**Midwest Transportation Knowledge Network**

## MTKN IV – Fourth Annual Meeting, UMTRI – Ann Arbor, MI (Oct. 21-22, 2004)

# Meeting minutes

**Block heading** = Official agenda item

*Italicized heading* = Individual topics of an official agenda item discussion or informal discussion of topics not originally on the agenda.

**Thursday, Oct. 21**

**Introductions**

Attendees – Bob Sweet (UMTRI), Amy Brennan (UMTRI), Julia Daniel (UMTRI), Chad Pollock (Missouri DOT), Marie Manthe (Kansas DOT), Arlene Mathison (UM – CTS), Jerry Baldwin (MnDOT), Janet Bix (Ohio DOT), Hank Zaletel (Iowa DOT), John Cherney (Wisconsin DOT), Joyce Koeneman (NTL), Christi Powers (via teleconference, Oct. 21).

After lunch, everyone introduced themselves and gave an update on their libraries.

**Bylaws Discussion**

*Committee changes discussion*

Jerry: We need to incorporate Executive Committee changes.

Arlene: Suggested chairs of the various committees would be a part of the Executive Committee, this is a change in the makeup of the Executive Committee. We would get rid of the old structure, specifically, the academic and state DOT library representatives. The reason for this change was if we decided to change our membership in the future (esp. if we include corporate transportation libraries), then we would need to change the bylaws again.

Jerry: Commenting on what Arlene had said, the current problem is that we have representatives by type of library. Instead we should have representatives by committee (or function). This better represents the group as presently there is no direct communication by committees to the Executive Committee with the present composition.

Another change suggested was to include the past chairperson as a member of the Executive Committee.

*Committee Structures before MTKN IV*

The composition of the current committees were listed for the group.

Communications Committee – Arlene (chair), John, Jim B. (MnDOT Library), Roberto, Shirlee (MnDOT Library). Duties/tasks performed included web, other publicity (brochure) and the listserv.

Bibliographic Instruction Committee – Janet, Hank (chair), Bob. They produced the excellent 'Working Smarter' training program.

OCLC Committee – Julie Bolding

Executive Committee – Jerry, Arlene, Bob, Marie, Nelda.

Arlene: wants to look at MTKN plans and goals and then form new committee structure from that.

Jerry: How well we are functioning between annual meetings should be a determining factor of new committee composition.

Bob: Asked if we should follow the SLA model? which would involve having an advisory board

Jerry: Commenting on Bob's question, said this was too complex for our working group. Stated that committees are set up between the work that needs to be done and to let the chair of the MTKN know what is happening.

Jerry: under current structure, for example, the university library representative would be trying to say or explain what is happening in the other universities, and he/she might not know that information because of a lack of communication. We don't need a voice to represent the types of libraries, but instead need voices more representative of the work being performed.

Arlene: Suggested we list the committees, but not in the bylaws, so we won't need to change the bylaws every time we need to change committees, or committee structure.

Jerry: **Motioned to amend bylaws to change Executive Committee structure from representative by library type to representation by function or work to be performed.**

**Motion seconded and approved.**

### Changes to bylaws

Article 5 – wording changed from 'Consortium' to 'active members of MTKN.' Very brief discussion of core membership of MTKN followed.

Marie/Arlene: we are strictly libraries, but will partner or collaborate with others. There are ways to accomplish this collaboration without expanding our core membership.

Jerry: **Move to adopt bylaws as amended. Motion approved.**

Bob changed the wording in Article 5, Section 1, and added changes to Article 5, Section 6. See bylaws for new changes.

### Term limits discussion

Question: Should there be a one year limit (for chairs) as stated in the present bylaws, or two years.

Jerry: didn't like the two year time period because of the amount of turnover in MTKN membership. He stated that continuity is better achieved through one year for the incoming chair, one year for the present chair and one year for the past chair. If a person occupies two years each for these positions, it would mean that person would need to make a six year commitment, which is simply too much time.

### Return to bylaw changes

Article 6, Section 1 – changed 'additional committees' to 'working committees.'

Janet: asked if we want to change bylaws, would we need a two-thirds vote by the entire group, or just those present.

Jerry/Bob: said voting can be done by all members, but just one vote per library (i.e. MTKN representative), not the entire staffs of the libraries.

**At this time, the bylaws were amended, approved and adopted – Oct. 21, 2004**

## Guiding Principles Discussion

### *Scope of MTKN discussion*

John: asked if we should describe AASHTO Region 3 in our guiding principles by listing the states involved, for an audience outside of the MTKN, or transportation community. Or perhaps explain why MTKN is aligned in this manner if anyone should have a question.

Joyce: MTKN should align with AASHTO Region 3, as it has always been geographically defined that way.

Jerry: Our bylaws don't necessarily limit us to Region 3. We have this network, but the problem is one of national scope. Our strength would be working with AASHTO on a regional basis. This would tie us into various alliances, especially with the Research Coordinators who work within these defined AASHTO regions. For example, RAC (Research Advisory Council) works with SCOR (AASHTO's Standing Committee on Research) along this structure, so it is in our best interest to also be aligned in this structure.

Hank: Would like to list the individual states within AASHTO Region 3 in the guiding principles.

Bob: In trying to help meet national aims, why are we (MTKN) just midwest-oriented instead of opening up to a national scope.

Arlene: Commenting on Bob's question, said it is more manageable to have regional meetings where everyone can attend, especially in light of a lack of NTL funding and the tight travel restrictions within state DOT budgets. The survey showed that most members could not attend a national meeting.

Bob: Asked about those parties who think the MTKN is a 'closed group.'

Arlene: Commented that Bob Johns recommends to remain as a regional network, but to form a subcommittee to work with others outside the MTKN (this does not mean TLCat).

Jerry: We need a national network. There are a number of libraries but too many to get into a single national network, and too many to expand MTKN. We are already showing that on a regional basis, you can get a good number of libraries together. Recommends not to have a national network as a single group, but instead work from the 'bottom up' by having regional networks feeding into a national network.
Presently for states outside the MTKN, it is the research directors, and not the librarians who are talking (referring to the Western states). They need to also talk to the librarians in the West. Now at its fourth meeting, MTKN is in a unique position in that they are continuing to meet and talk, without NTL funding. This is a new concept for transportation librarians, and we need to get the western libraries involved in a similar manner.

Hank: posed the hypothetical question, what if there is no interest among the Western states, except for Colorado, who would like to join MTKN immediately.

Jerry: stated that suggestion could be an option if all other options are exhausted. Specifically, we would try to convince Colorado to lead their own effort. If that effort failed, they could potentially join us. Emphasized further that we need to develop leadership in other regions, along with the need for funding. The pooled-fund effort could be one option for funding.

Joyce: we should explain who is in AASHTO Region 3.

Arlene: asked for whom are the guiding principles targeted?

Jerry: said the guiding principles have a multiple purpose: to serve as discussion-makers amongst ourselves and as a starting point for others who may use it as a model.

Joyce: feels NTL's leadership and networking is most important and they will hopefully (based on funding) continue to develop other groups. No plan right now to do that, but hopefully there will be one in the near future.

Janet: we need proof that what the MTKN is doing is effective, i.e. that MTKN DOT's are operating more effectively than DOT's not in MTKN and in DOT's that don't even have a library. The question then becomes, How do libraries help DOTs?

Jerry: We have ad hoc proof, but we need more concrete proof for those at the funding level.

Bob/Jerry/Arlene/Janet: We need to demonstrate our value.

Jerry: The guiding principles work in that they give a transportation library a measure of what they should be doing. Case in point – If the library at Nebraska can't live up to the principles, it opens up uncomfortable yet necessary political discussions at the Nebraska DOT (or DOR?).

Joyce: mentioned that it works for Missouri and Kansas.

Jerry: Virginia has had a great result, they have been very successful and are a direct result of work happening within the MTKN and NTL.

Hank:   Wondered what will happen at Illinois?  How did Michigan fall from grace?

Jerry:   Stated that libraries are always at the will of their parent organizations, but that the parent organization will make decisions based on the national scene.  If we get the library effort on a national scale, then it becomes necessary for state decision-makers to realize that they need to remain as a part of the national situation.

Joyce/Arlene:    asked what about transportation libraries in the Midwest , that are not in TLCat.

Jerry:   They can not be in TLCat unless they have uniquely identifiable transportation resources.  TTI (Texas Transportation Institute) and the Joint Highway Research Program (Indiana/Purdue) can't do that.  Though with TTI, they could potentially convert their records.  Indiana had an interest in TLCat but they couldn't uniquely identify them in OCLC.

Nelda had made an effort to contact Indiana DOT and she was referred to Purdue.

Marie:   asked if TTI had their own OCLC symbol.

Janet:   Ohio DOT did a symbol change (now OHDOT).

Chad:   Missouri is contemplating a symbol change.

Jerry:   believes that North Dakota DOT has a transportation library that is uniquely identifiable.

Bob will make changes to the Guiding Principles.  See updated document for the changes.

## Interlibrary Loan Guidelines Review

Janet:   Mentioned that Institute of Transportation Studies (ITS) at Cal-Berkeley charges a high rate for their interlibrary loans, even to MTKN members.  Other libraries don't charge, like Northwestern.

Jerry:   In a survey of 58 libraries serving DOTs, five of them charge an ILL fee.  Also, no state DOT Libraries charge.  Also cautioned against using the word 'free' in relation to Interlibrary Loans.  There are always costs, (i.e. postage)

Hank:   talked about having to photocopy an entire large document for a patron.

Jerry:   said that ILL means lending to another library, not photocopying for a patron, which is the same as document delivery to a local patron.

Hank/Jerry:    Writing the phrase "Interlibrary Loan" outside of the packages as they are shipped is good practice.

More general discussion centered on emailing people directly (as mentioned by Marie) versus placing an ILL via the Web.  Everyone agreed that both methods are acceptable.

Bob:   asked if MTKN members need to formalize their liberal lending policies within MTKN.

ILL Guidelines were then amended as approved.  See updated ILL document for changes.

A brief question was asked about the status of TAG.  That entity is still ongoing though its present status isn't exactly known.  Hank mentioned that Julie Bolding could perhaps instruct us on how to get involved in TAG?

## Update on TLCat

Joyce:   NTL is thrilled with TLCat, they have received good feedback, and feels it has been an overwhelming success.  With regard to funding issues, she suggested that MTKN libraries try to pay for their own funding for TLCat for the Mar 05-Feb 06 period.  This would allow other funds to be used for potential new members.  Nelda will determine how these funds would be used.  TLCat and TRIS are about equal in usage.

There was a brief discussion by several members wondering if there were login and session statistics for TLCat.

Joyce:   Nelda needs to know from MTKN, who from our region we want NTL to fund for TLCAT.

Roger Garren will send the announcement for the next session (i.e. NHI/Working Smarter course) to MTKN first so MTKN can provide the information to your users first.

Jerry: from the policy study meeting, NTL has enough funding for another year of TLCat, plus there is another member coming on board, who could be added during a quarterly update.

Jerry: commented that all transportation information investment is 'push' (i.e. pushing publications out), while there is no investment in responding to the customer (demand response). This is why TLCat is so important, as it represents a major demand response effort. OCLC Group Services had three beta sites, plus our group (who sought them out). But as of now, only the military libraries and transportation libraries remain. Our product, TLCat, is also being used far more than any other product from the other Group Services' projects. We are meeting a need and responding to customer requests.

## Incorporation of MTKN

Jerry: stated that if we ever have an MTKN fund (i.e. a checking account, etc.) we would need to incorporate. This is easy to do, we would get a tax ID and checking account. All we need to do is complete a form. MTKN should do this because it will increase our flexibility. It would be good if we get money from the pooled fun, and if we need to print our own products, we could draw funds from our checking account.

It was decided to add the fees to the meeting/registration fees for MTKN IV. If we need a treasurer, Arlene mentioned that she would delegate this duty.

## Update on Pooled-Fund Study – Christi Powers

Christi: From the responses to the pooled-fund study, there are several states that have committed: Wisconsin, Minnesota, Tennessee and New York. There were also some 'maybes'. They included: Alaska, Maine, Washington (state). Washington DOT was impressed with MTKN and TLCat. Nina McLawhorn talked with Leni ? and asked if Washington DOT would take the lead for the Western states. They have been approached by Nina, and there is no definitive answer from them yet. Consequently, an update will not be posted on the pooled fund Web site yet.

The question was then raised as to specifically what the MTKN could do to help this process.

Christi: Thanked the MTKN for the help on the FAQ's. She stated that Nina hopes we can be there to help explain technical issues, i.e. the nuts and bolts features for the various states.
Bob: Asked how we could get other states on board
Christi: Nina has been talking to people on a one-to-one basis, at various meetings she's been attending. MTKN could contact our colleagues and try to convince them.
Arlene: We need to make people aware of the pooled-fund effort, so far mainly a DOT thing, but open to others (universities).
Jerry: We need to get discussion at the library level, not just the research director level.
Arlene: Would like to look at how we can facilitate action among libraries in other states.
Christi: says she is looking forward to having a web form (question form) for people who have questions about this effort. Also, we could use the MTKN email to generate questions and answers.

After Christi's report the group then entered a brief discussion as to how the pooled fund effort can be a benefit. It was stated that this would be great marketing for MTKN and DOT libraries. It is important for a group of state DOTs to be talking about how important libraries are while simultaneously providing funding. We can't do this by ourselves.

### *Relationship with LTAPs*

Janet: Believes we should be more closely aligned with LTAP, to get their items cataloged.  Lisa Pogue, from the American Public Works Administration (APWA) was recommended as the contact to get some of them material.

Jerry: Over the years, librarians have been more interested in getting LTAP materials than LTAP has been in ensuring that the materials get into libraries.

Arlene: Asked if MTKN should do something about this.

Jerry: At the TRB level, we are talking to each other more. (i.e. the LIST Committee, Tech Transfer people, Education committee, etc..)

Arlene: Would like to contact Lisa Pogue to see if MTKN members can acquire LTAP material.


### Policy study update

Jerry: Policy study is a follow up to the Scoping study (done by Sandy Tucker and Barbara Harder).  RAC convinced SCOR that this policy study is needed.  SCOR provided funding for the scoping and policy study.  Policy studies are different than NCHRP studies.  The Policy study is a higher level study or a NAS (National Academy of the Sciences) study, as opposed to a TRB report.  An NAS study can advise the federal government while a TRB report can not.

The policy study committee was put together by Nan Humphrey and the first meeting was on Oct. 11-12. Frank Francois was the chair (former director of AASHTO).  Leni Oman (Washington), Mike Meyers (Georgia), Gary Allen (Virginia), Nina McLawhorn (Wisconsin), Roberto Sarmiento (Northwestern), Bonnie Osif (Penn State), Chuck McClure (digital expertise) and David  Lankes (virtual reference expert) round out the committee.  McClure and Lankus are library science professors.

Jerry said that he attended the first full day of the meetings and gave a presentation.  Nelda spoke about the NTL and Peter Young, the director of the National Agriculture Library, spoke as well.

Jerry thought the discussions were great, in that it involved non-librarians talking about our issues, an example being the distribution of information.

McClure said he didn't understand how it could be that some state DOTs had rather sophisticated library services while others had none at all.  He had wondered how this could happen. The final report should be furnished in the Fall, 2006.  There are no requirements for the report, and it advises the federal government.

Stated that we as librarians are already winning by raising awareness. Although it's officially an NAS panel, its membership was developed by TRB staff.

He was impressed with how the panel was aware of the issues, and taking things seriously, especially the academic members.

### Survey of State Departments of Transportation

Jerry: this was undertaken to help us understand our own issues.  Nan Humphrey wanted to add her own questions as well for her use.

Jerry distributed handouts at this point.

Jerry: The current situation is not favorable. Although he received responses from every state, inconsistencies exist.  He identified 58 library centers.  Six states claimed they did not have a library.

An important statistic is that 22 or23 libraries serving state DOTs are operated by an MLS graduate.  This number is an increase from the 1970s (where there were 10) and in 1990 (there were 17).  The people participating in the policy study have read this survey and have asked Jerry for more information.

Jerry mentioned some minimum criteria which a transportation library should be able to meet to be effective and viable. For example, having an MLS degree, a budget of $30,000 (not including salaries), etc.. Only 5 states were able to match this minimum criteria.  He mentioned the discrepancy of between state DOT libraries and their

ability to respond to customers.  MnDOT Library for example, does more business, and has larger capacity than CalTrans.

The group briefly discussed the Table on page 3, focusing on services statistics.  See Jerry's handout for details.

Jerry:   talked about the situation in Nebraska, where they focus on cataloging and provide only very limited services outside the department.  They have a database that probably could be readily converted into OCLC.  The Policy study is also looking at LTAPs, and other non-DOT transportation libraries.  They are looking at all transportation information issues. (John McCracken, of Turner/Fairbank, was also in attendance at the policy study). Another issue: Many people (like FHWA) are posting information on the internet and claiming they are finished with publishing responsibility.  But this is creating a big problem, just putting items/research on the internet and leaving it at that, is not the answer.
MnDOT library did a survey of MnDOT employees.  Almost all of their target audience knows about the existence of the library, but not everyone knows about all of their services.   This point will figure into their marketing plan.

## Strategic Planning

Discussion centered around the top three things the MTKN should be doing in the upcoming year.

Jerry:   Promoting/development of similar networks in other regions
Bob:     Pooled-fund support, possibly an email campaign and contact libraries in the West.
Hank:   we need more information for MTKN members on how pooled-fund can help us.
Janet:   We are only as strong as our weakest link.
Jerry:   Policy study question: how are state DOT libraries funded? It differs in each state. The pooled-fund study's aim is to show benefits of state DOT libraries and to inform funders/decision-makers.
Bob:     asked how the 20K is to be used. Will the money come directly back to the libraries?

The group would like more explanation of the breakdown.  This information might be posted on the pooled-fund web site.

Janet:   remarked that we've come a long way in fours years. Kansas, South Dakota, Missouri are all in the system.  Plus, TLCat has been very good for OCLC's Group Services.
Jerry:   Structure is in place, good for transportation libraries.  The pooled-fund study is another piece of that structure.
Arlene: Benefits of pooled-fund will be the awareness for DOT managements of library services.
Janet:   Called it an investment in the future.
Jerry:   The pooled-fund and policy study can convince decision-makers about libraries in state DOTs (for example, in Nebraska and Michigan).  Librarians can't do this alone.  We need others to carry our message to top staff.  This is a major benefit of the pooled-fund study.
Janet:   MTKN emphasis, we need to promote TLCat more, and promote it widely.

Question was raised if we should have an MTKN presence at TRB?  This could be tough to do with out-of-state travel restrictions.  Can the pooled-fund help with this?
Joyce:   said when we promote TLCat, we are promoting ourselves.
Chad:   remarked that more mentoring is needed.
Jerry:   At the present, we have no real mentoring procedure, we just teach by informal means (dropping an email to another, etc..)
Joyce:   sees institutions working in isolation as a big problem.
Bob:     asked how the talents of Christi Powers can benefit us?
Arlene: We can decide on a course of action for MTKN and ask Christi to then help us.
Jerry:   It is important that we not speak our language but instead speak the language of the decision-makers.  Christi could translate our issues into another language, their language.  A good example was Nina's one-pager.
Bob:     These are good tasks for the communication committee.
Jerry:   Don't talk like a librarian.  The importance of marketing is putting our ideas into a different and concise language.
Janet:   asked if we need a brochure on TLCat.

Hank:   mentioned the LTAP newsletter as an example.

Jerry/Hank:     MTKN should have a collection of articles (marketing pieces) on our Web site.

Janet then played a DVD for the group.  This DVD was a promotional item for the Ohio DOT Library. The group was very impressed with many different aspects of it, including:  getting the director of Ohio DOT to give testimonial narrative; the professional quality of it, especially since it was done in house at a fraction of the cost of outsourcing it; and testimonials for the library of other Ohio DOT workers (engineers, etc.); the impressive presence and script on camera of Janet and her staff; and the well-written script.

Marie:  Need to develop a strategic plan, help other libraries/regions develop their networks.  With regard to partnerships, she said we need to strike a balance between promoting the MTKN and leading by example, and being open to sharing information with other libraries, to help raise them up as well.

Amy:    Need to develop a strategic plan, taking all of the things we've been discussing and getting them into a plan.

Hank:   we need to promote transportation literacy.

John:   agreed with all of the points mentioned before.  added that at the WisDOT Library, he has discovered significant gaps in his collection.  He mentioned that many transportation organizations (like Jerry stated before) are publishing research material on the internet (in .pdf form), and that is where they stop.  They do not disseminate to the appropriate libraries, much less any transportation library, nor does all of this information get to TRIS.  He mentioned one report produced by the UW-Milwaukee's Center for ByProduct Utilization about fly ash in concrete. An abstract existed as a .pdf which TRIS picked up, but the item was not cataloged anywhere in the library system (i.e. WorldCat).  He had to contact the professor (author) of the article for a copy, which he printed out for cataloging into WorldCat/TLCat.  Other examples get into neither TRIS nor WorldCat.  Other examples include information by non-transportation organizations (such as regional planning commissions, metropolitan planning organizations, city community development departments, academic transportation institutes, city planning departments), which include items with large transportation elements, and posting them on the internet buried on sometimes poorly designed web sites.  He added that the URLs of these Web sites often change, with no redirects.   Academic transportation institutes and university transportation centers are also guilty of not always disseminating their research properly.  Perhaps an examination of these institutions and their relationship with their library networks, how they disseminate their material to TRIS (if at all), or if they even have a local library that catalogs this material into WorldCat should be examined.

Joyce:  Mentioned NTL's digital preservation effort, in which they are to cataloging or describing these types of publications on the NTL Web site.

Jerry:  Said this issue of capturing knowledge is an issue being looked at by the policy study on a national level.

Arlene: This is a major collection development issue, an important one that we need to address later.

Joyce/Jerry:     talked about whether it was important to catalog an item even if the item 'doesn't exist' anymore (i.e. the URL has changed). Jerry mentioned that it was up to the issuing agency to be responsible for making sure their publications are disseminated properly.

John:   Mentioned that in cases where the URL is volatile and that no library is holding the item, he is printing out a hard copy for permanence and cataloging purposes.  Other cases of these items are held by a lone local public library, and not held by any transportation library or university library (i.e. engineering library).  WisDOT Library started a campaign to acquire this material by contacting RPC's, MPO's, UTC's, other non-transportation organizations, including various city and county planning departments, specialized engineering schools which might have a transportation focus, etc.  The early returns have been good as the library has acquired a number of print and CD-ROM items of a local transportation nature (for Wisconsin), which are being entered by the library into WorldCat/TLCat. Also, we are asking that these organizations give the library any copies free of charge, and to include the library on all subsequent mailings.  The response has been good and the experience is being documented for statistical reports/presentations to the department at a later date.

Julia:  we need to promote the MTKN and MTKN in other regions.

**New committee structure/assignments**

Communications Committee – Hank, John, Jerry, Arlene.  Duties to include promoting TLCat to AASHTO and other key end users, construction of a brochure, looking at and perhaps imitating LTAP newsletters, web issues.

Membership Committee – Hank, Janet.  Duties will include talking about more members for MTKN, mentoring and partnership issues.

External Network Committee – Marie, Jerry, Bob. Duties will include promoting networks in other regions, sharing our experiences, serving as a model to others, and helping with information assistance.  Another duty will involve support for the pooled-fund study, perhaps with an email campaign to other libraries. We also need to find out more information on what exactly are the benefits of the pooled-fund for MTKN members.

BI – though no longer a committee, each MTKN member should promote and use the 'Working Smarter' training.

Strategic Plan Committee – this work will be performed by the Executive Committee

Executive Committee – Jerry (past chair), Arlene (present chair), Janet (incoming chair – see below).

### Discussion of BI course

Bob:    Thinks the course has a focus that is too broad.
Jerry:  Would like to see more feedback on the course.
Bob:    Would like to see the course be more customizable.


**Bob:    nominated Janet as incoming chair.  Nomination was seconded and approved by all.**

### Extended discussion of committee duties

**External Network Committee**
Jerry:  we need to get the librarians of other states to talk.
Arlene: we should let the research directors know what we are doing also.
Jerry:  right now it's too early to tell how the pooled-fund structure is going to work (i.e. to determine who is going to get what amount of money). A group will form from the people who are contributing to the pooled-fund effort. They will be the committee to determine  how the money will be distributed.
        We need to know who the representatives will be on the participatory panel.
Janet:  asked if we should be promoting the policy study.
Jerry:  About all we can do or say at this point is that the study is under way and that in 18 months we will have a product (i.e. a report).
Bob:    asked if we should write a few articles about the policy study and pooled fund study for the SLA Web site.
Jerry:  a good article would be about how the MTKN formalized its existence.  Hence, we can now tell people officially what the MTKN is all about.
Janet:  articles can be disseminated to state DOTs.

It was agreed that the external network committee would contact potential librarians, identify the AASHTO regions in which the libraries/librarians reside, and have committee members take a region and contact the librarians there.

Arlene: we should get Christi Powers' feedback and inform Nelda of what we are doing.
Marie:  we could use the information that Christi gave us, talk to others about the pooled fund and also talk to them about starting a network in their region.
        For example, Washington State, Tennessee, Alaska, New York and Maine, places which have committed or are heavily considering the pooled fun could be used as a starting point to talk about other networks.
Jerry:  Said he would look to see which states are in what AASHTO region and get information contacts for each one. Then email the contact and follow up with a telephone call.
Bob:    Suggested posting articles first on TLCat, etc.. then we could refer potential new network folks to these articles (on our web site).  We should also refer people to the statement on the policy study.
Jerry/Bob:      It would be advisable to tell new people that we are developing other networks so we have a structure in place to implement the policy study.

watch for the posting of information on the pooled-fund study at:  www.pooledfund.org

Jerry:   The pooled fund project exists because there is no guarantee that NTL will exist after reauthorization.  If the NTL does come through, all the better to work with, along with the pooled-fund.

**Communications Committee**

Work should concentrate on getting visibility or creating a presence at various conferences including the SLA Conference, or better yet, at TRB.  The question was raised if this should be the work of the Executive Committee.

Another question asked the what kind of presence we could have at Tech Transfer? we need more information on this.

Janet:   will ask Suzanne Butte if OCLC will sponsor an MTKN booth.  We could check with Ken Winter (VTRC) if there is any conflict of interest.  Would be great if Suzanne could get us a presence at TRB. Also ask her if she is planning anything at SLA as well as TRB.

Joyce:   We can't have an MTKN room, we need to make it an SLA Transportation Activity.  But could try to use OCLC's influence to get a room.

Non-profit space at TRB is $2000.  See the TRB Web site.

Janet:   left a message on Suzanne's voicemail when we tried to call her. She asked if Suzanne (OCLC) would sponsor something with us at SLA and TRB.

Bob:     said he would call Betti Lou Hicks to follow up (she's the chair of SLA's Transportation Division).

**Membership Committee**

We need to try and bring in Nebraska to the group.

Janet:   suggested we post 'Working Smarter', good for new people to use to do their own trainings in their DOTs.

Further talk focused on how to get Michigan DOT involved.

At this point several attendees needed to leave to catch airplanes, etc.  The meeting was adjourned, early afternoon, Friday, Oct. 22nd.