Library Association, 1990.

² Atlas of Florida [CD-ROM]. [Atlanta?] EduQuest, [1994?]

Geospatial Library will be launched in 2001. This service will develop separate records for geospatial information: an LC MARC record for the public online catalog and a FGDC metadata record within the Geospatial Library which will provide access to the different layers. A few datalayers will be restricted to Harvard users only, due to licensing agreements, but the goal is to offer access to the system via the Web. Initially, the system will offer access to the Digital Chart of the World, ESRI Maps and Data, Massachusetts GIS Data, Boston Water & Sewer layers, the City of Cambridge GIS data, and parts of the Bureau of the Census Tiger 2000 file. Librarians from the Social Sciences and Earth & Planetary Sciences will receive training on the use of the system thereby creating several points of expertise for faculty and students. Limitations include the fact that not all geospatial digital data will be included in this exploratory environment and there will be a limited number of records relating to paper resources. Types of layers to be considered for future addition to the geospatial library include raster imagery, orthophotoquads, additional state and city data, and foreign census information.

Digital information brings several issues to the forefront that libraries should be carefully considering. The first question is how will copyrighted materials be treated? In the past we have felt comfortable placing signs near our copying machines explaining the copyright laws and the concept of fair use. Today, as map collections begin to offer scanning services, including scanning and processing of large oversized maps, library staff are actually producing the digital files. As a result, the Harvard Map Collection will use a newly acquired large format color scanner to offer only scan to print services for the during 2001. Our intent is to review the issues with our Office of the General Counsel and to develop forms to be signed by the user specifically stating (limiting?) how the digital image will be used.

The final two limitations are points of contention and issues for many researchers – working with digital or paper resources. During this past year a heated discussion took place on the MapHist listserv concerning intellectual property rights and permission fees. While an Ortelius map of the America's from 1570 is no longer copyrighted, a library has the option to invoke its intellectual property rights. In other words, the Ortelius map is owned by the individual library which may, or may not, decide whether the map can be copied and restrict how it may be used. For example, as stated above, we will use our new large format scanner only to make printed copies of the maps we scan. Some scholars have criticized this as holding the individual maps as hostages and that they belong to the public and should be available to anyone. I disagree. Too often, researchers conveniently forget the time, effort, and cost that libraries assume to maintain these national treasures. Those research libraries holding these special collections have often

invested enormous quantities of staff time to care for these materials, cataloging many of them, preserving others, and providing adequate housing. The limitations are often defined to make sure that the item remains safe in the collections for future generations and that the items are copied within appropriate environmental conditions and by professionally trained staff.

These conditions and staff come at a price. It is interesting how everyone expects to be charged by a copying store but resents any charges for a similar service at a library. Most research libraries have a special collections imaging services or a photoreproduction department. Almost always, there are charges associated with this service. I suspect that some libraries charge more than a cost recovery fee and I know that some do so simply to restrict that service because it would overwhelm their staff. In addition, we often research and select materials for imaging via email, regular mail, and telephone. This takes our staff away from other primary duties but, at the same time, makes our collections available to a wider diversity of users around the world. Then the items must be transported to our Imaging Services where they then have to be handled again: placing large maps against the vacuum board, opening folio atlases, and all the time doing light meter tests. The entire process from researching the collection to identify a specific image for the user to creating an 8 x 10 black and white print or a color transparency is completed by professionals paid by the library. Libraries charge permission fees to offset some of these costs and seldom enough to make these services profitable. As we move deeper into our offering of digital services it is probable that libraries will have to charge for customized scanning or for parceling data sets and users should be prepared for such limitations.

Libraries are committed to providing access to their collections but access no longer just means providing the right book for the user. The future will bring more customized services especially as libraries include more geospatial information that is not familiar to a large group of their users. I believe that libraries will increasingly expand their offerings at no charge via the Web but will have to charge nominal fee's to offset the customized reference service that geographical information services may require. I also believe these fees and access restrictions may be limiting but will be offset by the final reward.

David Cobb
Harvard Map Collection
Harvard College Library
Cambridge, MA 02138
cobb@fas.harvard.edu
617-495-241