

SEAFOOD TECHNOLOGY COLLECTION

A Final Report

**Edward Kolbe
Sea Grant Regional
Engineering Specialist**

**Janet Webster
Associate Professor
Head Librarian, Guin Library**

**Oregon State University
September 5, 2003**

SEAFOOD TECHNOLOGY COLLECTION

A Final Report

9-5-03

Edward Kolbe
Sea Grant Regional
Engineering Specialist
Oregon State University

Janet Webster
Associate Professor
Head Librarian, Guin Library
Oregon State University

SUMMARY

Diminishing access to seafood technology literature, both the published and the unpublished “gray” literature, is perceived, due to closures of labs and libraries, and loss of expertise by retirement and funding reductions.

Our response in 1998 was to initiate a project that would measure interest and need, while demonstrating a process to create Web-based searchable collections. Industry became the primary target audience. Although the authors received salary support from home departments, fund-raising for project activities proved difficult. We raised \$30,000 over 5 years in the form of small gifts and grants from Industry and agencies.

With involvement of a Library Science graduate student and other library assistants, we created three collections designed to have value for the Industry and to test and demonstrate the information delivery process. Collections of “Seafood Wastewater”, “Seafood Byproducts” (including composting), and “Seafood Thawing Technologies” are now listed and searchable on the Web

<<http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/guin/seafood/index.html>>. Each entry includes bibliographic information and an abstract. Information on how to get a copy is available with all the references available either through the Guin Library at OSU, or when possible, the World Wide Web.

Throughout the project, we communicated progress and results while soliciting advice and information. Press releases, letters, articles, presentations and posters all sought to keep Industry and academic colleagues apprised of our results. This final report covers major outcomes and contains a tentative list of collections at risk, a draft “Collection Policy”, and a “Handbook” describing the detailed steps required to create future collections.

We end this project phase with reflections on the things that worked, the things that did not work, and criteria needed to pursue future efforts. We also make a recommendation

to create a regional information delivery system to fill current and future needs for information in the seafood technology field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
BACKGROUND	
History	3
Funding and Budget	4
Methods	5
COLLECTIONS	6
PUBLICATIONS, PRESENTATIONS, PROMOTION	8
REFLECTIONS ON THE PROJECT	9
What worked	9
What didn't work	10
What criteria are needed to pursue future efforts	11
What next	12
Recommendations	12
APPENDICES	
A. Original proposal and project definition	
B. Seafood technology information: where to look and how to get it	
C. Some potential collections in jeopardy	
D. Draft Collection Policy	
E. Handbook	

INTRODUCTION

We started this project in 1998, convinced that the collection of seafood technology literature, particularly the unpublished, is both important and fast-disappearing. We saw this as a critical issue, as food safety concerns and economic development interests increase in the face of closing laboratories, disappearing expertise, diminished library collections, and discarded or lost documents. Moreover, we assumed that once the professionals within Industry, agencies, and the University realized that we could build on-line accessible collections, they would respond with enthusiasm. Some did. But locating sources of funding proved difficult; interest was generally muted in the shadow of other more-pressing matters. Our objectives began with a comprehensive plan for action, then narrowed to decisions about what parts should be started in the face of limited support, and finally focused on the question: “who cares?”

This “final” report of the initial project phase has several objectives. One is to trace the background, history, and outcome of the project for those interested in the process or in what has become of the time and money spent. A second objective is to describe a

resource for seafood technologists -- contents of the existing collections and how to use them. And a third is to provide guidance to those who, at some future date, may wish to continue the project in some form or another.

BACKGROUND

History

Much of the seafood technology R&D performed worldwide in the last 50 years occurred in labs that have been greatly reduced in scope or that no longer exist. Examples on the west coast include the Utilization Research Division of NMFS in Seattle, the Canadian federal seafood technology lab and BC Research, both in Vancouver, and university seafood technology institutes at the University of Washington, and the University of California at Davis. Similar east coast closures have occurred in Gloucester and Halifax. Such closures and reductions precipitate the loss of an experienced research and outreach workforce, the failure to hire and train replacements, the closures of technology libraries, dilution of specialized publications, and the ultimate loss of technical information that was never published in readily accessible journals. Loss of expertise is exemplified by recent and imminent retirements of Sea Grant seafood specialists in all three west coast states and Alaska.

In the face of this marked reduction in effort and expertise, we perceived that the information needs of the industry would only increase. Leading the way are issues of food safety and the design of HACCP programs. Waste utilization, management of plant effluents, energy conservation and productivity, all represent increasing pressures. We saw needs relating to value-added process opportunities addressing new international markets and demand for quality; to limitations in fish stocks; and to development of underutilized species. Native village groups seek information to support their growing interests in seafood process development. The research community in universities and agencies experience similar needs in all of these same areas.

Much of the needed information exists. Some is published; some is the unpublished, "gray" literature that is fast disappearing. Our efforts using Web search engines and food technology indices revealed significant problems identifying documents, when we know these documents to exist. Then, once a document was identified, getting a copy was often no less of a challenge. The urgent need for a regional library to build and maintain a complete and accessible collection was clear, to us.

In the fall of 1998, we sent a letter and questionnaire to over 75 seafood technologists and administrators on the U.S. West Coast, Alaska, and British Columbia. Recipients were tied to industry, agencies, and universities. Well over 40 returns provided valuable ideas on the operation of a proposed regional library, advice concerning its location, suggestions for members of a steering committee and consulting advisors, and numerous offers to supply unpublished reports or difficult-to-find series' from private files. All who responded endorsed the general concept defining this library. A presentation of the

concept was made at the 1999 Pacific Fisheries Technologists Annual Meeting. The ensuing discussion was highly supportive.

We then prepared a full proposal outlining a multi-phase plan to retrieve, catalog, and create access to a regionally-based collection of seafood technology literature. Appendix A is a draft of this proposal and plan.

Funding and Budget

In 1999, we submitted the Phase I proposal (Appendix A) to the Saltonstall-Kennedy Program of NMFS, and to the Technology Program of National Sea Grant, asking for major support. Similar proposals went also to offices of the National Marine Fisheries Service (Montlake Lab), the U.S. Food and Drug Administration/Northwest Region, and various Congressional Delegations in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska Regions. At the same time, we requested smaller grants of \$5,000 from state agencies, university Sea Grant offices, seafood processing companies, and seafood industry organizations – approximately 30 such contacts in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. Our strategy was to encourage support of funding agencies by showing broad financial contributions from potential users of such a collection. The Co-PI's already had some salary support from OR/AK/WA Sea Grant and COMES (Kolbe), and from OSU Libraries (Webster).

Full proposals to the Sea Grant and SK programs were not successful; nor were those to FDA and NMFS. Reviewers seemed typically skeptical about the prospects of funding such a collection. They saw the term “library” as connoting a permanent facility (and, so, on-going requests for financial support).

The smaller requests were ultimately successful in gathering \$30,000 in outside funding:

	<u>GRANTS</u>	<u>OSU MATCH</u>
Oregon Economic and Community Development Dept.	\$15,000	
[Formal matching salary support from OSU]		\$17,680
California Sea Grant	\$5,000	
Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute	\$5,000	
Ocean Beauty Seafoods	\$2,500	
Unisea Foods	\$2,000	
National Fisheries Institute	<u>\$500</u>	
Totals	\$30,000	<u>\$17,680</u>

This budget supported the following approx. expenses:

Personnel (Salary plus benefits)	
Ed Kolbe, Co-PI	
Janet Webster, Co-PI	
Brian Paust, Contributing PI, from Univ. of Alaska	Total of \$17,680

Liz Fox, Library Assistant, Guin Library, OSU	
Judy Mullen, Library Assistant, Guin Library, OSU	
Larry Schmidt, Graduate Student in Library Science	Total of \$21,700

Travel and Conferences [Included: Three annual meetings of the Pacific Fisheries Technologists, School for Scanning, Marine Science Librarians Annual Meeting, area travel]	\$2,700
Equipment [Scanner, Computer]	\$2,600
Supplies	\$1,500
OSU Overhead	<u>\$1,500</u>

Total \$30,000

As the limitation of funds became clear, our project objectives narrowed to “Industry” as the target audience, and to the questions, what do they need, how will they prefer to access it, and what is their level of interest?

Methods

An early step was to determine what seafood technology resources already existed. The result was “Seafood Technology Information: where to look and how to get it”, as presented in Appendix B. This was distributed at the 2001 PFT meeting as well as mounted on the Web at <http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/guin/seafood/guide.html>. This document identified existing resources that can be accessed from a variety of sources. In its creation, however, we did not find a single resource specifically focused on research in the seafood technology field. The Seafood Network Information Center website, maintained by the Sea Grant Extension Program at UC Davis, provides an excellent gateway to many resources and valuable information for the field. However, it does not provide cohesive access to research information, nor provide means of obtaining items referenced if not available electronically. Thus, we proceeded with our project plans.

Our strategy was to put together a number of collections to serve as examples, and then poll Industry to evaluate the format and value to representative users. We did not assemble the formal advisory committee originally proposed, but solicited advice from a wide range of West Coast and Alaska colleagues. Without adequate funding, we could not systematically approach organizations and individuals to begin our retrieval of

collections that were at risk of being lost. Nor could we hire consultants to screen and select references within collections. As the result of broad communication and publicity, we did begin a tentative list of potential collections at risk. This appears in Appendix C.

As the first trial collection topic, we selected “Seafood Wastewater”, because of the following:

- It addressed issues that were critical to coastal processors.
- We already possessed a base collection from work by Kolbe.
- This topic provided a spectrum of formats – both published and unpublished, that would serve as a valuable learning step.

We were faced with the immediate question of what exactly was to be included in subject matter and scope, prompting creation of a draft “Collection Policy”, Appendix D.

Once the “Seafood Wastewater” collection process was underway, we expanded to two more topics: “Seafood Byproducts” (including composting) and “Thawing Technologies”. The former was from a collection provided by retiring OSU Extension Seafood Specialist, Ken Hilderbrand. The latter began with a collection of co-PI Kolbe. Thus the creation of these three collections would demonstrate the web-based process we originally proposed. The following section describes these collections. Appendix E presents a “Handbook” describing how one would create and/or modify new collections of potential future interest.

We had also anticipated scanning documents within the collections so users could have easy access to full-text materials. Copyright restrictions limited what could be scanned, although there is material in all three collections that is not subject to those restrictions. We still plan on digitizing selected material. Currently, we have links to existing full-text of some material through the National Sea Grant Library and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

From the beginning of the project, we were concerned with addressing the needs of the Industry. Our initial survey indicated interest. We continued to explore this interest by making presentations about the concept at annual meetings of the Pacific Fisheries Technologists. These interactions provided excellent feedback loops. We also did a pilot interview study with key Industry people to test the usefulness of the initial collection, Seafood Wastewater. Co-PI Kolbe communicated regularly with the seafood press to keep the project visible. Co-PI Webster wrote two articles for the Journal of Extension that used the project as a demonstration for the use of bibliographies as an outreach tool. We developed ongoing links to other providers of electronic information, most notably, the Seafood Network Information Center.

COLLECTIONS

Each collection is unique, yet each has similarities in structure and compilation. All three collections are represented by a bibliography, a web-searchable listing of its contents. These bibliographies were compiled using ProCite® version 5.0. The standard work forms are used so basic bibliographic information, location, and keywords are consistent.

Each citation has several keywords assigned to it. These describe the content of the item more fully than the title. The *Water Resources Abstracts Thesaurus* and *Aquatic Science and Fisheries Abstracts Thesaurus* have been used as much as possible for subject terms. Abstracts were added to augment the keywords. Permission was granted to use those downloaded from commercial databases and we created additional ones as needed. Copies of all items were obtained before we would include them in the collection and its bibliography. All three collections are available as web-searchable or text bibliographies at <http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/guin/seafood/index.html>

None of the collections are comprehensive. Rather, we chose to be selective and present core and important resources to the user. We recognized the limits on people's time and ability to sort through comprehensive listings of resources. We attempted to use our expertise to shape collections that would be relevant and useful.

Seafood Wastewater (130 items)

Co-PI Kolbe identified this topic. He provided guidance and suggestions to Larry Schmidt, a library school graduate student with a master's degree in environmental engineering, who gleaned material from many sources using a variety of searching methods such as database searching and bibliography checking. Most of the material has been published since 1970. We include older material if still relevant. While the Pacific Northwest and Alaska are the geographic areas of most interest, often material from other parts of the world are useful. The core documents cited in the bibliography give the user a basic understanding of the processes and the issues. Others cover more specific information, perhaps by species or treatment technique.

Seafood By-Products (38 items)

This collection is an enhanced version of a bibliography compiled by Ken Hilderbrand, Oregon Sea Grant. Through his career as a Sea Grant Extension Agent, he collected material on composting and seafood by-products. Upon his retirement in 2002, he gave this collection of documents to the Guin Library. As we sorted through them, we decided to make them more accessible while selecting those most relevant to seafood interests. We converted his list into ProCite, revising and enhancing entries as needed. No additional material was gathered. Much of the material is gray literature rather than published research.

Seafood Thawing Technologies (84 items)

This collection is based on the references of a review Co-PI Kolbe wrote for Dekker's 2003 *Encyclopedia of Agricultural, Food and Biological Engineering*. Co-PI Webster did an initial search in *Food Science and Technology Abstracts* and additional items were added from bibliographies and other resources.

PUBLICATIONS, PRESENTATIONS, AND PROMOTION & CORRESPONDENCE

Publications:

Webster, J. and J. Mullen. 2003. *Handbook on Creating Annotated Bibliographies Using Bibliographic Software: Conceptual Decisions and Practical Steps*. Available online: <http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/guin/seafood/Handbook.pdf>

Webster, J. 2003. Bibliographies as an Extension outreach tool: an old method in a new age. *Journal of Extension*. Vol 41, #3. June. Available online: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2003june/a7.shtml>

Webster, J. How to create a bibliography. 2003. *Journal of Extension*. Vol 41, #3, June. Available online: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2003june/tt1.shtml>

Webster, J. 2000. *Seafood Technology Information: where to look and how to get it*. Available online: <http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/guin/seafood/guide.html>
[Reproduced in Appendix B]

Presentations:

Schmidt, L. and E. Kolbe. 2002. Trends and approaches to seafood wastewater processing. A Presentation to the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Pacific Fisheries Technologists Meeting. Reno, NV.

Webster, J., E. Kolbe, L. Schmidt. 2002. Seafood wastewater information. A Presentation to the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Pacific Fisheries Technologists Meeting. Reno, NV.

Webster, J. 2000. Seafood technology information: where to look and how to get it. A Poster presented to the 2000 Annual Meeting of the Pacific Fisheries Technologists Meeting. Ketchikan, AK.

Webster, J. 1999. Seafood technology information resources – current access and future possibilities. A Presentation to the 1999 Annual Meeting of Pacific Fisheries Technologists. Parkville, BC.

Promotion & Correspondence:

Kolbe, E., J. Webster, B. Paust. 2000. Letter describing current project status sent to list.

Kolbe, E. 2000. Press release: Seafood Technology Collection – the planning phase is underway.

Ramseyer, R. 2000. Seafood research in jeopardy. Fishmonger.com. February 26, 2000.

REFLECTIONS ON THE PROJECT

We end Phase I of this project with mixed feelings about the outcome. The learning and accomplishment far exceeded that normally expected for the limited funds we attracted over the course of the 5-year project. But Phase I has not led to Phase II, a disappointment. The following describes some of our successes and failures, and provides some criteria and recommendations for possible “next steps”

What Worked

- *Collections.* The project developed and demonstrated the collection, review, listing, and access tools for three topics within the area of seafood technology. The result is three web-searchable collections that will continue to be useful to the seafood industry and others.
- *Reporting.* Over the 5-year course of the project, we actively communicated its status and results. Reporting was in the form of a web-site featuring information and draft collections, articles in the industry press and in the *Journal of Extension*, letters/information sheets sent to our list of potential users, posters and presentations at three annual meetings of the Pacific Fisheries Technologists.
- *Visibility of Need.* Communiqués noted above served to raise visibility of the issues, highlighting the need among an audience of industry and other potential users.
- *Web as a Tool.* This project complemented others in showing and promoting the use of the Web as an effective information delivery tool.
- *Collaboration.* Creation of an information delivery system of this nature depends upon an effective collaboration among disciplines. This project provided a valuable experience for librarians and researchers to learn how effective collaboration can produce information tools.
- *Training.* The project supported the work and training of students and library assistants. Of particular note is graduate student Larry Schmidt whose Masters Project was focused on the initial collection. Advised by Co-PI Webster, his skills in information services, writing, oral presentations, and surveys were major contributions toward his degree of Masters of Library Science. He is now employed as Science Librarian at the University of Wyoming.
- *Copyright.* Creating accessible on-line collections assembled from a large number of sources raised important issues of copyright. Copyright is held by many of the indices, publishing companies, and organizations representing many of the information sources. The learning and resolution of these issues are valuable steps that will support future efforts.
- *Support.* The Principal Investigators received valuable support in salary and services required to undertake this project. For Ed Kolbe, these included Oregon Sea Grant, with some additional help from the Alaska and Washington programs and from the Coastal Oregon Marine Experiment Station; for Janet Webster, the Oregon State University Libraries.

What Didn't Work

- *Attraction of Funding.* Our fund-raising efforts netted little money, given the amount of time and energy expended. A few things learned (or re-learned):
 - Concentrate fund-raising efforts on large grants. All grants will require formal proposals, University input and approval, follow-up reports on progress and final results, records of spending details. Agencies awarding small grants (e.g. \$5,000) require as much and often more of this detail compared with those awarding larger grants (e.g. \$150,000). Two examples for us demonstrated excessive time and effort: a \$5,000 award from California Sea Grant, and a \$15,000 award from the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department.
 - Demonstrating Industry endorsement by means of communication is more “cost-effective” than by showing evidence of Industry funding. We attempted to get grants and gifts from the seafood industry primarily to show funding agencies that Industry was a partner. This required much time and effort, stimulated response from few organizations, and resulted in limited dollars. In our judgment, actual industry funding carried no more weight on the larger proposals than did attached letters of endorsement.
 - Submit a proposal only after it is clear that an agency is receptive. This might result from publication of a detailed “areas of interest” list, gaining action or assistance from political representatives, receiving positive personal signals from agency representatives.
 - Convince funding agencies that the project has a finite duration. We made the mistake of using the word “library” in many of the proposals seeking support of what was a finite and defined project. Despite positive attached letters and proposal reviews, at least two agencies regarded the project as an open-ended money-sink (“We don’t fund libraries”, said one). Proposals should stress first, that we would create a “digital collection” vs. “traditional library”. Second, creation of initial digital collections does not require indefinite staffing, funding, commitment. And finally, a “library” and staff are required only for housing the site; updating and other future changes would result from separate projects.
- *Identification of Needs.* Within the disparate community of users, we were unable to create a workable “needs assessment”. Without it, we could not convince ourselves of the clear importance and so were unable to convince others. As a result, the objectives remained somewhat fluid.
- *Engaging the User.* When we finally focused on “Industry” as the target audience, we failed to elicit much response from them concerning our developing collections. There was undoubtedly a spectrum of reasons. One possible problem was selection of “wastewater” as the initial demonstration. Such a topic may help

a processor to respond to pressures exerted by regulators, but it does not represent information or ideas that will enhance profits.

- *Clear Expectations.* For some users, we did not deliver the product expected. We must guess at the details, but the expected product was likely an on-screen scanned document resulting from a few of the user's keywords typed into a simple Web site. In some cases this does occur. In most, obtaining a copy of the report of interest requires additional steps.
- *Partners.* We failed to engage other partners who would share energy, outreach, assistance, and ownership. Potential partners might include another library, a Sea Grant program or specialist, or industry organizations such as the National Food Processors Association – Seafood Division.

What Criteria are Needed to Pursue Future Efforts

Given the lessons learned, we can list a few criteria that we consider essential to the future creation of web-searchable collections.

- *Identify a critical need.* Although a “critical need” for this information has been reinforced by many seafood technology colleagues, the level of need acknowledged by industry is difficult to measure. Realistically, Industry's expressed level of interest will never be high until the need is immediate. It may be that the research and outreach community will have to take the lead in gauging rationale and in the subsequent planning and implementation.
- *Identify the value to a major funding agency.* As noted above, proposals and project definition should avoid reference to “library support”. Highlight the distinct difference between *building* collections, the objective of the grant, and *maintaining* or augmenting collections. The latter describes a different mission, one that fits well with those of existing libraries or of dedicated long-term information specialists. Agencies that might fund such projects could range from federal programs (e.g. National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture), Industry foundations (e.g. Darden Foods Foundation), a consortium of regional state programs (e.g. Sea Grant)
- *Identify a “champion”.* Once created, collections would be “institutionalized” within library systems that may or may not choose to continue development and update. However, the early phases of creation and project development happen only through the efforts of one who will lead the way.
- *Identify an institutional home.* Continued access to the Web-based collections, the housing of important “gray” literature, and the possible expansion or update of lists must, in the end, be based within a stable organization. Besides providing continuity, such an organization must also have expertise, commitment, and a philosophy of service. A most likely example of this is a university library. Other examples might be a single state program (as the current California Sea Grant-supported Seafood Network Information Center), an established industry organization (as the National Food Processors Association, or the National Fisheries Institute), the National Sea Grant Depository in Rhode Island, an international body such as Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

What Next

We continue to sense an on-going need for access to published and unpublished information. Our study and project has focused on the area of seafood technology, demonstrating three collections searchable on the Web. But our academic positions give us a perspective of such information needs in many other areas of marine science. For example, Co-PI Webster, with Oregon Sea Grant and EPA support, created the “Yaquina Bay Bibliography”, a collection of research on the ecosystem of Yaquina Bay (Oregon) and its watershed (<http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/guin/yaqbib.htm>). Examples of information needs and opportunities are evident in countless other areas as well: shellfish production/genetics/diseases, seafood safety and regulations, gear development and by-catch reduction, coastal engineering, tsunami hazards, estuarine ecology, and so on. Such areas of interest are not confined to individual states, but have regional, if not international, impact.

Recommendation:

To address this need, we recommend creation of a Regional Extension Sea Grant Information Delivery Specialist. Such a permanent (or 5-year-trial) position might be funded by National Sea Grant or by a consortium of programs such as Alaska-Washington-Oregon-California. This full-time specialist and program, based at a regional university library, would create and maintain digital collections in a range of subject areas of interest and importance.

If created with adequate support, this position could also take over management of two existing and important information networks, both having uncertain futures. The first is the Seafood NIC and its electronic mailing list, housed at UC-Davis and funded largely by California Sea Grant. It is accessed internationally. The second is the “Heads Up” website, based at OSU and funded by a number of organizations, including regional Sea Grant programs. It provides timely information to the regional fishing industry.

Through library and Sea Grant contacts, the position would both enhance, and benefit from, existing library networks and services, regional Sea Grant Communications staff and programs, and developing international websites supporting seafood and marine science information.

Appendix A Original proposal and Project Definition.

<http://osulibrary.orst.edu/guin/seafood/collectionproj.html>

Appendix B Seafood Technology Information: where to look and how to get it.

<http://osulibrary.orst.edu/guin/seafood/guide.html>

Appendix C Some potential collections in jeopardy that might be targeted in future project phases. Note that most of these were identified at the beginning of this project (around 1998).

- Saltonstall Kennedy project reports. Kevin Ford (NMFS) has identified the 1983-1993 period as having the most concentration on Seafood Technology;
- National Marine Fisheries Service Montlake Lab Library. Former librarian Pat Cook has identified this collection to have unknown future access.
- OSU Seafoods Laboratory. Records and files date back to the Lab's founding around 1948;
- Institute of Marine Resources Seafood Lab. An historic collection of a now-closed institution, according to Norm Haard, UC Davis.
- Files and reports of BC Research, Vancouver. Although a private institution in its later years, it is now shut down, and these files are said to be accessible to the public. Contact names: Vulf Sternin, Denise DeLeebeeck, Yvonne Jones, Barb Rasco (to help resolve copyright issues)
- Private Collections:
 - Stewart Roach, Ret. (Issaquah, WA; former engineer with Canadian Govt. Labs and then with Marco, Seattle);
 - Don Kramer, Univ. of Alaska/Fairbanks
 - George Pigott, Ret. Univ. of Washington
 - Jerry Babbitt, NMFS/Kodiak
 - Harold Barnett, NMFS/Seattle
 - Ed Kolbe, OSU
 - Brian Paust (Ret, UAF)
 - John Halvor (referred by Paust)
 - Peter Howgate (Ret., Torrey)
 - Chas. Peckham (formerly with LMR Fisheries Research, San Diego)

DRAFT COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

January 8, 2000

SEAFOOD TECHNOLOGY COLLECTION

PURPOSE

The seafood industry, its research community, and management agencies need access to current information as well as past research. Both are problematic due to the demise of research and development laboratories, disappearing expertise, and discarded or lost documents. In the face of this marked reduction in effort and expertise, the information needs of the industry only increase. Leading the way are issues of food safety and the design of HACCP programs. Waste utilization, management of plant effluents, energy conservation and productivity, all represent increasing pressures. Needs relate to value-added process opportunities to address changing international markets and demand for quality, limitations in fish stocks, and development of underutilized species. Native village groups seek information to support their growing interests in seafood process development. The research community in universities and agencies experience similar needs in all of these same areas.

The process of building and managing this collection would generate various benefits: a transfer of technology, both current and past, to users in the industry; a resulting enhancement of industry's competitiveness; an involvement of industry, academic, and government partners; a wise use of marine resources, including the products of aquaculture; the mechanism, through user action and training sessions, to enable industry to influence Sea Grant and other university research and Extension priorities. This collection will potentially address some of the information needs of Pacific Northwest seafood technology researchers in academic, industry and government settings.

COLLECTION GUIDELINES

A. Language

English is the major language of the collection. Given the vitality of the seafood sector in the Pacific Rim, Asian language material should be considered. Spanish language material may also prove valuable. Translations are acceptable.

B. Chronological Guidelines

Initial emphasis will be on older material (pre-1980). Newer material is more accessible through existing indexes and catalogues.

C. Geographical Guidelines

Preference is given to the research conducted species and products of the Pacific Northwest including Alaska and Canada. Other geographic areas are included as they relate to Pacific Northwest species and issues.

D. Audience

Seafood researchers in academic, industry and government laboratories are the primary audiences. Additional audiences include industry product and quality assurance managers, marketers, engineers, suppliers, Extension educators, students, government regulators, and technology transfer agents. The general public may have some interest in seafood safety and consumer information as related to seafood technology. The library would concentrate services on users in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

E. Type of Material

Seafood technology research is generally published in reports or journal articles. Occasionally, it will be collected in monographs. Much of the primary material is gray literature -- either unpublished or minimally distributed. Consequently, emphasis is put on identifying and collecting the gray literature. Proceedings, industry and government reports are valuable.

A core collection of the mainstream journals, monographs and reference works forms the critical foundation. Some popular materials may be collected, especially in the area of seafood safety.

F. Subjects Covered

Primary focus will be on materials relating to seafood technology and engineering in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. This includes seafood safety, preservation and shipping, value-added processing, waste utilization and management.

The collection would not include the following areas in its initial focus: fisheries biology; fisheries management and stock assessment; fishing gear/harvesting methodologies; aquaculture production.

G. Other Related Resources and Collections

Existing core collections are housed at the Oregon State University, University of Washington, University of California at Davis, and the University of British Columbia. Regional and unique material are housed, but not actively collected, by these same libraries as well as the National Marine Fisheries Service Library/Montlake, and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Library/Halifax. Currently, inaccessible or difficult to access resources include publications of the Vancouver Seafood Technology Lab of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, BC Research/Fisheries Technology Division, and the Saltonstall-Kennedy Program. The Sea Grant Depository at the University of Rhode Island maintains a strong collection of Sea Grant publications.

Appendix E Handbook

<http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/guin/seafood/Handbook.pdf>