

## Meeting Notes

### Interior Museum Property Committee Meeting

9:00 AM -- 3:00 PM, Thursday, December 9, 2004; Room 2603A, Main Interior Building

Mark your calendars for the **next meeting, scheduled for Thursday, February 24, 2005**. We will meet in the Office of Acquisition and Property Management (PAM) Conference Room (MIB 2603-A).

Ron Wilson opened the December 9 meeting at 9:00 a.m. with introductions. Emily Shillingburg assisted Ron with note-taking. All meeting participants are listed below.

BIA	Emily Shillingburg	202-501-5946
BLM	Stephanie Damadio (via phone)	530-677-3158 (H)
FWS	No representative available	
IACB	Kenneth VanWey	202-208-3773
MMS	No representative available	
NPS	Terry Childs	202-354-2125
	Ann Hitchcock	202-354-2271
	Sherry Hutt	202-354-1479
	John Roberts	202-354-2009
OS/NBC	David McKinney	202-208-7017
	Kim Robinson	202-208-1169
OS/PAM	Donald R. Cumberland	202-208-4698
	Ronald C. Wilson	202-208-3438
OS/OST	Leon Craig, Jr.	202-208-6618
	David Pradt (via phone)	505-816-1084
Reclamation	Myra Giesen	785-843-0160
	Wanda Walker (via phone)	406-247-7702
USGS	Joanna Bloch	703-648-7326
	Allan Montgomery	703-648-7321

### UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ron Wilson provided hard copies of the following URLs:

<http://www.doi.gov/pam/> Office of Acquisition and Property Management

<http://www.doi.gov/pam/property.html> Personal Property

<http://museums.doi.gov/> Interior Museum Program (IMP) homepage

He noted that the current version of 410 DM is at <http://www.doi.gov/pam/114tab.html>.

Donald Cumberland was asked to explore the possibility of adding a "printer friendly" option to the IMP web pages.

## **IMP WORK GROUPS**

### Training and Technical Assistance

Donald Cumberland reminded the group of the availability of "Tools of the Profession" detailing curatorial supplies and equipment and their suppliers. Partnership agreements are in place with several vendors offering best-customer pricing for Interior units and their non-federal partner institutions. Contact Donald if you need more details, or to suggest other vendors that should be included.

Donald Cumberland provided a report on 2004 training activities and projections for 2005. Fifty-three staff members were trained in three courses in 2004.

"Managing Museum Property" will be offered March 14-18, 2005 in partnership with the San Diego Museum of Man.

#### Other Courses under Development:

- Distance Learning Module in partnership with the IMP Training Work Group and NBC's DOI University – to be completed in FY2005
- Curating Natural History Collections in partnership with the Denver Museum of Nature and Science – 36-hour course in Spring 2005
- Managing Archives and Official Records in partnership with the NPS Museum Management Program – 24-hour course no later than FY2006
- FWS-specific training: Managing FWS Museum Property

Myra Giesen indicated that the Bureau of Reclamation may request bureau-specific training for FY 2006.

All requests for training or technical assistance should be submitted to the IMP as soon as the need is identified. IMP staff will place such requests on the calendar on a first come, first served basis.

### Contaminated Collections

Ron Wilson reported that the Contaminated Collections Working Group has almost completed its work. Review comments of the final draft document were positive, with only a few requiring the attention of the full Working Group. Once those comments are resolved, the guidance and information will be distributed to all bureaus via a memorandum from the Assistant Secretary – Policy, Management, and Budget.

Core Participants in the Contaminated Collections Working Group include:

Judy Bischoff (NPS – HFC)	304-535-6146	judith_bischoff@nps.gov
Steve Flory (NPS – MMP)	202-354-2013	steve_flory@nps.gov
Catherine Hawks (SI)	703.876.9272	CAHawks@aol.com
Ann Hitchcock (NPS – WASO)	202-354-2271	ann_hitchcock@nps.gov
Sherry Kaswell (DOI – SOL)	202-208-6201	Fax: 202-219-1790
Paula Molloy (NPS – NAGPRA)	202-354-2207	paula_molloy@nps.gov
Chip Murphy (USFWS)	703-358-2254	chip_murphy@fws.gov
Ian Rosenblum (DOI – NBC)	202-208-5795	ian_rosenblum@nbc.gov
Ronald C. Wilson (DOI – PAM)	202-208-3438	rowilson@os.doi.gov

Other interested parties who participated less regularly include:

Donald Cumberland (DOI – PAM)	202-208-4698	donald_r_cumberland@ios.doi.gov
David Bleicher (NPS)	202-619-7358	david_bleicher@nps.gov
Lenore S. Clesceri (NSF)	703-292-7959	clescerl@att.net
Heather Davies (DOI - PEP)	202-208-7884	heather_davies@os.doi.gov
Carol DiSalvo (NPS)	202-219-8936	carol_disalvo@nps.gov
Carolyn McClellan (BIA; now BLM)	202-452-5090	carolyn_mcclellan@blm.gov
Carla Mattix (DOI – SOL)	202-208-7955	office e-mail not available
Markci Metcalf (DOI – SOL)	202-208-6201	Fax 202-219-1790
Ernie Ralston (NPS)	202-513-7206	Ernest_K_Ralston@nps.gov
John Robbins (NPS – WASO)	202-343-3388	john_robbins@nps.gov
Emily Shillingburg (DOI – BIA)	202-501-5946	office e-mail not available
Sara Wolf (NPS – NE Region)	617-242-5613 X 13	sara_wolf@nps.gov

### Handbook Updates

Donald Cumberland distributed hard copies of revised Chapter 9, Museum Property Handbook Volume I. Electronic copies were distributed following the meeting. The next chapter to be updated will deal with Disaster Planning. Donald will review bureau responses to the 2003 request to identify priorities for other needed guidance. Anyone who wants to update his or her 2003 response is welcome to do so.

Ron Wilson noted that the IMP currently lacks staff resources to complete a complete revision of the Handbook. When originally written, the IMP had 5 staff and bureaus were providing additional staff support to the Interior Museum Property Task Force. Those resources were reduced as the Task Force transitioned to the Interior Museum Property Committee.

### **TARGETED MANAGEMENT CONTROL REVIEW**

Ron Wilson shared preliminary results of the 2004 Targeted Management Control review of bureau museum programs. The full report will be shared after the Assistant Secretary – Policy, Management, and Budget signs it. A partial summary is provided below.

NPS identified \$34,995,000 and 709 FTE in unmet operational needs, and \$258,737,000 in unmet construction needs. BIA needs an increase of at least \$2,261,000 and 7 FTE, and USGS needs an additional \$100,000 for space and one FTE, and \$25,000 for equipment.

Other bureaus declined to estimate specific shortfalls, but the urgency of the need is reflected in comments such as "It is clear that vastly increased funding levels are required" (BLM), and "Any additional funding and staffing would have a positive effect" (IACB). Inadequate unit-level planning prevents full documentation of funding and staffing shortfalls.

In FY2003, collections were estimated to total 145 million items at 592 bureau locations and at 1,087 partner institutions. Targeted review questions asked how many of these locations meet Departmental standards for requirements such as baseline data, planning documents, annual inventories, and appropriate security and fire protection. Responses for the 592 bureau facilities provide a disappointing alarm regarding how much remains to be done. Among the findings:

- 40% of museum items (57.4 of 145 million) were cataloged by the end of FY2003,
- 80% of bureau units have current unit-level museum property surveys,
- 80% of bureau units have current Scope of Collections Statements,
- 32% of bureau units have Collection Management Plans
- 40% of bureau units have Emergency Management Plans that include museum property,
- 55% of bureau units have fire detection/suppression systems,
- 64 % of bureau units have appropriate security systems for their museum property, and,
- Backlogs continue to grow in large bureaus because programs that generate collections do not fund their preparation for long-term curation.

Confirmed compliance percentage rates at 1,087 non-bureau partner institutions are in the single digits for baseline surveys, Scope of Collections Statements, Collection Management Plans, fire detection/suppression systems, and security systems. Actual compliance is likely significantly higher, but the current review reveals a disappointing lack of information.

Cataloging of collections is the process by which item-level accountability is established. Inventory standards provide checks on the effectiveness of that accountability. BLM and FWS report no compliance with the Department's inventory standards. BOR reports that compliance varies unit to unit from full compliance to none. BIA reports full compliance at bureau facilities only. NPS reports compliance at all but 29 parks and one center; several of these cite valid reasons for not completing annual inventories – hurricane (2), typhoon (2), contaminated storage room (1), and inaccessible collections due to a move or renovations (2). Of the small bureaus and offices, IACB, MMS, NBC, and OST report full compliance with inventory standards.

## **UPDATES ON MANAGEMENT CONTEXTS**

### National NAGPRA

Sherry rry Hutt became Program Manager of the National NAGPRA Program in July 2004. She joined the IMPC meeting to provide a status report on Program activities and plans for moving forward.

She stated that the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAPGRA) is property law. It creates a formal process that is similar to the informal process developed to examine the provenance of art from the Nazi era when property was removed from rightful owners. The law itself is relatively simple; complexity is added through subsequent interpretations through case law. She referred to the Kennewick case

that has granted scientists access to study the human remains that are the subject of the case. The case was framed as “science vs. religion” or “science vs. the government” rather than as a property rights analysis. It was referred to as an Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) case by the court, and is being managed based on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers protocol for access to Corps collections.

A proposed amendment to NAGPRA that would change “that is affiliated” to “that is or was affiliated” has not been approved by Congress. She noted that the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was followed by a series of litigation and proposed amendments that permitted Congress to clarify the original intent. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards have stood the test of time. See this URL:  
[http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch\\_stnds\\_8\\_2.htm](http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_8_2.htm)

The process established by NAGPRA includes publication of Notices of Inventory Completion in the Federal Register. She found that some draft notices had been pending for 5 to 10 years. All are expected to be processed within the next 60 days. National NAGPRA staff focuses on process and format, and provide no editorial oversight regarding the substantive content of the notices. Some draft notices that have languished for more than five years are being proposed for “withdrawal” unless the submitting museum or agency wants to go forward within 30 days of being notified of the proposed withdrawal.

The Culturally Unidentifiable Native American Inventories Pilot Database is now available online. The online version of the database can be accessed at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra/ONLINEDB/INDEX.HTM#CUIOnline>. The first 200 of 600 institutions have been asked to verify entries accounting for 108,000 of 111,000 culturally unidentifiable human remains. Museums and agencies were/are asked to review and verify or update the data they submitted within 30 to 60 days. This is a staggered informal staff-to-staff review process – 200 institutions were done first. Data are then posted to the web site. The database is searchable by agency, museum, state, or county. It is expected to generate additional consultation that may result in additional remains being culturally affiliated. As staff work through the inventories, additional data will be posted.

The web site <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra/> will be updated with more information, including repatriation activity, and frequently asked questions (e.g., When am I done? Are we in compliance?).

The NAGPRA Review Committee is alternating between telephonic and live meetings to catch up with the backlog that accumulated during more than a year without meetings. The next live Review Committee meeting will occur March 14-16, 2005 in Honolulu. The agenda includes four disputes.

January 18, 2005 is the deadline for comments on proposed regulations on “future applicability.” See <http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/06jun20041800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2004/04-23179.htm> or the link from <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra/>

Proposed regulations (43CFR10.11) on disposition of culturally unidentifiable remains will appear in the Federal Register in February or March 2005. Future needs include regulations on unclaimed new finds.

In response to a question regarding Federal collections in non-federal repositories, Dr. Hutt noted that such collections are Federal agencies' non-delegable responsibility. If collections are from Federal land, they are Federal property. There have been a few cases in which museums have repatriated Federal collections without the knowledge of the agency. NAGPRA program staff tries to prevent this as they review Notices of Inventory Completion and Notices of Intent to Repatriate.

#### Financial and Business Management System

Ron Wilson encouraged IMPC representatives to monitor progress on the Department's Financial and Business Management System (FBMS), which will replace many existing systems and will include interfaces to capture Heritage Assets data required for financial reporting. You can monitor developments at this URL: <http://www.doi.gov/fbms/>

Terry Childs expressed concern that discipline and program staffs are not being included sufficiently to ensure accurate reporting of Required Supplemental Stewardship Information (RSSI) data.

Rayleen Cruz (Reclamation) is leading the Property portion of FBMS for the DOI Property Management Partnership. You can send comments to her, or pass them through your bureau property officer to the Property Management Partnership.

#### Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB)

Several meeting participants reported on their contacts with staff at the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. At the October 2004 FASAB meeting, the Board instructed staff to move forward with the exposure draft that would change Required Supplemental Stewardship Information (RSSI) to "basic information" subject to stricter audit standards. While this could bring increased attention to the resources needed to manage stewardship land and heritage assets, several IMPC representatives expressed concern that FASAB has not fully included discipline and program staffs in planning for the transition.

You can review the exposure draft reclassifying heritage assets and stewardship land at this URL <http://www.fasab.gov/pdf/haslr.pdf> The current FASAB newsletter is at this URL <http://www.fasab.gov/fasabnews/fasabn88.pdf> Additional discussion of the reclassification issue is in the minutes of the March 2004 FASAB meeting, posted at this URL <http://www.fasab.gov/pdf/minutes20040304.pdf> .

Myra Giesen, Emily Shillingburg, and Ron Wilson were assigned to monitor FASAB developments and to keep the rest of the IMPC informed.

In response to comments regarding the need for more coordination among managers of non-collectible heritage assets data, Ron Wilson agreed to ask Charlene Hutchinson for a list of bureau contacts for non-collectible heritage assets data.

#### Draft Proposed Legislation

Ron Wilson stated that he will draft proposed legislation by March 2005 that would provide all bureaus with collection management authorities currently held by the NPS, NBC and IACB. Previous discussions have confirmed that it is more important to get it right than to rush forward with a draft that does not meet our needs.

#### **2004 ANNUAL REPORTING ISSUES**

The Department's 2004 Performance and Accountability Report is posted at this URL: <http://www.doi.gov/pfm/par2004/index.html> Sections that are relevant to the IMPC include

- Part 2, Mission Area 1 – Resource Protection,
- Part 2, Mission Area 4 – Serving Communities,
- Part 3, Required Supplementary Stewardship Information, and
- Part 4, Management Response to Independent Auditors' Report.

Bureaus provided the following descriptions of their 2004 experiences:

USGS – Joanna Bloch printed a sample of catalog records as a demonstration for auditors. The process was relatively smooth.

NPS – Ann Hitchcock provided a national random sample from the ANCS+ database. During park visits, auditors asked no substantive questions. Terry Childs noted that she provided baseline information on non-collectible heritage assets for auditors, and emphasized the need for memory from year to year. Sharing this baseline information among KPMG auditors will help prevent having to educate each new audit team each year.

One question arose regarding whether or not a contract auditor was authorized to receive the information they requested. The issue was resolved by routing the request through appropriate channels.

Another question arose regarding KPMG requests for original signatures on Collection Management Reports.

Ann expressed concern that last-minute edits by the audit team resulted in inaccurate statements in the final report. She cited a December 7 Government Executive article that reported quality dips as agencies complete annual reports earlier. [See this URL: <http://www.governmentexecutive.com/dailyfed/1204/120704k1.htm> ] Ann would like to see the final draft prior to its publication. Ron Wilson noted that the current reporting schedule does not provide that opportunity. In the discussion that followed, it was

suggested that an earlier cut-off date for updates could provide additional time for ensuring accurate data are reported.

BIA – Emily Shillingburg saw some evidence of cross-bureau discussions among the audit teams this year. She noted that the BIA audit team asked to see signatures on the annual inventory certifications. She also noted that the team developed a process analysis document each year.

NBC – Kim Robinson and David McKinney reported that the auditors focused on controlled property and annual inventories.

BLM – Stephanie Damadio stated that rapid turnover in entry-level audit staff makes ongoing education difficult. She works closely with bureau finance folks to prepare response to summary recommendations.

Reclamation – Myra Giesen reported that auditors had three simple questions for her. She explained Reclamation organization, described deferred maintenance, and explained a reduction in number of cubic feet from the previous year.

## **2005 ANNUAL REPORTING**

In discussion of planning the call for FY2005 museum data, several questions and proposals were developed. Ron Wilson agreed to pass these on to Charlene Hutchinson in the Office of Financial Management (PFM) for consideration. Ron reported that Charlene has confirmed that RSSI data will be required for the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter, but not before. Key milestones for reporting FY2005 RSSI data were provided after the meeting in a December 27, 2004 memorandum from the Assistant Secretary – Policy, Management and Budget.

Auditors expressed concerns to PFM about how condition of museum collections is reported. They asked if the item-level condition data are based on actual condition assessments. Condition of museum collections is currently reported in two ways – the number of items in good-, fair-, and poor-condition based on catalog record notations made at the time of cataloging. This does not provide a new condition assessment each year, as doing so for tens of millions of items would be physically impossible and would not provide meaningful information. Three options were identified for responding to the auditors' concern. These include:

1. Stop reporting the item-level condition data, and report only the condition of facilities housing the collections, an indirect indicator of condition of the items in the collections;
2. Report the results of item conditions noted during the annual inventory process. This typically involves a random sample. Using this approach would require changes in inventory procedures since current procedures require only certification to bureau headquarters that the inventories have occurred, not the item-level details; and
3. Conduct a statistical sample to verify the condition data on the catalog

records. This has not been done because it is cost-prohibitive to physically examine a statistically valid sample of items distributed at 1600 or more locations throughout the country.

The preference of the group is option one if the current approach is not acceptable.

Several participants expressed frustration with the last-minute edits that resulting incorrect final reports. Ron noted that auditors insist on complete congruence between the bureau RSSI report and the Department's report. This is difficult because Ron and Charlene never receive copies of the bureau RSSI reports that auditors are comparing with the Department-wide summary. The data in the Department's report generally comes from the Bureau Museum Property Management Summary Reports, which sometimes differ from the data entered on the PFM server and the data included in the bureau RSSI reports. This year there were several cases where corrections made by program staffs did not get reported to bureau finance offices. This resulted in the finance and program offices reporting conflicting data.

IMPC recommendations for addressing these issues in FY2005 reports include:

1. Use June 30 as the cut-off for RSSI data reported in the final report. This has the potential disadvantage that the reported results would not match the financial data funding the results.
2. Use the approach of the Office of Planning and Performance Management (PPP) got reporting Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) results, in which they state, "Office of Management and Budget guidelines preclude us from using preliminary data as a basis for determining whether the performance goal was achieved. Final data and analysis will be included in the FY2005 Performance and Accountability Report." Using this approach, we would report preliminary 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter FY2005 data and accurate final 4<sup>th</sup> quarter FY2004 data. This would allow time to review and verify the final data.
3. Combine the RSSI museum report and the Bureau Museum Property Management Summary Report in a single document in which the RSSI report is an "executive summary" of the more detailed Bureau Museum Property Management Summary Report. This would help ensure that a single version of the RSSI text is examined by the auditors, and that different data are not presented in separate reports. Some participants questioned if this approach make both sections of the report subject to audit.
4. To the extent practical, remove numbers from the text portion of the report, relying instead on the numbers reported in the RSSI templates. If edits are required, this would reduce the number of places where changes are required.

Ron Wilson noted discrepancies in the museum data that bureaus reported to PPP and to PAM. Thus the data in the RSSI section of the PAR (page 258) do not match the data in the GPRA performance section (pages 120 and 136). Part of the problem stems from inconsistent use of the GPRA data definitions. These are appended to the end of these notes for your reference. The first one applies to BLM, FWS, NPS, and Reclamation; the other applies to BIA.

## BUREAU MUSEUM PROGRAM UPDATES

Time constraints prevented full reports from all bureaus, but NPS and USGS provided these written updates:

Current NPS service-wide initiatives include (*new items since last report in italics*):

- Establishing significance criteria
- Developing a museum award named after Ralph Lewis
- Developing a generic repository agreement for natural history collections
- Integrating museum management and the incident command system, *recent response team at Gulf Islands NS and participation in development of Emergency Support Function #11 as part of the National Response Plan*
- Participating in development of the incident management analysis and reporting system that NPS is leading for DOI
- Improving documentation for museum management staffing needs
- NPS museum centennial 2004-2005 activities – *exhibit, The Power of Context: NPS Museums at 100 Years, to open at DOI Museum in early February; see web site at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/museum/centennial>, which has monthly Featured Treasures and conservation tips*
- Converting paper catalog records to ANCS+
- Maintaining an agreement with American Type Culture Collection to serve as repository for biological collections in cryogenic storage
- *Developing exhibit, Inauguration! To open at DOI Museum January 18*
- *Proposing revisions to AAM regarding accreditation procedures for NPS*
- *Renewing policy, DO#24 NPS Museum Collections*

USGS reports the following activities:

### Museum Storage

- Purchased 16 museum storage cabinets and corresponding drawers for Museum of Southwestern Biology in Albuquerque, NM
- Purchased 8 museum storage cabinets and drawers for National Center
- Acquired one 10-drawer flat file/map cabinet for National Center

### Conservation

- Working with Harpers Ferry Center, Division of Conservation to have wooden and metal objects and textiles treated at the conservation laboratory
- Conducted the annual conservation inspection and treatment to Model A vehicle

### Collections

- Working with Sons and Daughters of USGS Mappers (California based) to acquire equipment for the collection
- Working with California museum to transfer/borrow objects related to USGS Geologist Levi Nobel
- Continue to accession and catalog objects at the National Center

### Website

- Revised and updated website for museum property

- Preparing web exhibits for Lunar Rover, Director Nolan, Geologist Levi Nobel Research
- Assist with outside research being conducted on USGS Museum Property

Reclamation reported the following activities:

- Formed a Museum Property Working Subgroup made up of regional representatives and the Office of Program and Policy Services
- Drafts of Museum Property Management Policy and Museum Property Management Directives and Standards will be out for internal peer review in February 2005
- Systematically reviewing and updating planning documents
- Drafting a new Reclamation Museum Property Management Plan
- In final stages of getting Re:discovery collection management software up and running; anticipate bureau-level training on the software mid-summer 2005
- Continues to catalog and accession collections
- Continues to perform facility-level condition assessments
- Revising museum property program internet and intranet web pages

**Other bureaus were invited to submit written updates to be added to these notes.**

#### **NEXT STEPS/WORK PLAN**

Action items are identified throughout the notes above. Beginning with the notes of the December 9, 2004, meeting, draft notes will be reviewed by meeting participants. IMP staff will use review comments to prepare the final version of the notes that will be posted on the IMP web pages.

## Template for Strategic Plan Measure Definition PEM.3.002

<b>End or Intermediate Outcome Measure</b>	Percent of collections in DOI inventory in good condition
<b>Data Reported</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of collections on DOI Inventory in good condition</li> <li>• Number of collections on DOI Inventory</li> </ul>
<b>Scope of the Measure</b>	This measure includes all collections on DOI inventories.
<b>Goal Lead(s)</b>	
<b>Data Point(s) of Contact</b>	BLM, FWS, NPS, and Reclamation
<b>Key Terms/ Definitions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collections: Collections include assemblages of objects, works of art, and/or historic documents, representing archeology, art, ethnography, biology, geology, paleontology, and history, collected according to a rational scheme and maintained so they can be preserved, studied, and interpreted for public benefit. A collection includes cataloged and/or uncataloged objects under the control of an administrative unit/location, which may have multiple facilities/spaces that house the collection. [Adapted from 411DM1]</li> <li>• DOI inventory for collections: A collective term used to refer to all collections owned or controlled by DOI, consistent with bureau operational plans and bureau museum property plans. These may be cataloged and/or uncataloged.</li> <li>• Good condition for collections: Collections are assumed to be in good (or better) condition when the spaces (museum storage and exhibit spaces and administrative office space) housing those collections collectively meet more than 70% of applicable departmental standards for such spaces [411DM3.2-3.3].</li> </ul>
<b>Measurement Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent equals 100 times the number of collections in good condition, divided by the number of collections on the DOI inventory</li> </ul>
<b>Reporting Frequency</b>	Annual
<b>Date of last change</b>	June 27, 2003
<b>Comments</b>	

## Template for Strategic Plan Measure Definition - SEM.3.016

<b>End or Intermediate Outcome Measure - 145</b>	Indian natural resource trust assets management – Percent of collections in DOI inventory in good condition
<b>Data Reported</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of collections on BIA inventory in good condition.</li> <li>• Number of collections on BIA inventory.</li> </ul>
<b>Scope of the Measure</b>	This measure includes all collections on BIA inventories.
<b>Goal Leads(s)</b>	Tom Young, Director, Management Support Services (202-208-2535) Debbie McBride, Chief, Division of Environmental and Cultural Resources (202-208-3606)
<b>Data Point of Contact</b>	Emily Shillingburg, Environmental and Cultural Resources (202-501-5946)
<b>Key Terms/ Definitions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collections: Collections include assemblages of objects, works of art, and/or historic documents, representing the fields of archeology, art, ethnography, biology, geology, paleontology, and history, collected according to a rational scheme and maintained so they can be preserved, studied, and interpreted for public benefit. A collection includes cataloged and/or uncataloged objects.</li> <li>• BIA inventory for collections: A collective term used to refer to all collections owned or controlled by BIA, including collections documenting the history of the Bureau, as well as collections removed from Indian trust lands under Antiquities Act permits and material covered by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, consistent with bureau museum property plans. Collections may be managed in BIA facilities or other Federal and non-Federal repositories.</li> <li>• Good condition for collections: Collections are assumed to be in good (or better) condition when the museum storage and exhibit facilities housing those collections collectively meet at least 70% of applicable departmental standards for museum facilities.</li> </ul>
<b>Measurement Process</b>	Percent equals 100 times the number of collections in good condition, divided by the number of collections on the BIA inventory.
<b>Reporting Frequency</b>	Quarterly
<b>Date of last change</b>	September 30, 2003
<b>Comments</b>	Cultural and natural resource collections are not trust assets.