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**Abstract:** This project looks in-depth at the problems and solutions that arise when establishing a community archives in the digital era. The case that will be explored is the community archives of Front Runners New York, a LGBT running club. The archive documents this small slice of the New York City LGBT community, capturing the impact of the AIDS epidemic and the community’s struggle for wider acceptance in the 1980s and 1990s, to more recent triumphs in the 2010s such as the success of the marriage equality movement. This project finds that establishing and maintaining a community archives in the digital era necessitates navigating a complex set of technological and social issues, including issues of ownership and copyright, methods for capturing records, digitization and born-digital record keeping, social media and web archiving, and digital preservation. Using an action research approach, this paper discusses the solutions developed to address these issues, as well as those issues that remain unresolved.
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Introduction

The last decade has seen a growing interest in community archives (Bastian and Alexander). Flinn and Stevens define community archives as comprising of “the (often) grassroots activities of creating and collecting, processing and curating, preserving and making accessible collections relating to a particular community or specified subject” (p. 5). Caswell, Cifor and Ramirez note that community archives “can materialize around ethnic, racial or religious identities, general and sexual orientation, economic status, and physical locations” (p. 61). This particular project will explore a specific community archives, and ask the question:

What issues arise in community archives with the transition from analog to digital records? What ways can a community respond to these challenges?

The literature on community archives most often addresses traditional archives, such as accessioning boxes of paper records, or the digitization of such records. Although some literature alludes to possibilities brought on by Web 2.0 technologies, there is not extensive discussion of the ways that community archives can shift their practices to acquiring born-digital materials (Gilliland). As intellectual and creative productions are increasingly created digitally, often without analog equivalents such as printouts, the move away form digitization and toward born-digital record keeping is increasingly necessary if an archive is to document contemporary activity. Born-digital documentation can include photographs, written-works, and videos, as well as web archives, emails including newsletters and activity from social media accounts. This particular project will explore a community archive that has begun to address the challenges of born-digital documentation. However, before these issues are discussed, background on the archival context will be explored, followed by a methodology for studying these issues.

Background Context
The particular community archive that will be explored is the archives of Front Runners New York (FRNY), the LGBT running club of New York. The name traces its root back to the mid-twentieth century where LGBT clubs required coded names so that if member identities were discovered, they would not be automatically “outed” and face the significant social repercussions. Notable “coded” clubs in the United States include the Mattachine Society—oriented to mostly men although not exclusive—and the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB) group, which was lesbian club. In the case of Mattachine, the name was from a French secret fraternity of unmarried men; for DOB, “Bilitis” refers to a fictional lesbian from the poems the “Songs of Bilits” (Bronski; Gallo).

The use of coded names for gay clubs continued into the 1970s when a gay running club in San Francisco was created and eventually named FrontRunners. The name referred to the title of Patricia Nell Warren’s 1974 book *The Front Runner*, which is a story of a gay runner and his gay coach. The name would have some resonance with gay people as the book became quite popular (e.g., it was a *New York Times* bestseller), but not be so overt as to deter members who may not be out or entirely out. In October 1979, Malcolm Robinson asked the San Francisco group if he could use the name for a club he was creating in New York. As they did not control they name, they agreed and he placed in ad in the *New York Running News* to see if any lesbians and gay men were interested in forming a running club. According to former President Steve Gerben, about a dozen people responded and the club has existed ever since (Gerben).

The archive documents this small slice of the New York City LGBT community, capturing the impact of the AIDS epidemic and the community’s struggle for wider acceptance in the 1980s and 1990s, to more recent triumphs in the 2010s such as the success of the marriage equality movement. The archive includes newsletters, photographs, programs from the annual “LGBT Pride Run” in Central Park, membership directories, oral histories, among other series of records. In January 2014, long-time member and former president Mike McMahon asked me to participate in establishing an archives of the club. I agreed to participate, being interested in helping archive this small slice of the New York City LGBT community and giving community archiving a try. We both agreed that the important documentation worth preserving were not minutiae such as individual running times, but rather documentation around the larger social function of the club such as providing the means for gays and lesbians to meet each other outside of the context of a bar or club. In the next section, I will discuss the methodology used in studying the issues and challenges faced in this community archive project.

**Methodology**

The approach taken here is an action research approach, where the researcher acts as a participant in a community of activity toward solving problems that emerge, and developing solutions and best practices along the way. According to Denscombe, the “research should not only be used to gain a better understanding of the problems which arise in everyday practice, but actually set out to alter things – to do so as part and parcel of the research process rather than tag it on as an afterthought which follows the
conclusion of the research” (p. 126). Action research has been adopted most thoroughly in the education community, where teachers and educational researchers work together to improve educational practice, student outcomes and learner motivation.

Through an action research approach, the archives team and I engage in problem solving activity as they are encountered and develop solutions. A particular focus is placed on developing reusable solutions, such as open-source software, that could be both reused as needed as well as possibly prove useful to other archival projects. During this process, documentation is maintained, such as notes, photographs, emails, minutes from meetings, work products (computer code, collected materials, and built out web presences), which were reexamined in assembling the research findings presented here. This paper discusses some of the problems and solutions encountered from 2014 to 2016.

Findings: Issues and Solutions

Digitizing textual records

The initial two projects that the newly formed archive team embarked upon were digitization projects. The first project involved the digitization of the club’s paper archive, which has been stored in a file cabinet in the basement gym of Rutgers Church near Central Park where the club runs. The paper archive was comprised of about 2 linear feet of largely newsletters from the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s that were not organized in any way. The archives team orchestrated a “sorting” event where participants used a large conference table to sort records into folders by year. A dozen members participated, and an image of the event is shown in Figure 1. Employing this “crowdsourcing” strategy allowed for all the records to be sorted in about an hour, which would have taken a lone individual a day or more. Using the computer-lab next door, members entered metadata about their particular folder into a Google spreadsheet, noting newsletters that were missing and would need to be located within the personal collections of long-standing members. Providing this metadata in the shared spreadsheet allowed for an accurate inventory of the paper archive, helping prepare it for digitization.

<Insert Figure 1>

Figure 1. “Sorting” paper records event, May 2014.

When archivists work in a community archives setting, they sometime have to set aside some of the ways that archivists typically do things in favor of how the community would like to proceed. For example, I advocated for items being organized first by series (e.g., Newsletters, Membership Directories, etc.), then chronologically, rather than simply chronologically (e.g., filing all items in a folder with a year). I tried to explain that one reason that archivists typically avoid filing by year is that if you cannot decipher what year a record was produced, then how do you file the record? However, team members argued that the types of records were well dated so this would not be an issue. They were right: no paper records were ambiguously dated. However, being able to set aside archival practices in favor of a community’s common sense organizational approach is necessary both for smooth collaboration but also for respecting the community’s insights.
To conduct digitization, it was decided that a local digitization company would be used where the records could be easily dropped off and picked up without the fear of records getting lost in the mail. As each monthly newsletter was printed on different color paper, creating a somewhat rainbow effect suggestive of the iconic LGBT rainbow, it was decided that all the materials would be digitized in color to retain this effect. A member and I picked up the records one evening, dropped them off at the digitization company, and picked them up the next week with the digitized copies on a hard drive. The scans included OCR data with the PDF/A files. This proved useful when importing the newsletters into the archives’ newly established Omeka site that has a “PDF Text” plugin, thus making the OCR text searchable.2

**Digitizing photographs**

Whereas the text-based digitization project was successful in making available these textual records, the second digitization project proved more challenging. A collection of about 25 envelopes with about 800 photographs was sent in for digitization before the archives project began in 2014, returning DVDs of digitized images. However, it was never clear whom the creator of the photographs were or if they were from the same creator. As items could be easily dropped into a filing cabinet in the church basement, as there was no procedure for accessioning records before 2014, the provenance of the photographs were unknown. There was very little metadata for the photos, such as an envelop label. Going through the groups of photos, I was eventually able to establish the events and dates for groups of photos based on signage in the photos or what was printed on shirts.

Photographs in this collection document events like the annual NYC Pride march. As the club is part of the larger NYC LGBT community, the documentation provides clues into what that community was like at that time. For example, the photograph in Figure 2—one of my favorites—shows the Gay Pride March of 1984 with gay New Yorkers marching among onlookers, with some interested in the march and others simply hurrying to their destination. The photo gives glimpse into 1984 gay New York: affectionate, sexually-charged, rebellious and defiant.

<Insert Figure 2>

Figure 2. Unknown photographer, “Gay Pride March 1984, Fifth Avenue, New York City,” FRNY History and Archives, available at: [http://www.frny.org/omeka/items/show/1483](http://www.frny.org/omeka/items/show/1483).

Although the digitization and import into Omeka was straightforward, the assignment of metadata using the community’s knowledge turned out to be more difficult. The community was most interested in getting individuals depicted in photographs tagged by name. Based on the success of the earlier event, another attempt at crowdsourcing metadata creation was attempted through a “tagging” event. Before the event, I had developed a guide to creating metadata for the photos in Omeka. It was hoped that during the event, participants would learn to do the tagging, and go home and do some in their
free time. Held in a computer lab, I instructed participants on how to do the tagging and handed out an instruction sheet that I had developed.

Creating metadata in Omeka turned out to be tedious and un-engaging to participants. Community members wanted to engage in photo tagging similar to Facebook, where you can click a face and tag someone by just typing in the first few character of their name. Further, if the person is a friend of yours, they will get notified, helping to create a circle of connection. Since Facebook has such widespread adoption, and was easy to use by the less technically savvy members, we decided to explore the possibility of using Facebook and a crowdsourced metadata creation platform. The notion was that once the tagging was complete, the metadata could be exported via the Facebook API and re-synced with the records in Omeka.

When the plan to use Facebook as a tagging platform was discussed at a club board meeting, serious reservations were expressed. There was concern that some members did not want to be findable, especially on Facebook, because of fears of being “outed” and the related social repercussions. Despite the belief that some had that this should not be in an issue in New York City in year 2016, this example indicated that long-standing fears of ostracism for being gay persisted and well as the need to preserve individual privacy. To allay these legitimate fears, it was decided and the board agreed that photos could be tagged on Facebook via a “secret group” that was invite-only. To accomplish this, all of the Facebook photos were exported from Omeka into this “secret group.”

Despite the appeal of using Facebook as a crowdsourced metadata creation platform, it turned out to be problematic for a number of reasons. First, Facebook provided no way to tie back the photos uploaded into Facebook with those in Omeka. It was hoped that Facebook would retain the original file names somewhere in its metadata accessible via the API, but this is not the case. The original filenames were seemingly discarded. Second, the photos maintained by Facebook are heavily reduced versions of the originals, thus making Facebook itself an unsuitable “post-custodial” replacement for Omeka. The digitized image shown in Figure 2 has an original size of 6 MB and is 3410 x 2048 pixels, but the largest size available via the Facebook API is 2048 x 1335 pixels at 344 KB, indicating that the photograph has been shrunk in size and highly compressed to create a very small file size. Zooming in on the photo indicates the loss of original detail that Facebook forgoes for quick transmission and storage. It is unclear if Facebook retains the original photos or discards them altogether.

Given that Facebook does not have a built-in way to export photographs or photo metadata, I developed a tool that allows Facebook users to export photo metadata and download images for Facebook groups they manage and pages that they like. Although Facebook’s API’s notes that metadata on tagged users should be accessible via the API, I found that this was only true for photos on Facebook pages rather than Facebook groups. It is unclear why this limitation exists, but is a third reason that the plan to use Facebook as a platform for crowdsourcing photo metadata was seriously hampered.

*Electronic records and the digital dark age*
The digital dark age, as it relates to archives, is the concept that with the shift to electronic records, there will be gaps in the archival records because archives will be unable to either capture or preserve the electronic records from that period. In looking at the club’s records, this would certainly be the case, as paper-based newsletters ended in 2004 and replaced with email newsletters that were not as well preserved as the paper newsletters. To avoid furthering the digital dark age in the club’s archives, the archives team looked to capture electronic newsletters and fill the voids where possible.

To capture and preserve electronic newsletters, a team member noted that all the newsletters were kept in Constant Contact, a cloud-based newsletter tool that the club had been using since 2007. However, since Constant Contact only allowed a limited amount of disk space for images used in the newsletter, someone had been removing old images to make room for new images. This caused old newsletters, when either pulled up from the Constant Contact database or from members’ e-mail accounts, rendered with no images, such as the newsletter shown in Figure 3. Recognizing how this practice was irrevocably damaging the club’s records, this member was able to secure more disk space so that old newsletters did not have to be damaged to allow future newsletters to be sent.

<Insert Figure 3>
Figure 3. Sample email newsletter with images deleted from webserver, available at: http://www.frny.org/omeka/items/show/4101.

Through aggressive effort by the archives team, newsletters from 2007 to current have been captured and preserved, albeit some of the older newsletters are missing images. This involved creating an open-source script that exchanged data with the Constant Contact API and eventually creates PDF copies of the newsletter. The PDF contains a graphic version of the newsletter, preserving the look of the newsletter, followed by a JSON data export, which includes the text of the newsletter as well as other metadata that was maintained by Constant Contact. These newsletters were uploading into Omeka by year, and are thus searchable like all the older paper-based newsletters.

This experience highlights that the digital dark age is a real phenomenon in community archives, which especially get manifested in the early to mid-2000s where groups transitioned to email records over paper-based records. It also highlights that records like email newsletters can be captured, yet requires some technical know-how, such as writing a script to export from a cloud service. Limitations of cloud services, such as only allowing a limited amount of disk space, can endanger archival records as individuals clear them out to make room for active record keeping needs.

Ownership, Copyright and Donation of Born-digital records

One of the first things that the archives team developed was a means for individuals to donate records to the archives. This involved creating a donor form, where the physical property is transferred as well as the copyright. There are two ways that individuals can donate: through the web-based contribution module on the Omeka site (powered by the...
Contribution plugin\textsuperscript{6}), or sending a donation to fnydonate@frny.org. When an email is sent to that address, an auto-reply is sent with the donor form asking that the user write back with a “yes” if they agree to the donor form (see Figure 4). If a donor has a large amount to donate that will not easily fit in an email, the team helps them donate with the club’s Dropbox.com account, which allows for large files to be uploaded.

\textbf{Subject: DONOR AGREEMENT}

Thank you for your donation to the Front Runners New York Archives. Please note that by donating items to the FRNY Archives you agree to the donor agreement. If you agree to the donor agreement, please reply to this message and put in the message body "Yes, I agree." If you do not agree, please reply back and indicate so.

\textit{Donor Agreement}

Front Runners New York
PO Box 230087 Ansonia Station
New York, NY 10023

I hereby donate the item sent in my previous email to Archives of Front Runners New York (FRNY), as an unrestricted gift, and transfer to Archives of FRNY legal title and copyright to the contents in as far as I hold them, except for any limiting conditions that I specify.

I agree that any materials in the collection which are not to be retained by Archives of FRNY shall be disposed of by Archives of FRNY as it sees fit.

Figure 4. Donor form that it automatically sent to donors via email.

Unfortunately, this donor process, while still in place, has proven somewhat problematic. With physical material, such as the donation of an envelope of developed 35mm photographs with the original camera negatives, considering this a “donation”—or giving a tangible thing to a non-profit—makes sense. With digital materials that are so routinely copied, the idea of “donation” is a somewhat foreign concept. Further, in several cases, members expressed that they would rather not transfer copyright. For some donors, this is because they are commercial photographers and generally do not transfer the copyrights as they may want to sell the photographs in the future. For others, they feel that this will inhibit their ability for non-commercial uses of their photographs, such as personal uses like uploading them to social media sites like Facebook.

In several cases, I found myself explaining to donors why we were asking for copyright, and explaining how their photographs were copyright protected for their life plus seventy years, and that control of their photographs would pass onto their estate after death. I explained that the value of the archive would diminish if say un-gay-friendly estates retracted the copyright of materials at some unknown date in the future. This explanation was satisfactory for some members, while not quite for others. One member who practices law advocated that the archive move away from transferring copyright but
rather seek a perpetual license. I have attempted to get him to draft what this license would look like and work on it is pending. Thus, donor forms that look to transfer ownership and copyright of digital material can be difficult for donors to wrap their heads around, it not outright unagreeable. When considering digital materials, the archival community may need to rethink donor forms such that new legal arrangements are entered in other than copyright transfers.

A further difficulty relates to individual understanding of what is eligible for donation. Several cases occurred where individuals attempted donating pictures of themselves that others have taken, believing that since they were the subjects of the photograph and they had the file that they had some kind of ownership over it. For photography, the copyright owner is generally the person who has taken the picture, regardless of whose camera it was or who has the file. In cases such as this, it has been necessary to explain to members that the original photographer needs to donate the photo. In sum, the language around intellectual property and copyright are difficult for individuals unversed in that language to fully understand, thus making donations more challenging. It may be necessary for community archives to develop new means for taking in donations that have legal validity but are also easier for community members to understand and agree to.

**Acquiring born-digital photographs**

As the means to acquire born-digital materials such as photographs was developed, as described in the previous section, the need to create metadata for such records was needed. While being able to assign event descriptions of photograph collections is easily completed, assigning item or photograph-level metadata has proven more difficult. One problem is that Omeka, while providing functionality for batch-loading photographs, has no means to bulk-assign Dublin Core metadata. For donated photographs, they are often from the same creator, are from the same date and have the same rights, thus having a bulk assignment metadata feature is absolutely essential. A further issue is that Omeka, in its administrative back-end, creates very small thumbnails of images, making it difficult to see who is featured in a picture should you want to go in and assign metadata for a picture you encounter. To address the issue of small thumbnails and inability to bulk-assign metadata, I created an open-source tool called the “Omeka Quick Metadata Entry Webform.” The tool shows all photographs in a collection, with options for modifying the Dublin Core title, description, date, creator, and rights metadata fields. Importantly, it includes a link for each metadata field called “make all same as first,” which replicates the metadata on the first entry for all entries. It also includes large thumbnails so that persons featured in a photograph can be readily discerned.

In sum, tools for addressing large quantities of similar materials, such as assigning the same metadata to digital photographs, is necessary. While tools such as Omeka have a great number of features for enabling a community archives in the digital era, such as the many features discussed here, there are features such as bulk assignment of metadata that are sorely missing. Fortunately, since systems such as Omeka are open source and relatively easily expanded upon, features that are essential for community archives such as this one can be developed.
Social media and web archiving

Like many groups and organizations, the club has been using social media since the earlier part of this decade. However, members are aware that social media sites have a tendency to grow and then fade. For example, myspace.com, which was hugely popular in the previous decade, has now largely faded away and important features rendered inaccessible, such as their blogs feature (Cocciolo). Further, the club has maintained a website since the 1990s, which has not been archived other than through the efforts of the Internet Archive.8

To capture the social media activity of the club, an assortment of tools were employed. For example, Facebook activity was initially captured via the Photograbber application to download the photo albums, and then the Facebook Timeline was captured by scrolling back as far back as it would go and saving the HTML page. All this data was collected together and saved in a ZIP files in Omeka. While this continues to work for saving the Timeline, Facebook changed their API, rendering the Photograbber application inoperable.9 Photo albums are now downloaded using the tool described earlier that I created.

Instagram content is downloaded using the open source tool downstagram.10 Although this tool captures photo metadata, it is unfortunately unable to capture videos in Instagram, which is a more recent addition to the site.

In 2015, the club decided to end its initiative to create member profiles, which are interviews of members and are rich resources on individual lives.11 Before they were taken offline, they were web archived as PDF files using a tool called “Save as PDF.”12 More recently, web archives of the frny.org website was created using the new tool Webrecorder.io, which requires you to visit every page of a website and a WARC file is created.13 The WARC file can be viewed or played-back using the Webarchive Player created by the same developer.14

In sum, web archiving requires adopting new tools, and the tools themselves have short shelf lives like the content on websites. However, as the web has become the primary mechanism for sharing information and culture in the digital era, and yet the content on the web is highly ephemeral, it is necessary that it gets captured and preserved in a stable repository.

Digital Preservation

Through the work of digitization and acquiring born-digital materials, the community archives of FRNY had over 6,000 items occupying 42 GB in its Omeka site. This material requires digital preservation, which are the activities and planning that helps ensure that digital information of enduring value remains accessible and intellectually faithful to its original form over time. The team recognized that the best way to accomplish this is through creating multiple copies of the data. The first copy is the live
data, which is hosted on a Dreamhost shared server. This copy is re-synced about every two-months on a hard drive stored in an office in Manhattan, including a dump of the Omeka database. The copy stored on the hard drive is also re-synched with a Dropbox.com professional account, thus providing three geographically dispersed copies of the data. Although this simple solution is far from perfect, the team and I believe that it is a “good enough” digital preservation solution that should help ensure the long-persistence of this information. The notion of “good enough” digital preservation solutions, advocated by the team running the IMLS-funded POWRR project (Preserving [Digital] Objects with Restricted Resources), works well for a community archives project such as this one (Schumacher, Thomas, VandeCreek, et. al.).

Conclusion

In conclusion, this project finds that establishing and maintaining a community archives in the digital era necessitates navigating a complex set of technological and social issues. These include:

1) Digitization and crowd-sourced metadata– Crowdsourcing of metadata creation can be successful, however, participants want engaging activities that feel meaningful, such as the circle of connection (e.g., being notified when you are tagged by someone) made possible through Facebook. Unfortunately, Facebook proves to be a problematic platform for crowdsourcing metadata creation or using as a “post custodial” archive because of difficulty in reliably exporting metadata from it and the reduction of image quality.

2) Privacy - In the LGBT community, issues of privacy continue to persist, such as fears of being “outed” through online social media.

3) Archival Practices - In community archives settings, archivists must sometimes set aside their practices and use those that make the most sense to the community.

4) Electronic records and the digital dark age – The digital dark age, or a period where archives could not or did not capture electronic records, proved itself to be a reality in this case. However, through aggressive and sustained efforts, capturing electronic records such as email newsletters is possible.

5) Ownership, Copyright and Donation of Born-digital records – With born-digital records like photographs, legal language related to ownership and copyright can be confusing or unagreeable in a community archives context. Individuals want to retain the rights for personal uses, such as posting photographs to social media. Rethinking donor forms, such as the possibility of using perpetual licenses, may help address this issue.

6) Acquiring born-digital photographs – Tools for addressing large quantities of similar materials, such as assigning the same metadata to digital photographs, should be considered a necessity in all digital archiving tools.

7) Social media and web archiving – New tools must be regularly adopted as the tools themselves have short shelf lives. However, capturing web content is worth the effort as it has become the primary way information and culture is shared.

8) Digital preservation – Rather than attempting to strive for an elaborate digital preservation solution, adopting a “good enough” solution, such as maintaining
For Review Only

three geographically dispersed copies of the data, is an approach that works well
in a community archives context.

This project concludes that creating a community archives that is able to accommodate
both digitization and born-digital projects is possible. However, the technical work and
overall labor is significantly more involved than in the paper-based world, involving
work such as developing computer scripts, creating item-level metadata, replicating data
for preservation purposes and adopting new tools to capture web data. Despite these
challenges, with some perseverance community archiving participants can overcome
these issues.
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Thanks, Volunteers!
The entire membership of FRNY wishes to thank all the club volunteers who helped make last weekend so successful. There are too many names to list everyone here, however know that the membership is grateful. Thanks to everyone who volunteered at the 24 mile water station, led by coordinators Dano Grams and Marty Tracy; those who helped at the pancake breakfast, coordinated Andrew Butler, and those who helped with the pasta dinner, coordinated by Sean Butler. Also thanks to those who cheered out on the marathon course and kept the runners going!
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