

From: Bowman, Randal
To: [Shulman, Stu](#)
Cc: [Cash, Marcia](#)
Subject: Re: Ready to start coding monument review comments
Date: Saturday, June 17, 2017 1:24:25 PM

This is why we are not scanning postcards into the [regs.gov](#) system any more. I will be talking with Jennifer on Monday about the handwritten letters, as it may be easier to handcount those then take the time to open the pdf, as part of the coding. I did some yesterday, got mostly postcards or handwritten (latter all titled "see attached Attachment" with a 4-digit number). It seemed to me to take 3-4 times as long to code one of these, including opening and closing Adobe, even though it came up automatically, coding as a regular comment. Not a fatal delay, but highly annoying to many of our coders.

I will note the extra postcards with the other such instances.

On Sat, Jun 17, 2017 at 10:54 AM, Shulman, Stu <stu@texifter.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Alexandra Florea (b) (6)
Date: Sat, Jun 17, 2017 at 10:40 AM
Subject: Re: Ready to start coding monument review comments
To: "Shulman, Stu" <stu@texifter.com>
Cc: John P (b) (6), Max Soellner (b) (6),
Patrick Fitzgerald (b) (6), Gabriela Zago (b) (6)

Hi Stu,

I want to bring to your attention document number: DOI-2017-0002-133254.

The document contains 15 postcards opposing the review, different pens, different handwriting, I find it problematic that they were scanned together and amount, in our coding to 1 oppose review vote, instead of 15. I guess, if this is an isolated situation, it doesn't make a big difference in the ulterior analysis, but in case this is happening more systematically, we should probably watch out for that.

Cheers,
Alexandra

Alexandra Florea
PhD Candidate IPP Transnational
Goethe University Frankfurt
Find me on Twitter: @alleyah

On 17 June 2017 at 13:55, Shulman, Stu <stu@texifter.com> wrote:
Definitely want to watch out for that nuance.

On Sat, Jun 17, 2017 at 12:24 AM, John P (b) (6) > wrote:

I've found that a few of these comments are ambiguous if there isn't any context given. When they only say, "Stop the land grab", that could mean "Stop private businesses from taking the public's land" or it could mean, "Stop the federal government from taking the state's land".

I didn't see this ambiguity in the early comments until I ran into a bunch that clearly meant the latter (i.e., supports the review).

On Fri, Jun 16, 2017 at 10:33 AM, Shulman, Stu <stu@texifter.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bowman, Randal** <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov>

Date: Fri, Jun 16, 2017 at 10:31 AM

The system is ready for everyone to begin coding.

A couple of things to keep in mind - 1, while I have removed the overwhelming majority of the nearly-identical letters by the group coding approach I used for the last round, you will still see some nearly identical letters. That is because many of the comments are variations on a common theme. It does not mean you are coding the same comment twice. The system will automatically deliver to you the next available uncoded item, and when all items are coded, it will say something like no more items to code.

You will not get an item already coded.

To start, log on, hit :coding", "code a dataset", and the first comment should appear.

Good luck, and contact me with anything unusual, if possible copying the heading or unusual item and pasting it into an email.

--

Dr. Stuart W. Shulman

Founder and CEO, Texifter

Cell: [413-992-8513](tel:413-992-8513)

LinkedIn: <http://www.linkedin.com/in/stuartwshulman>

--

Dr. Stuart W. Shulman

Founder and CEO, Texifter

Cell: 413-992-8513

LinkedIn: <http://www.linkedin.com/in/stuartwshulman>

|

--

Dr. Stuart W. Shulman
Founder and CEO, Texifter
Cell: 413-992-8513
LinkedIn: <http://www.linkedin.com/in/stuartwshulman>