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ABSTRACT

This project develops a policy and question-based procedure guide for archival appraisal—the decision-making process for what is preserved or conserved, and what is destroyed in an archive—for the City of Boise Department of Arts and History. Due to resource constraints, the department needs a clear appraisal policy as well as a procedure guide that could be used by someone new to appraisal. The project theorizes that in a small institutional setting, lack of space can drive focused collecting goals. Focused collecting goals can help achieve a cohesive and useful collection. Drawing from the ideas of Frank Boles and Julia Marks Young, and Helen Willa Samuels, I processed the Thomas Byrne Collection, and analyzed that process. Based on that analysis, I produced an appraisal policy section recommended to the department for inclusion in its collection development policy, and developed a procedure guide to accompany it. I developed the policy and procedure guide together, harmonizing the documents to create an example of appraisal in a small archival setting.
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PROJECT OVERVIEW

Introduction

Archival appraisal is one of the most fundamental activities for an archivist. It also is among the first activities carried out when an archive acquires a collection. Richard Cox and Helen Willa Samuels referred to appraisal as “the archivist’s first responsibility.”¹ Every collecting institution, from the smallest home collection to the National Archives in Washington, D.C., faces a singular dilemma before anything else: what stays and what is rejected, discarded, or destroyed. To make decisions about what to keep and discard, archivists turn to appraisal.

Archival appraisal looks at what value an artifact or collection might offer to a collecting organization. The values considered by archivists are the usefulness or significance that an artifact or collection offers to the collecting institution. Because the mission of archives is to preserve and maintain artifacts for research, a central consideration for appraisal is whether they can be made accessible for researchers. Other elements considered during appraisal are related to an artifact or collection’s condition, uniqueness, significance of its creator, or circumstances of creation. Those are weighed against archival realities such as budget and space constraints, donor relationships, or privacy of information. Appraisal is the process that, based on analysis of the above

criteria, leads to a decision about what artifacts or collections to retain, reject, or discard. Every archive performs appraisal, whether documented or not.

This project concerns archival appraisal at The City of Boise Department of Arts and History (the Department). In an effort to establish an archive, the Department needs to implement a collection development policy. As the foundation of collection development is appraisal, any policy the Department adopts requires a section outlining appraisal criteria. An understanding and analysis of the Department’s archival procedures necessitates the creation of a useful policy section for appraisal. To understand those procedures, I processed the Byrne Collection, a private collection of more than 150 photographs and three boxes of assorted artifacts. Because the department is without an officially adopted policy, I worked according to widely accepted best practices—practices garnered from an analysis of numerous institutions, and research I performed on the historiography of archival appraisal.

Through the examples it produced, processing of the Byrne Collection informed the development of a documented appraisal approach specific to the needs of the Department. It included a policy section and a procedure guide to help archivists learn appraisal during its application.\(^2\) The Department did not have guidelines for appraising collections or artifacts. It needed a way to guide collections managers on appraisal of artifacts and collections. The answer to that gap was the creation of a question-based appraisal procedures guide. In appraisal terms, the policy expressed what values might make an item a good fit in the collection and the procedures guided the process of doing that.

---

\(^2\) At the time of publication the recommendations produced by this research are still under consideration by the City of Boise Department of Arts and History.
The project comprised three goals. The first goal was to process the Byrne Collection noting areas where documented appraisal policy could provide insight, and make the archival process more effective. The second goal was to research and analyze other institutions’ appraisal policies, and to seek elements to apply to the Department’s policy. The final goal was to write a recommended appraisal section for the Department’s adopted policy. Additionally, appraisal procedure guidelines were also written to complement the policy.

**Literature Review**

Modern theories of archival appraisal in the United States surfaced around the post-World War II era in the National Archives. The first in the modern era to write about archival selection processes were Philip C. Brooks, in *Public Records Management* and *The Selection of Records for Preservation*, and G. Philip Bauer, in *The Appraisal of Current and Recent Records*.³ Both authors noted the severe inconsistency within the different levels of government document management and sought a coherent policy that would unify and modernize the United States’ archival appraisal systems. Brooks argued that archivists destroy duplicates in order to make room for more relevant documents.⁴ He further argued that the process for selecting records of value and records for destruction was a singular process, and that the person making such selections must be involved in each aspect of the life cycle of a record.⁵ Brooks concluded that the archivist

⁵ Ibid., 234.
should make selections with the “co-operation of all persons connected with [the records’] life history.” Bauer’s work was far more controversial than Brooks’, though the archival community readily adopted some of his methods. He suggested that the most important element of appraisal was a “stern and true cost accounting.” Two realities drove Bauer’s cost accounting suggestion: the reality of an archival world awash in redundancy and a desire for clearly delineated determiners. The controversy arose because the greater archival community considered monetary cost evaluation unethical.

Theodore R. Schellenberg brought together the ideas of Brooks and Bauer, as well as his own, in the work *The Appraisal of Modern Public Records.* The work outlined a tiered system of values that many museums and archives still use. There were two main tiers, each with subordinates: Primary Values consisting of administrative, legal, and fiscal value, and Secondary Values consisting of evidential and informational values that were each developed with sub-categories. For contemporaneous archivists his system seemed intuitive—or perhaps they were so overwhelmed with the influx of artifacts and documents—that there was scant discussion of the subject of archival appraisal between 1956 and into the 1980s. So thin was the dialogue that Richard Berner did not write about the history of archival value in his 1982 work *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis,* stating that he omitted it due to the “primitive nature of its development.”

---

6 Ibid.
There was one notable exception to the nearly three-decade gap in archival appraisal dialogue: Maynard J. Brichford’s *Archives and Manuscripts: Appraising and Accessioning*. Brichford was the first archivist to detail appraisal outside of a government archive. In a non-government archive, and with extensive use of Schellenberg’s principles, Brichford produced a different image of archival appraisal. Brichford’s work during a quiet period of writing on appraisal allowed the conversation to continue. His work affected the next generation of archivists. By the mid-1980s several models existed for archival appraisal; among them was the Boles-Young Black Box. Frank Boles and Julia Marks-Young, noted archivists, together made two assertions and proposed a solution via critical rethinking of Schellenberg. The pair suggested that archivists, by applying Schellenberg’s model as rules rather than guidelines, had allowed themselves to be limited by it.\(^{10}\) They based their claim on the assertion that appraisal was contained in the minds of the archivists as somewhat of a “Black Box.”\(^{11}\) Boles and Young set out to document the archivist’s black box and systematize it into a more informed method of appraisal. What they ended up with was a theoretical appraisal system without concrete application from which to derive outcomes. Despite the theoretical element, their work did present two concrete ideas that have endured: the “Value-of-Information” and “Costs-of-Retention” assessments.\(^{12}\)

\(^{10}\) Frank Boles and Julia Marks-Young, “Exploring the Black Box”, *The American Archivist*, 48, No. 2, (Spring 1985), 124.

\(^{11}\) The black box idea was one taken from science and refers to a case in which an object can be used for its external manifestations without an understanding of how it internally accomplishes those. Boles and Marks-Young discuss their application of this concept: Ibid., 122.

\(^{12}\) The archivist uses these two matrices together. He can use them to quickly categorize and assess the enduring value of a collection and weigh it against the reality of the cost of conserving it. For more on these methods see: Boles and Marks-Young, 138-39; and,
The Boles-Young principles were among three theories in response to Ham’s call for greater collaboration.\textsuperscript{13} The other two were documentation strategy and the New Paradigm. Documentation strategy tried to prove Ham’s “representative record of human experience.”\textsuperscript{14} In his article “The Forum,” Hackman outlined documentation strategy: selection should be a larger discussion that should take place among archivists, creators, and researchers.\textsuperscript{15} The goal was committees that would meet together to discuss and assemble an informed record of enduring value. Due to the realities of large-scale collaboration combined with the increasing volume of collections, documentation strategy was possible only in small archives. New Paradigm was the second response to Ham and developed from the museum world looking toward an idea of provenance to aid selection. Those dealing in government archives could not apply documentation strategy successfully due to the volume of records they handled, and thus promoted New Paradigm.\textsuperscript{16} In practice this new method did not individually select records, but evaluated them based on the completeness of the collection.\textsuperscript{17} The New Paradigm achieved its goal by focusing upon the administrative needs of the creator rather than the researcher or archive. By highlighting the needs of the creator rather than the potential value to a researcher, New Paradigm potentially overlooked records of value to posterity.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{13} In 1975 Gerald Ham delivered an article in which he called for a more complete and “representative record of human experience” within archival selection. See Ham, Gerald, “The Archival Edge,” American Archivist 38 (1975), 5-13.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} The reason for this lay in the volume of records being handled.
\textsuperscript{17} David Bearman and Richard Lytle, “The Power and Principle of Provenance,” Archivaria 21 (Winter 1985-6)
\end{flushleft}
Three years after the Boles-Young and Hackman publications, Richard Cox and Helen Willa Samuels suggested in The Archivist’s First Responsibility a reframing of the questions concerned with appraisal. Cox and Samuels petitioned archivists to stop referring to appraisal as an abstract and inexact art and work together to form a research question that could more definitely identify a clear process of appraisal. The most important element in their research was the call to collaborate. With healthy collaboration among archives, they believed that a better representative sampling of society could be preserved. My research agreed with Cox and Samuels— institutions should more exactly define appraisal. Archives cannot thrive without defined appraisal practices.

In the 1990s the conversation developed with variations on the New Paradigm and documentation strategies. After that time Boles amended the record with revised information as the second edition of the “Archival Fundamentals Series.” His revision to Ham’s earlier work was one of the first to include the impacts of digital media on the field. This admission of technology into archives was important, even though archives still acquire physical collections. It displayed the realization that digitization had grown to the point that it was no longer secondary, and it came with complications. Digital documents—particularly those born-digital—differed not in the value of the information contained but in format and volume. After Boles, two other authors considered

---

20 Born-digital documents or records are those that were created digitally. Alternately there are digital files that were originally created “on paper” and converted to digital format. See: Richard Pearce-Moses, A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology, s.v. “born-digital,” (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005)
appraisal of digital media: Barbara L. Craig’s *Archival Appraisal: Theory and Practice*, and Richard Cox’s *Archives and Archivists in the Information Age*. Craig considered the implications and potential costs associated with maintaining digital records. Her methods drew largely upon the appraisal methods developed in the 1980s and 90s. Cox inquired what it means to be an archivist in the Information Age. However, he also avoided a direct discussion of what digitization meant for appraisal specifically. He did discuss the effect of record volume on their value finding, paradoxically, that the increase in the volume of records created an increase in cultural *perception* of record value, while at the same time it has decreased the archival value. He tempered his conclusions with the reminder that drawing such conclusions while being present in the process is problematic. Considering these two works, one may draw one of two conclusions: either the authors had observed no shift in appraisal due to digital media, or the digitization to that point in time had developed with it no measurable change to appraisal. Because Craig did address theoretical changes, however briefly, we must assume the latter was true.

Because appraisal is not concerned as much with media as it is with the inherent value of an item, the Digital Age at first appeared to have little effect. However, as Ciaran B. Trace noted in her 2006 research, the emergence of the Internet and, in particular social networking applications, there has been a trend away from the archive as

23 Ibid., 221.
a physical place. She said, “groups of like-minded people are coming together to create their own communities.”24 The implications in her assessment are that because of the masses of digital media, virtual societies are creating their own virtual archives. Within virtual spaces terms such as “value,” “appraisal,” and “selection” carry little or no meaning, but the processes that they refer to take place anyway. These groups, through an ever-evolving process of social compacts, appraise the value of every bit of digital ephemera that gets posted and determine if it stays or goes. What they are doing appears similar to selection documentation strategy. Despite the progress in the digital culture in virtual appraisal, the archival and records management communities’ realities do not allow for such fluid collaboration. Though the current project does not handle any digital items for the archive, it will digitize selected items in the collection. Selecting items for digital and traditional preservation is a complex process that has to consider selection and appraisal in both realms.

In conclusion, for the past sixty-five years the fundamental need for pragmatism among archivists has often outweighed the many calls for change. At the core of archival appraisal is the question of value, and that question remains the subject of healthy debate. Perhaps Schellenberg’s principles were so fundamental that despite numerous attempts to deviate, the archival community continues to return to informative and evidential, primary and secondary value. One element that was missing conspicuously from the body of writing on the subject of appraisal was any deep consideration as to whether the size of the archive plays a role as an appraisal criteria. Terry Cook discusses how institutional

values can influence appraisal, and Richard Cox argues for a well-constructed collection development policy. Yet the sources, the majority of which are part of larger institutions, left a gap in their assessment of institutional size and its effect on appraisal. This project sought to provide insight into the reasons for that gap.
NARRATIVE

Introduction

This project provided a solution for the City of Boise Department of Arts and History’s lack of documented archival appraisal policy and guidelines. The project followed three stages: identifying the lack of an appraisal policy; research and analysis to understand archival appraisal and its applications; and developing a departmental appraisal policy and procedure guidelines.

Problem Identification

In June of 2012 the Boise Department of Arts and History acquired a small collection of photographs and a few artifacts from long-time Boise resident Thomas P. Byrne. When I joined the department in January 2013 as an intern, I received the task of developing an oral history from a series of interviews with Mr. Byrne, as well as processing the collection he donated. Included in the collection were numerous photos, many not identified. While interviewing Mr. Byrne, I had him identify as many of the photos as possible so they could be arranged within the collection.

Throughout the spring and summer months I processed numerous photographs and artifacts. Processing consisted of identifying the photograph or artifact, determining its condition, recording it in the accession sheet catalog, and preparing it for storage.25 When I began working with the Thomas Byrne collection, the department was without any documented procedures on how to carry out processing. Furthermore, there was no

---

25 The Department defines accession as the process of acquiring collections and cataloging them. Thus, it uses “accession sheets” to catalog each item in a collection during processing.
way to determine which artifacts were worth keeping. The Department expected all items would be retained. That gave rise to the question of how archives choose what to keep or discard. Until the Byrne Collection, the Department had only processed a few artifacts and one collection, and without a trained archivist, it was difficult to determine whether there were appraisal standards or precedent. I located some of the Department’s documents to aid collections processing: one that defined the terms of their archival system, one to fill out for each item processed, and one labeled “Collections Management Policy – Draft.”26 The definitions document helped me understand certain terms, but it did not help with the Department’s specialized uses of many terms. The accession sheets were helpful in their mimicry of the Department’s archival system “Discovery: Proficio,” though many of the line items lacked sufficient explanation. Those documents were helpful to an extent, but vague, and the policy incomplete. I could not find guidance on what the collecting or preservation goals of the Department.

History Programs Manager Brandi Burns directed me to the Department website and their “Plan for Guiding the Development of the History Division” to help me better understand what the department had planned for historical collecting.27 That document provided scope concerning the plan for the department, as well as what collections might fit within their goals. It was a broad overview of plans and recommendations, including those for developing policies, but did not include an actual policy. None of these documents answered the most important question concerning the collection: how did the

26 Jody Hawley-Ochoa, Boise City Department of Arts and History Collection Management Policy, Draft, (Boise, Idaho: n.p., 2010).
Department decide what to keep and what to discard? At a broader level the question was, “How did any archive determine what to keep and what to discard?” The answer to that question lay in the specialty of archival appraisal.

Archival appraisal is the practice of determining what kind of value an item or collection holds. The archivist does not assess monetary value, but archival value. The Society of American Archivists defines archival value as “The ongoing usefulness or significance of records.”

A photograph of a street corner in 1864 Boise might have no monetary value, but if a researcher had a need for that particular photograph, or the information it contained, it might hold enduring, informational value for him. A quill pen from the late 18th century may be just a pen, but if it was used to write the United States Constitution, it becomes relevant for its connection to that event. There are many different values that an item or collection can possess; an archivist determines which are important. Those decisions constitute archival appraisal. In order to make appraisal judgments, an archivist must understand what those values are and how to inquire about them. Differing values have relationships and may divide into categories. Many categories have been attempted, but most still echo to some degree Theodore Schellenberg. This project recognized the development of archival appraisal and sought to bring many of its ideas into an easily understood format for those new to collections management. The most pertinent authors were Boles and Young, whose work set out to express the thoughts of archivists in making appraisal determinations. This project set out to do the same, and to distill those thoughts into a format that was less technical.

---

29 See note 7.
In 1956, Theodore Schellenberg developed the basic—now called traditional—categories of primary and secondary values that many archivists referred to when appraising. Primary values are those that made a record useful to its place or person of origin. In the Byrne Collection, Bertha Virgil’s receipt for a 1920s hardware store purchase documented the legal transfer of property via a cash transaction. In 2013 that receipt for hardware used in a house that was subsequently dismantled was unlikely to be used as proof of purchase. It was still valuable, but that the value had changed.

In July 2013, Bertha Virgil’s receipt had value for a different reason, one related to Schellenberg’s secondary value. The difference in value, Schellenberg suggested, was due to the change in use of the records. Secondary values are when someone other than the creator of a record finds it useful. The receipt held information other than the transaction, notably the purchaser’s street address, potentially useful for a researcher studying that Boise neighborhood. Schellenberg drew further distinction between two types of secondary values. There were those secondary values that were of evidential use concerning the organization that created the record, and those that were of informational use concerning the persons involved, problems involved, or circumstances of creation. Schellenberg’s influence was seen in this project where the proposed appraisal policy stated that an artifact be “useful to the Department for educational or research purposes.”

---

30 Schellenberg’s principles were written for use in records management. Because of the way archives developed from records management, his principles have often been co-opted by archivists. Though he wrote about records—and I have represented that in this section—the principles were applied to artifacts.
32 Ibid.
or where the appraisal procedure guide asked whether an artifact was “valuable because of the person who created it.”

Boles and Young’s influence was less evident in the text of the policy and procedure guide. However, in form, the procedure guide and policy showed elements of their methodology. Boles and Young proposed that appraisal be extracted from its position as an inference played out in the minds of archivists and that its decisions be documented so that there could be consistency across archival processes. Their research also contributed an element that was apparent in the form of questions in the procedures guide regarding the political realities for archives. Archives were faced with donations from important individuals whose collections were not of particular importance or significance and were not relevant to the archive. The Boles and Young strategy offered the solution of documenting the potential consequences of rejecting the collection or the precedent that accepting it would set.33 For that reason, questions regarding precedent and consequences are included in “Cycle 1: Acquisitions” of the procedure guide in Appendix B.

Collection Processing

The Department offered little to guide appraisal of artifacts and the reasonable course of action was to process the Byrne Collection based on a combination of precedent from other archival policies and analysis of archival method manuals. As my research progressed, Brandi Burns informed me that the Department intended to adopt a collections policy based on the one from the Center for Sacramento History (CSH). I

obtained a copy to see if I could use it to aid my collection processing. There was some useful information contained in CSH’s collection development policy and echoed in the appraisal policy section I developed. An example was the set of statement-based acquisition guidelines it contained. In that policy I did not locate any section specifically regarding appraisal, though it did include a description of what items might be acquired, as well as what might be deaccessioned. Ultimately policy sections concerned with acquisitions and deaccessioning were the product of archival value considerations. The Maine Historical Society Collections Policy stated an artifact might be accepted if it “has documented associations to individuals…within the boundaries of the State of Maine.”

In doing so the Maine Policy did not explicitly state an appraisal guideline, but for an archivist considering that policy constraint in relation to an artifact or collection, it became an appraisal question. The practice of not specifically addressing appraisal in collections development policy was typical across the many I examined. It was not the case that appraisal was absent; it was simply inferred by archivists—usually in a section of the policy concerning what it might acquire or discard. While that practice might have application for personnel trained in archives, for the Department it did not.

Because Boise’s history department was small, collections managers experienced a greater degree of involvement with each collection—individual artifacts were more carefully examined for relevance to the collection and archive, and collections managers were able to spend time collaborating with creators and researchers. In the case of the

---

Byrne collection, the donor was still living and he was able to identify photographs and artifacts, making them more useful to researchers. One such example was a photograph from the collection titled “Photograph of Rustic Cabin.” According to the author, the reverse of the photograph had writing identifying it as “Fivemile Homestead” and the date was 1894. There was nothing else in the collection identifying to whom the homestead belonged, and without corroboration from another photo of the cabin, it would have been valuable as an example of a 19th century Boise homestead. When Mr. Byrne identified the photo as the Gibson homestead, it became more valuable. With the knowledge of the family that lived there, researchers could use it for purposes beyond the general geographic area; it would also be useful to someone researching the Gibson family. In an archive with a goal of obtaining and maintaining a representative sample of the people and places in Boise’s past, the item demonstrated its usefulness and value for the Department’s archive.

That example showed two important aspects of appraisal that were specific to the nature of the Department. It highlighted one of the strengths—processing might be completed with more attention to the individual artifacts, informing appraisal decisions by providing more information about the artifact. In doing so, artifacts were made useful for more purposes and more valuable for research or education. The example also displayed the importance of collaboration with creators or donors and how collaboration might increase the usefulness of an item. The idea of collaboration, however, was not new; Helen Willa Samuels was notable for suggesting committees made up of creators, archivists and researchers of a particular discipline, who would meet to discuss what should be preserved and what should be discarded. It was not a practical suggestion for

---

36 See Appendix C.
large institutions that dealt with backlogs of collections. Some of Samuels’ ideas were more practical for a small archive like the one at the City of Boise. For this project, Samuels’ suggestions led to more in-depth consideration of the values that collaboration with creators could contribute to artifacts or collections.

When a person chose to keep something, regardless of its monetary value or usefulness to them, it presented potential historical value to an archive. By opting to keep an artifact or collection, a creator or collector appraised its worth at some level. In the Byrne Collection there were a number of ephemeral articles—ticket stubs, receipts of dues payments to social organizations, etc. The ticket stubs were for various theatres and shows, many not in Boise, and they did not bear the holder’s name. Each of the tickets or receipts taken as a singular artifact was not very useful for research. Their value lay in consideration of their context among and within the rest of the collection. That context expressed an element of what was important to their creator in saving them. Because of that they held potential usefulness for researchers. That examination of creator-related value led to the addition in the policy that items might be relevant for their relationship to the collection.37

Throughout processing I took careful notes on how I thought about value. While accessioning an item titled “Photograph of People at a Banquet,” I inquired as to what potential value that image could have.38 Mr. Byrne identified one person in the photo, Ray Clawson, as a relative born in Idaho, but he believed that the photo had been taken in

37 See Appendix A, Cycle 2: Processing, point 3.
38 See Appendix C.
New Orleans, where Ray had lived. Except for his relationship to the Clawson family who had lived in Boise, Ray had little relationship to the city once he moved away in the 1940s. Furthermore, even the location of the photo was unknown. The photo was reviewed for its relevance to the Byrne Collection; there were other photos of Ray that provided more contextual import. Mr. Byrne did not mention any special relationship to the photo when asked. With so little information about an individual only laterally connected to Boise, it did not offer sufficient value to the Department archive and should have been considered for disposal. However, without appraisal policy or procedure in place to warrant such action, the photo was accessioned. The Department needed a way for collections managers to make informed appraisal decisions so the collections would not be encumbered with items outside their collecting scope. I began researching other collecting institutions’ policies to understand how they made their selections.

**Defining the Problem**

After reading numerous policies, I determined that the Department needed not only a policy for appraisal, but a procedure guide as well. For a person processing a collection, reading “An [item] may be accepted into the Archive if the Department possesses the necessary resources,” might provide some guidance, but it was the questions that person asked—questions like, “What resources are being referenced?” or “Does the department have the staff required to conserve this item?”—that allowed him to make an appraisal judgment. With some observation, I concluded that policy and procedure shared a relationship, but served different purposes. Statements of principle

---

39 Zach Brown, “Oral History Interview with Thomas P. Byrne,” (Boise, Idaho: City of Boise Department of Arts and History, 2013) audio recording, not cataloged.
40 See Appendix A.
used for managerial decision-making comprised a policy, while procedures were
guidelines used by persons performing the work to achieve policy goals.

While identifying the problem I worked to account for the specific needs of the
Department as a collecting institution. Each of the things that made the Department
unique I observed in other institutions; it was the combination of resource constraints,
training, and organizational structure that set it apart. Every aspect did not necessarily
impact collections or appraisal, but there were three that shaped my policy development.
First was the Department’s lack of a professionally-trained archivist—most of the
processing was performed by personnel untrained in archives and acquisition, not by an
archivist. Secondly, the Department’s archive, while governed by the city, was not the
repository for official records; the focus was historical collections from important places,
individuals or families connected with Boise. That was an important consideration
because resources were available to direct toward the collections surrounding the citizens
and places in Boise. The Department focused its appraisal decisions toward accepting
artifacts from the population of Boise at large. Thirdly, the Department had significant
facilities constraints—it lacked storage space, and what space it did possess was not
temperature- and humidity-controlled.

The Byrne Collection served as an example of a small private collection
representing Boise and a few of the people who lived there. It was acquired because of
the opportunity it offered the department as a collection of artifacts concerned with the
places and people of Boise. Though Mr. Byrne as a person did not have a significant
impact on how Boise developed, he was representative of a sector of society that lived,
worked, and helped to build Boise. Many of the artifacts in the Byrne Collection were
reminders of Boise’s past. Much of the collection was photos and easily stored artifacts, although there were a few larger items that required greater attention. Because of the nature of the Department as a non-government repository, it had the resources available to acquire the Byrne Collection.

Because of the lack of space, any policy practical for the Department needed to limit what was collected to only items that were of the greatest significance—items with the most archival value, or those that helped to create a representative record of the human experience in Boise.\textsuperscript{41} For the policy, that meant narrowly defined acquisition guidelines. The department as not the repository for government records, and the volume of collections was small. I concluded that, with a small volume of collections, more time could be devoted to increasing the usefulness of the collections by providing more information about their contents.\textsuperscript{42} Documentation strategy presented a similar vision, but it saw little success in larger archives due to the large volumes of records the processed.\textsuperscript{43} The Department’s lack of space required appraisal statutes that narrowed what could be accepted. With the smaller volume due to stricter acceptance tolerances there was more time to use working with each collection. Thus, the procedures focused on individual artifacts more than was possible in a larger archive.

Finally, the lack of an archivist meant that the policy and procedures had to develop without much of the specialized and technical language used by archivists. Specialized uses of terms—like “value,” “appraisal,” or “arrangement”—that bore related

\textsuperscript{41} Paraphrase of F. Gerald Ham, "The Archival Edge," 5-13.
\textsuperscript{42} Such information gathering was an area where I deviated from my understanding of archival best practices. Most institutions consider it impractical. While it affected the processing of the Byrne Collection, I did not include any recommendation that future collection managers do the same.
\textsuperscript{43} Boles, \textit{Selecting and Appraising}. , 22.
meanings in everyday usage were confusing to someone untrained in archives. For the Department it was a practicality to remove the specialized language in appraisal, as it was part of the first task a new collection manager undertook. While it would seem essential for him to learn the specialized usage and technical language used among archivists, such education was beyond the scope of this project.

**Developing Appraisal Policy and Procedure**

In order to produce a coherent policy regarding archival appraisal for the Department, I reviewed and analyzed the policies of other collecting institutions. I looked at a variety of policies, those from small city institutions to ones from larger state repositories. I included both government and non-government archives, as well as some museum policies. Such diversity was necessary to inform appraisal policy development to fit the Department’s specific needs. During the research process I discovered some organizational consistency across appraisal policies. Typically, there was a section outlining the criteria for acquisition, and another for deaccessioning. For those sections, some policies had elaborate and detailed lists and instructions. Others were brief, with one or two criteria, deferring to mission statements or financial resources.

Bastrop County Historical Society Museum (BCHS)—serving a population of less than 75,000 and guided by a staff and governing board knowledgeable in archival procedure—did not have an elaborate policy. Its criteria for acquisition were defined in a

---

44 See Appendix A.
45 See Maine Historical Society.
46 See Bastrop County.
Those criteria were historical relevance, and primary and secondary uses. Because the BCHS employed a trained archivist familiar with the application of archival values, it was possible for the organization to publish less specific criteria. The Maine Historical Society—serving the history of the State of Maine, nearly two hundred years old and with a large and fully trained staff—acquired artifacts and collections for multiple library and museum collections according to twelve concise statements, only four of which addressed archival value. Maine’s policy terms of archival value closely aligned with the Boles-Young approach to value, allowing for retention cost to play a part in the appraisal decision. I included a similar idea in the policy developed for this project by assuring adequate care for artifacts in “Cycle 2: Processing.” Another common element between these two organizations was the deference to mission and goals in the acquisition criteria. For purposes of the Department it seemed more cohesive to interpret those goals through an appraisal lens and outline them specifically.

The policy from the Center for Sacramento History (CSH) showed good balance with regard to recognizing collecting goals and the Center’s mission, while specifically outlining the criteria pertinent to acquisition. It was likely that the Department would adopt a policy based on the CSH policy; it was therefore used to inform some of the decisions in the appraisal policy for this project. One example of acknowledgement of organizational mission being included in appraisal policy was CSH’s policy item 4.6.2 that recognized the educational purposes for acquisitions. Because the Department also served the public in an educational fashion, a similar requirement for acquisitions was

---

47 Bastrop County..., 1.
included in the proposed policy section for this project. Even though CSH’s policy was more explicit in outlining its acquisition criteria than some others, it remained brief. After consideration of the different policies, I concluded that the Department, because of the scope of its collection and the number and qualifications of personnel involved, would benefit from a succinct policy that explicitly included elements of the Department mission and collecting goals.

Archival appraisal was often highly theoretical, with products that attempted to concentrate entire collecting philosophies into a single chart, or a quantitative metric that determined what was accepted and what was rejected. Barbara Craig created a flowchart that displayed the various factors and processes that influenced an appraisal decision. Elements of her work could be observed in the appraisal procedure guide developed by this project in the form of questions about donor relationships and external constraints. In a fashion similar to the many appraisal theories, ideas for a policy ran a large gamut: visual charts, matrices, rubrics, scoring systems, statements of what was and was not qualified, and various hybrids. The policy finally took the form of two pages of statements designed to coordinate with the procedure guidelines for appraisal. It was divided into four “cycles” roughly analogous to the typical processes over time for an item or collection: Acquisition, Processing, Reappraisal, and Deaccessioning and Disposition. The four-cycle approach provided a structured, succinct policy for personnel that might not have experience in archival practices. The appraisal procedure guidelines mirrored the four-cycle policy structure. It created redundancy that was a positive reinforcement of archival processes.

48 See Appendix A, Cycle 1: Acquisitions, bullet 3.
49 Craig, 187.
After processing the Byrne Collection I determined that the best procedural guidelines for appraisal would be those that accentuated the strengths of the Department while limiting the weaknesses. There were numerous other factors that could have been considered as strengths or weaknesses, the brief list below outlines those that factored into the developed procedures:

**Strengths**

- Not a Government Repository – Functioning as a non-government repository exempted the Department from the task of appraising large volumes of city records.
- Resources – While a paucity of resources might have been a weakness, it also served to develop a more focused archive. With fewer staff, access to management and decisions were better informed and more efficient.
- Insufficient Facilities – While large storage areas were desirable, the lack of space to preserve collections drove careful, focused collecting goals used to enhance the collection by refining the appraisal criteria.

**Weaknesses**

- Untrained Staff – The Department did not have staff specializing in collections management.
- No Archivist – The Department’s lack of an archivist made it difficult to develop a cohesive and useful archive.
No Venue – The department lacked a venue for display, or even for a researcher to be able to use the collection. While there were plans to develop such a space, it had not happened.

Small Budget – The Department’s small budget for collecting made it difficult to purchase items that might have been useful to the collection.

The most important strength was that the Department operated as a non-government archive. The most important weakness was the low level of training that the collections staff possessed. Any procedures needed to develop based on these factors. Beginning with the weakness because it presented the most constraining aspect of developing procedures, I analyzed the process of how the Department selected an item or collection. I accounted for my own interpretation of that process by taking careful notes. Out of those notes came the suggestion that any person newly initiated to collections management probably would not have a developed schema for inquiring about archival value.

Prior to my study of archival value and appraisal, I assumed that all items should be accessioned simply because they were donated—I did not have a developed understanding of archival value. My questions about artifacts were nebulous: “Is this rare?” or “Why should the department keep this?” By asking such questions it seemed reasonable that a photo postcard from the early twentieth century with no identifiable individuals on it, no writing or any unique aspect—certainly nothing to tie it to Boise—would not belong in a collection for Boise. Mr. Byrne was not able to identify anyone

---

50 See Appendix C. Real photo postcards were very common in the early to mid twentieth century. Some were quite rare, but the one accessioned to the Department was not at all
from the postcard, and its arrangement within the collection did not provide further clues about origin, nor did the postcard enhance the collection by its presence. I sorted through all of the Department documents trying to gain an understanding of why this item should be in the Department’s archive. Finding none, I set the postcard aside for consideration at another time. That time came after I had a more thorough understanding of appraisal, and value. Picking up the postcard again I asked “Is this useful for research or exhibition?” and “Does it enhance the collection?” It was a subtle yet significant shift in thinking. Instead of asking ambiguous, global questions about the item, I was asking specific questions about archival values. Individuals untrained in archives might spend a lot of time asking questions that will provide fragile answers because they do not have an understanding of archival value. By developing a question-based procedure guide, I hoped to fill that knowledge gap and shorten the learning curve for new collections managers.

Working through the Appraisal Procedure Guide’s questions in relation to the artifact or collection they were acquiring or processing, the staff member or volunteer would be led to think about value in archival terms. The questions were intended not as a scoring system for the artifact or collection, but instead to focus on what did or did not present a valuable opportunity to the archive. Individuals might not have training in the specialized language used in archival appraisal, but by answering a series of questions that included, “Who was the creator of the item/collection?” or “Was the creator important to Boise’s past?” that person was considering the value of significance. Other questions, such as “What kind of research would [the item] support?” encountered the rare, and had no identifying factors on it except for the print company that made it, a company in Chicago that printed millions of real photo stock cards.
value of the item. The questions were tied to traditional categories of value that Schellenberg and others had written about, while sparing the technical and specialized terminology used in traditional appraisal.

This approach was applicable to the Department because of its size and volume of information. Because the Department was not the records repository for the city, collections might be vetted at the item level. Were the department responsible for city records, a full training program and a trained archivist would be needed. The small size of the department and compressed space for collections made it possible for those new to archival work to learn on the job through question-based procedures.

The lack of sufficient resources at the Department drove another aspect of the procedure guidelines: narrowness of scope. Because the Department lacked space, adequate facilities, and a sufficient budget, what could be accepted as part of the archive needed to be demonstrably within the scope of the Department’s collecting goals. For this reason, items would be checked along the way to see that the previous step was completed properly. In practice, as an item made its way through the appraisal cycles, it was checked for conformity with the prior cycle. The Department should attach a document noting the rationale for the decision. An approach similar to this was proposed in Developing and Maintaining Practical Archives based on Boles and Young’s scheme for appraisal.

I encountered the need for that redundancy in the form of a small leather wallet with random news clippings that was included in the Byrne Collection. It was clear that

---

51 See Appendix B. As each cycle of the process is begun, the processor is asked whether the previous steps were completed consistently with the collecting goals of the Department.
52 Hunter, 62-67.
there was no cohesive element to them, many possessed little significance, and most were undated. The leather wallet was in very poor condition and not useful to the department, but I had been told that all items were to be accessioned, none destroyed. There was no explanation as to what value the wallet presented to the Department’s archive. The Department needed a way to communicate collecting rationale across archival events—acquisition, processing, and disposition. It also needed a way of checking that rationale in order to develop a strong collection. To accomplish these goals, the procedure guidelines included a question in Cycles 2-4 concerning the compliance of the previous steps. Also, collection managers were encouraged to include a brief note in each step explaining their appraisal decisions.

Finally, because the proposed policy and procedure guide was not a quantitative measure for what item or collection might be a good fit in the Department’s archive, the ultimate decision was left to the department manager. The questions and the policy were meant to cause collections managers to think about value and make informed decisions or recommendations. They were not created as constraints, but as aids for developing a collection of value that was cohesive, useful and exhibitable.

Conclusion

There were three purposes for this project: to process the Byrne Collection at the City of Boise Department of Arts and History; to research and evaluate appraisal strategies and various collections policies of other collecting institutions; and to develop a documented appraisal strategy for the Department. The intent was for the first two goals to inform the final goal of developing an appraisal strategy. Appendices A and B were the final form of that strategy. The data from the first two goals combined in narrative form
through a program of note taking and observation of accession forms, a few examples of which were included as Appendix C. The greatest realization of the research was the production of the Appraisal Procedure Guide, which harmonized with the appraisal section for the Department’s policy and provided guidelines for understanding archival value. The policy section was succinct. The developed procedures would be put to best use with a form for the archivist to complete concerning reasoning for acquisition, retention, or disposal. Finally, this project concluded with an appraisal strategy that was practical to the specific needs of the Department. There were many other collecting institutions with similar constraints and composition to the Department that could benefit from this research by understanding appraisal in a smaller setting.
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APPENDIX A

Appraisal Section for City of Boise Department of Arts and History Collections

Management Policy

Appraisal for artifacts or records should follow the methods laid forth in “Appraisal Procedure Guidelines.”

Cycle 1: Acquisition – An artifact or collection may be accepted into the archive if:

- it is relevant to the history of the city of Boise;
- it complies with the Department’s mission and collecting goals;
- it is useful to the Department for educational or research purposes;
- the Department possesses the necessary resources (staff, storage and maintenance conditions, funding) to acquire and preserve it;
- it is authentic, original, and of sound provenance;
- it can be obtained with unrestricted, clear title;
- there is not a more suitable repository for it;
- it can be acquired ethically;

Cycle 2: Processing – An artifact may be processed into archive if:

- it complies to the appraisal standards of Cycle 1;
- it can be sufficiently conserved and preserved;
- it is relevant to the history of the city of Boise or, by means of relationship to a particular collection, is made relevant;
- it is unique;
- it is authentic and original;
- it cannot be better preserved in another form (in digital format, microfilm, etc.).

Cycle 3: Reappraisal – An artifact may be selected for continued preservation if:

- it continues to comply with Cycles 1 and 2 of the appraisal section;
- it has not deteriorated beyond usability or can be effectively conserved by the Department;
- the Department continues to be the most suitable repository.

53 At the time of publication, this policy and the accompanying procedures guidelines were still under consideration by the Department of Arts and History.
Cycle 4: Deaccessioning – An artifact may be deaccessioned and permanently removed from the collection if:

- it no longer complies with the criteria outlined in Cycles 1, 2, or 3;
- it should be repatriated under NAGPRA, ARPA, AIRFA or any other protective act;
- it no longer complies with the Department’s mission or collecting goals;
- it has deteriorated beyond usability and conservability;
- a superior duplicate exists in the collection;
- the department is unable to further preserve it;
- a more suitable repository exists for the item.
APPENDIX B

Appraisal Procedure Guide for the City of Boise Department of Arts and History

Appraisal Procedure –
The appraisal procedure outlined here will coordinate the efforts of multiple handlers to aid in producing a cohesive archive. These processes correspond to the appraisal standards of the Department’s collecting policy. The person following this guide should not seek to answer each question absolutely, but allow the series of questions to help develop an idea of the item’s enduring value. Especially during acquisition, a brief note describing why the collection is being acquired should be included.54

Cycle 1 Process: Acquisition –
Acquisitions are the gateway to the archive. It is important to take care during this process to weigh the archival value against the monetary cost of conservation and preservation.

• Goals
  o Does this item or collection conform to the institutional goals of the Department?
  o Does this item or collection conform to the collecting goals of the Department?

• Resources
  o Does the Department have adequate facilities or material resources to properly preserve this item or collection?
  o Does the Department have adequate staff (by means of presence, training, knowledge, and skill) to provide for effective care of the item or collection?
  o Does the Department have the financial resources to acquire the item or collection?
    ▪ Is the item or collection important enough for the archive that funding must be secured to acquire?
  o Does the Department have adequate funding to conserve and/or preserve the item or collection?

• Is the provenance of the item or collection identifiable?
• Does the item or collection possess sound title?
• Cooperation
  o Is there another organization for which the item or collection would be a better fit?
• Who was the creator of this item?
  o Is the item or collection valuable because of the person who created it?

54 Throughout this guide, “Item” is a generic term referring to individual artifacts or whole collections.
- Is the creator important to Boise’s past?
- Does the item or collection enhance an existing collection?

- **What is the anticipated use of the item or collection?**
  - What kind of research would it benefit?
  - What kind of exhibit would it benefit?

- **Must the item or collection be acquired to satisfy and/or maintain relationships?**
  - What precedent would acquisition of the item or collection set for future acquisitions?
  - What damage might be done to the status of the department by not acquiring the item or collection?

- **Are there any further concerns about the acquisition of this item or collection?**
  - Can the content or nature of the item or collection be classified as too personal for retention?

- **Cycle 2 Process: Processing**
  During processing entire collections can be examined more closely; individual items can be appraised and may be set aside for disposition.

- **Confirmation of Cycle 1**
  - Were the policies from Cycle 1 applied consistently with Departmental goals?
    - If no, was there sufficient cause and documentation for a policy override?

- **Documentation**
  - Is provenance sufficient?
  - Is the title clear?

- **Item-Specific Concerns**
  - Is the item in good condition?
  - Does the item belong in the collection?
  - Is the item unique?
  - Is the item a duplicate?
  - Does the item enhance a current collection (is it part of a set)?

- **Resources & Retention**
  - What resources are needed to preserve this item properly?
    - What is the projected life span of this item?
    - What is the expected cost of preservation over the lifetime of the object?

- **Cycle 3 Process: Reappraisal**
  Reappraisal is a contingency process; if resources are not available it does not happen. Items should only be considered for reappraisal after their archival life-cycle is complete, or if there arises a factor that demands immediate address.

---

55 If no use can be contrived, the item should not be selected.
• Does the item still comply with the criteria in Cycles 1 and 2?
• Has the item deteriorated beyond usability and conservability?
• Is the Department still the most suitable repository for the item?
• Is there still a perceivable use for the item?

• **Cycle 4 Process: Deaccessioning** –
  When it comes time to deaccession an item, this process runs through a final set of questions to determine the disposition.
  • Does the item fail to comply with criteria in Cycles 1, 2, or 3?
  • Is the item protected under NAGPRA, ARPA, AIRFA or any other protective acts or treaties?
    o If so, it requires repatriation.
  • Is the item outside the scope of the mission of the Department?
  • Has the item deteriorated beyond usefulness?
  • Is the item a fake, forgery, reproduction, or duplicate?
    o If a reproduction, or inferior duplicate: can it be used for educational purposes?
  • Is the Department unable to preserve the item? Name the reason:
    o Facility constraints?
    o Other resource constraints?
  • Is the item more suitable to another repository?
  • Deaccessioned items must be disposed of and the disposition documented accordingly.
APPENDIX C

Byrne Collection Accession Sheet Scans

Item 1: Accession Processing Sheet of a Photograph of a Rustic Cabin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Arts and History Collections Accession Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalog #: ___________________ Component Parts: ______ Accession #: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: ___________________ Classification: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Name: PHOTOGRAPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt Name: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: PHOTOGRAPH OF RUSTIC CABIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist/Maker: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: PHOTOGRAPH OF HOMESTEAD AT FIVE MILE. IDENTIFIED AS GIBSON FAMILY HOMESTEAD BY THOMAS BYRNE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material: GELATIN SILVER PRINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made: 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Made: FIVE MILE, APA, ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: CETY HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building: CETY HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf: ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box: ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling: SHELTER FROM LIGHT AND EXCESSIVE HEAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Unit: PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction(y/n): N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature/Marks: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions: &quot;FIVE MILE HOMESTEAD 1979&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium of Sign: PENCIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermarks: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Location: REVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: ___________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dimensions-English:
Remarks: ____________________________

Dimensions-Other
Addit Dim: ____________________________
Set Dim: Closed, In Storage, On Exhibit, Open
Dimension Notes: ____________________________

Measured by: ____________________________ Date Measured: ____________________________

Condition: Excellent, Fair, Good, Poor
Condition Description:
LOWER LEFT CORNER TORN: SLIGHT
LOWER RIGHT CORNER CRACKED: NEGLIGIBLE

○ abrasions ○ bleeding ○ bulgy areas ○ buckling
○ bulges ○ chip ○ corrosion ○ crack
○ crease ○ delamination ○ dent ○ dirt/grime
○ discoloration ○ distortion ○ embrittlement ○ flaking
○ fraying ○ gouge ○ holes ○ loss
○ missing element ○ mold ○ pest damage ○ pitting
○ powdering ○ rot ○ scratch ○ shrinking
○ stain ○ tarnish ○ tears ○ warping

Number of Pieces: __________ Other Numbers: __________________________
Degree of Damage: none slight moderate major extreme
Storage Recommendation:
- acid free envelope/folder
- dust cover
- flat on shelf
- hanging from rack
- interleaved w/ acid-free tissue
- padded form
- rolled on tube
- special box/crate
- support/cradle
- wrap w/acid-free tissue

Multimedia:
- Digital Audio File
- Digital Image
- Digital Video File
- Electronic Document
- Web Site

Recent Conservation: 1 2 3 4 (5)
1=urgent 2=not exhibitable as is 3=needs minor repair/cleaning
4=needs further evaluation 5=needs no work

History/Use
*Source:

*Acq Method:

Credit Line:

Date Made: 1874
Place Made: FEVEMILE, AOA, ID

Manufacture Technology:
Place Used:

Cultural Association: BORSE, AOA, ID

Provenance:
Narrative: 

Eminent Figure: Ophelone Gibson

Significance: LATE 19TH CENT. HOMESTEAD IN BORSE AREA, REPRESENTATIVE OF ARCHITECTURE AT THE TIME AS WELL AS SOCIAL CLASSE
LIFESTYLE.

Related Objects:
Catalog Number: Repository:
Relationship:
Related Object
Notes:

If more, continue on back of page.
Item 2: Accession Processing Sheet of a Photograph of Four People near Rock Structure
Dimensions-English:
H: ____ W: ____ D: ____ Diam: ____ L: ____
Remarks:

Dimensions-Other
Add'l Dim: 

Set Date: Closed ___ In Storage ___ On Exhibit ___ Open ___
Dimension Notes:

Measured by: EACH BROWN  Date Measured: 06/05/2015
Weight:

Condition: Excellent ___ Fair X ___ Good ___ Poor ___
Condition Description:

CREASE 1 CHAR ON TOP LEFT CORNER, NEGATIVE

Extended Information:

- abrasions
- bulges
- crease
- discoloration
- fraying
- missing element
- powdering
- stain

- bleeding
- chip
- delamination
- distortion
- gouge
- mold
- rot
- tamish

- bubbly areas
- corrosion
- dent
- embrittlement
- holes
- pest damage
- scratch
- tears

- burkling
- crack
- dirt/grime
- flaking
- loss
- pitting
- shrinking
- warping

Number of Pieces: 1  Other Numbers:

Degree of Damage:
- none
- slight
- moderate
- major
- extreme
Storage Recommendation:
- acid free envelope/folder
- dust cover
- flat on shelf
- hanging from rack
- interleaved w/ acid-free tissue
- padded form
- rolled on tube
- special box/crate
- support/cradle
- wrap w/acid-free tissue


Recent Conservation:  1  2  3  4  5
1=urgent  2=not exhibitable as is  3=needs minor repair/cleaning  4=needs further evaluation  5=needs no work

History/Use:
*Source:

*Acq Method:

Credit Line:

Date Made:  EARLY 19TH CENT  Place Made:  CALIFORNIA

Manufacture Technology:  PHOTOGRAPHIC  Place Used:

Cultural Association:

Provenance:
Narrative:  POSSESS BY THOMAS BYNE, FAMILY PROBABLY ACQUIRED FROM THE VIGEL FAMILY THROUGH THOMAS VIGEL IV (NEIL) BYNE. THE SULLIVANS WERE FRIENDS OF THE VIGELS, AND THIS PHOTO WAS CLEARLY SENT TO THEM IN A CARD.

Eminent Figure:  PEEFY VIGEL

Significance:  INDIVIDUALS IN PHOTO WERE SOCIAL RELATIVE OF PEEFY VIGEL, A NOTORIOUS MERCHANT WHO OWNED THE PUB. PHOTO IS AN EXAMPLE OF SOCIAL CLASS ACTIVITY & FASHION OF THE TIME

Related Objects:
Catalog Number:  Repository:
Relationship:
Related Object
Notes:

If more, continue on back of page.
Item 3: Photograph of People at a Banquet

Department of Arts and History Collections Accession Sheet

Catalog #: Component Parts: Accession #: Classification: Category:

Object Name: PHOTOGRAPH
Alt Name:

Title: PHOTOGRAPH OF PEOPLE AT BANQUET

Artist/Maker:

Description: PHOTOGRAPH OF PEOPLE AT A BANQUET. PHOTO FOCUSES ON THREE KEY FIGURES IDENTIFIED AS MILLIE SUGAR RAY, A FOURTH FIGURE PARTIALLY OBSCURED IS IDENTIFIED AS RAY SUGAR RAY'S WIFE. IN ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW, THOMAS BURKE IDENTIFIED RAY CLEVELAND AND SUGGESTED LOCATION OF NEW ORLEANS.

Material: COBALT SILVER
Date Made: 1950s Place Made: UNKNOWN

Location:
Building: SORREY CITY HALL
Room: DEPT ARTS WEST
Shelf:
Notes:

Handling:

Object Status: STORAGE
Web Ready(y/n): 
Record Status:

Physical Description
Count: 1 Count Unit: PAGE Reproduction(y/n): 

Signature/Marks:
Signature:
Inscriptions:
Date:
Marks:

Medium of Sign: Stamps:
Watermarks:
Labels:
Mark Location: FRONT ON BOTTOM
Notes:
Storage Recommendation: 
- acid free envelope/folder
- interleaved w/ acid-free tissue
- special box/crate
- dust cover
- padded form
- support/cradle
- flat on shelf
- rolled on tube
- wrap w/ acid-free tissue


Recent Conservation: 
1=urgent  2=not exhibitable as is  3=needs minor repair/cleaning
4=needs further evaluation  5=needs no work

History/Use
*Source:

*Acq Method:

Credit Line:

Date Made: Before 1963  Place Made:

Manufacture Technology: Photographic  Place Used:

Cultural Association: Religious Activities

Provenance:
Narrative: Ray Clawson, identified in the photo, was Tim Byrnes' uncle. The Byrneses were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Tim and his husband, Thomas Byrnes, stayed in Boise with the family, according to Thomas. This photo was sent to them from the Clawsons. It was part of a collection gifted to the City of Boise.

Eminent Figure: Ray Clawson

Significance: Ray was born in Idaho to John Wesley and Selgie Topping Clawson. The Clawson were highly prominent citizens in Boise, one time owning a house on Hudson Blvd.

Related Objects:
Catalog Number: Repository:
Relationship:
Related Object
Notes:

If more, continue on back of page.
**Item 4: Photograph of Five Men in Suits and Hats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object Name</strong></td>
<td>Photograph Post Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Photograph of five men in suits &amp; hats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Made</strong></td>
<td>1907-1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Silver chloride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Boise City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium of Sign</strong></td>
<td>The PMO stamp dates the card to 1907-1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Handling</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count Unit</strong></td>
<td>2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Ready (y/n)</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object Status</strong></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature/Marks</strong></td>
<td>Postcard layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inscriptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stamps</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watermarks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mark Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>The PMO stamp dates the card to 1907-1915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dimensions-English:
H: 5 1/4 W: 5 1/4 D:______ Diam:______ L:______
Remarks:__________________________

Dimensions-Other
Addit Dim:________________________
Set Dir: Closed____ In Storage____ On Exhibit____ Open____
Dimension
Notes:__________________________

Measured by: Chuck Brown Date Measured:________________
Weight:__________________________

Condition: Excellent__ Fair X Good__ Poor__
Condition Description:
- upper left corner front: crease and crack - slight
- lower left corner front: torn corner missing - slight
- lower right corner front: torn, corner missing - slight
- torn 3/8" tear - slight

○ abrasions ○ bleeding ○ bubbly areas ○ buckling
○ bulges ○ chip ○ corrosion ○ crack
○ crease ○ delamination ○ dent ○ dirt/grime
○ discoloration ○ distortion ○ embrittlement ○ flaking
○ fraying ○ gouge ○ holes ○ loss
○ missing element ○ mold ○ pest damage ○ pitting
○ powdering ○ rot ○ scratch ○ shrinking
○ stain ○ tarnish ○ tears ○ warping

Number of Pieces: 1 Other Numbers:________________________

Degree of Damage:
none__ slight moderate major extreme
Storage Recommendation:
- acid free envelope/folder
- interleaved w/ acid-free tissue
- special box/crate
- dust cover
- padded form
- support/cradle
- flat on shelf
- rolled on tube
- wrap w/ acid-free tissue

Multimedia:
- Digital Audio File
- Digital Image
- Digital Video File
- Electronic Document
- Web Site

Recent Conservation:
- 1 = urgent
- 2 = not exhibitable as is
- 3 = needs minor repair/cleaning
- 4 = needs further evaluation
- 5 = needs no work

History/Use
*Source:

*Acq Method:

Credit Line:

Date Made: Place Made:

Manufacture Technology: Place Used:

Cultural Association:

Provenance:
Narrative: Gifted to city of Boise w/ Byrna Collection

Eminent Figure: N/A

Significance: Fashion, communication methods

Related Objects: Catalog Number: Repository: Relationship:
Related Object Notes:

If more, continue on back of page.