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Original Record:

http://oasis.oregonstate.edu/search/t?SEARCH=Air+drying+of+lumber&SUBMIT=Search

TEI Header:

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<TEI xml:lang="en" xmlns=http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0 xmlns:rng="http://relaxng.org/ns/structure/1.0">
<teiHeader>
    <fileDesc>
        <titleStmt>
            <title>Air Drying of Lumber</title>
            <author>Rietz, Raymond C.</author>
            <resp>author of 1971 ed.</resp>
            <author>Page, Rufus H.</author>
            <resp>author of 1971 ed.</resp>
            <name>Peck, Edward C.</name>
            <resp>major contributor to 1971 ed.</resp>
            <name>Tschernitz, John L.</name>
            <resp>involved in 1999 ed revision</resp>
            <name>Simpson, William T.</name>
            <resp>involved in 1999 ed revision</resp>
            <name>Fuller, James J.</name>
            <resp>involved in 1999 ed revision</resp>
            <sponsor>U.S. Dept. of Agriculture</sponsor>
            <sponsor>USDA</sponsor>
            <sponsor>Forest Service</sponsor>
            <sponsor>Forest Products Laboratory</sponsor>
            <respStmt>
                <resp>TEI markup</resp>
                <name>April Younglove, Emporia University</name>
            </respStmt>
        </titleStmt>
    </fileDesc>
</teiHeader>

This report describes how lumber can be air-dried most effectively under outdoor conditions and illustrates the principles and procedures of air-drying lumber that were developed through field investigations and observations of industrial practices. Particular emphasis is placed on the yarding of lumber in unit packages. Included are topics such as why lumber is dried, advantages and limitations of the drying process, properties of wood in relation to drying, layout of the drying yard, piling methods, causes and remedies of air-drying defects, and protection of air-dried lumber.
<profileDesc>
  <textclass>
    <keywords>
      <term>drying lumber</term>
      <term>air dry</term>
      <term>wood structure</term>
      <term>wood shrinkage</term>
      <term>drying rate</term>
      <term>wood defects</term>
    </keywords>
  </textclass>
  <keywords scheme="LCSH">
    <term>Lumber -- Drying</term>
    <term>Wood – Moisture</term>
  </keywords>
</profileDesc>

DC Record:

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<rdf:RDF xmlns:rdf="http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#"
  xmlns:dc="http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/
  xmlns:dcterms="http://purl.org/dc/terms/">
  <rdf:Description>
    <dc:title>Air drying of lumber</dc:title>
    <dc:creator>Forest Products Laboratory (U.S.)</dc:creator>
    <dc:subject>Lumber – Drying</dc:subject>
    <dc:subject>Wood – Moisture</dc:subject>
    <dc:description>
      <dcterms:abstract>This report describes how lumber can be air-dried most effectively under outdoor conditions and illustrates the principles and procedures of air-drying lumber that were developed through field investigations and observations of industrial practices. Particular emphasis is placed on the yarding of lumber in unit packages. Included are topics such as why lumber is dried, advantages and limitations of the drying process, properties of wood in relation to drying, layout of the drying yard, piling methods, causes and remedies of air-drying defects, and protection of air-dried lumber. </dcterms:abstract>
    </dc:description>
    <dc:publisher>U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory</dc:publisher>
  </rdf:Description>
</rdf:RDF>
Explanation of mapping to Dublin Core:
I tried to closely follow the Dublin Core Metadata Best Practices from the from the CDP Metadata Working Group (http://www.cdpheritage.org/cdp/documents/CDPDCMBP.pdf) using LCSH subject and authority headings. I followed recommendations for best practice for punctuation and capitalization as well. For instance, I left in the dash but not the period in LCSH headings because the CDP example did the same. The CDP Metadata Working Group lists the following fields as mandatory: Title, Creator (if available), Subject, Description, Date Original, Date Digital, Format, Digitization Specifications, Resource Identifier, Rights Management. Therefore, I included all of those fields and tried to fill them out as completely as possible. I also included as many of the recommended fields as I could.

I left out publisher, relation and coverage because I am unclear on how to address these fields given the imaginary nature of this assignment. That is, I pretended to be scanning the document for my Emporia class in SGML format, but in actual fact I did not. Therefore, these fields might be filled out differently depending on if I had scanned a printed out version of a PDF from OSU or if I scanned directly from a government pamphlet. Finally, I could have included the table of contents as a qualifier to the description field, but in the end decided not to because the transcription was becoming too time consuming and I did not have a clear URL link to that exact page.
There are, of course, a huge number of fields that could have been included or repeated and some fields that I did include which may not be useful for everyone. In some sense, there is no such thing as a totally complete record, or a record that will serve everyone’s purposes. For this assignment, I chose to use the CDP standards both because it provided a structure for me to work within and because their best practices relied on known standards such as LC, which are widely recognized and are therefore will help me generate data that is more likely to transfer between formats.