LETTER FROM THE CHAIRPERSON:

I want to thank all of the members that came to the business meeting last summer in Minneapolis. Another thanks should go to Cheryl Nyberg who did an outstanding job last year as Chairperson and who continues to be a tremendous help to me as her successor. Thanks should also go to Marsh Baum for the fine job she did as Secretary/Treasurer last year. David Batista should be commended for the work he did in revamping JURISDOCS. He will continue this year as editor with the assistance of Cheryl Nyberg. Lastly, the coordinators of the programs last summer - Marsha Baum, Bill Walker, and Susan Tulis should be thanked for all the work they put into the programs.

Several new additions to the State Bibliography Series were completed last summer:

- Cammarata - Kentucky State Publications: A Guide for Law Librarians
- Herbert - Louisiana Legal Documents and Related Publications
- Jordan - Bibliography of Selected Legal and Law Related Montana Documents
- Scerest - Iowa Legal Documents Bibliography
- Stemple - West Virginia Legal Bibliography

These bibliographies are currently working their way through the Publication Committee and will be available soon in the AALL Occasional Papers.

There are more bibliographies that should be completed for next summer. Two bibliographies are being updated: California and Missouri. Two new additions to the series one on Georgia and one on Ontario are in process. The bibliographies for Florida and Utah should be done by next convention also. There are still states that have not been done or that need updating - a list appeared in the last AALL Newsletter. If you are interested in working on a state bibliography please contact me.

I also need names of members who would like to serve on the Publication Committee. This committee would help develop ideas for new publications that GD/SIS could start. They would also help coordinate the current publications projects.

Susan Dow, Vice-Chair/Chair Elect, submitted four excellent program ideas for the New Orleans convention;

---
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The Program Committee accepted one of these programs for the New Orleans convention (Foreign Relations...). Now is the time to start thinking about the San Francisco Convention. If you have any ideas or would like to be a member of the Program Committee for next year please let me know.

Lastly, I would like to ask for volunteers to help on the newsletter committee. This committee would help Cheryl and David with the big job of putting out JURISDOCS. This committee, among other things, would help solicit ideas and materials for the newsletter. If you would like to be on this committee please submit your name to me.

FROM THE EDITORS:

Well, there are going to be two of us in this column now; Cheryl Nyberg (Past Chair) has agreed to officially join me in co-editorship. I know this will make the newsletter stronger and may actually help insure that deadlines are met on a timely basis (well, I can dream can’t I?).

Please notice that I have switched schools (see addresses at end of newsletter).

I have also acquired a new piece of equipment, a scanner. With this scanner peoples photographs could be added to their columns, the covers of books could be reproduced when their reviews are published, or (insert your ideas here). David

We are looking for a few good men and women to prepare columns on state documents, international and foreign documents, disappearing and fugitive federal documents, and electronic and CD-ROM government information products and services. Of course, we are also interested in other articles, bibliographies, opinion pieces, and reviews. If you feel that JURISDOCS fails to adequately reflect your interests and concerns, here is your opportunity to change the situation.

Please contact David at Rutgers-Camden (609-757-6469) or Cheryl at the University of Illinois (217-244-3044) to volunteer. For added inducement, we should mention that JURISDOCS is now being distributed to selected people outside of the Association, including the Public Printer, the Chair of ALA/GODORT, the editor of Documents to the People, and randomly chosen dentist waiting rooms.

To contribute to JURISDOCS, send your article to either David or Cheryl. Articles may be submitted in paper form (double-spaced please) and/or on a floppy disk (easiest for us). If you send a floppy disk it must be in one of two formats: 800K, 3.5 inch Macintosh disk in Word (4.0 or lower), McWrite, or McWrite II, or 3.5 (3.5 inch DOS preferred by Cheryl) or 5.25 inch double-sided double-density DOS disk in Word Perfect. Deadlines for this volume: May 3, 1991 (for issue number 2, which will include a summary of the Spring Depository Library Council Meeting) and June 26, 1991 (for issue number 3, the pre-convention issue).

It has been mentioned that the logo used last year on the first page of the newsletter does not truly reflect the broad interests of the SIS (i.e. state and international, as well as federal documents) since it is derived from the federal depository logo. So we are going to have a design-a-logo contest. The rules and the prizes (YES! PRIZES!!!) will be announced in the next issue, so start designing.
MINUTES OF THE GD/SIS BUSINESS MEETING

The Government Documents SIS Business Meeting was convened by Cheryl Nyberg over dinner on June 19, 1990.

Old Business

Following the approval of the minutes from the 1989 business meeting, the following reports were made.

1. Treasurer's report - Marsha Baum

Opening balance (6/30/89) $7097.22
Income $3357.92
Expenses paid through 5/31/90 ($1771.95)

Closing balance (5/31/90) $8683.19
Estimated outstanding expenses ($2017.92)
Estimated funds available $6665.27

2. JURISDOCS report - David Batista, editor

JURISDOCS got a new look this year with the printing of the latest issue. Articles and other contributions are needed for next year. AALL Headquarters has decided to centralize production and distribution of newsletters in 1991. The SIS will retain editorial control over frequency, content, etc., but will lose control over the timing of production schedules. The centralization is intended to make better use of professional staff and provide for more efficiency in publication and to allow AALL to make universal subscriptions to SIS newsletters available. Universal SIS newsletter subscriptions will have an effect on SIS memberships and dues.

3. Report on State Bibliography Series - Cheryl Nyberg

Six bibliographies were prepared for the 1990 meeting. Cheryl thanked all of the compilers for their efforts. There is a concern over the transfer of the state bibliographies to the AALL Occasional Papers Series because of the length of time taken for review by the AALL Publications Committee. (The Kentucky state bibliography was held up in the Publication Committee for six months.) Because these bibliographies do contribute to the SIS treasury balance, the delays can have a negative impact on the SIS.

4. Report from Depository Library Council - Sally Holterhoff, representative

Sally explained how DLC works and discussed the major topics covered at this year's meetings, including the electronic dissemination of information and cost sharing for online services. Another topic was the Congressional Record for which the CD-ROM for 1985 is still in progress. Sending letters about individual publications which are discontinued or which are targeted for cancellation (e.g., Department of State Bulletin and FBI Uniform Crime Reports) seems to have an effect; the Department of State is working on a replacement for the Bulletin [Editor's Note: Replacing the Bulletin is the Dispatch (S 1.3/5), which depositories are now receiving.] and the Uniform Crime Reports are not being discontinued. Also, all depository libraries will receive guidelines from the Joint Committee on Printing and GPO stating what information will be provided on CD-ROM and machine readable formats. The electronic transmission of Supreme Court decisions is ready to begin [Editor's Note: See Project Hermes, this issue, p. 22]. Libraries with access to BITNET (the majority of people at the SIS meeting) will be able to access the decisions. Sally announced that this is her last year on the Depository Library Council, with her term ending September 1990.

5. Report from ALA/GODORT - Susan Tulis, representative

GODORT activities have been directed at making the Public Printer and federal agencies aware of what librarians want. GODORT has started an "Adopt an Agency" program. Concerns about fugitive docu-
ments and electronic formats are being addressed by GODORT. The bill to amend 44 U.S.C. did not include electronic format.

6. Report from AALL Government Relations Committee - Bruce Kennedy, chair
   The Committee has worked with ARL and SLA and is starting to work with ALA. Library concerns were explained to Congress in testimony by Cheryl Nyberg. A four page summary of issues is available from Bruce. Sally Holterhoff is the new chair of the Government Relations Committee. The GD/SIS needs to be involved with the Committee and ensure that issues of concern to the SIS are addressed.

   The goal of the Washington representatives is to create a Washington presence for AALL and to develop relations with federal agencies. The charge for the representatives was expanded at the 1990 AALL meeting and a governmental relations policy has been developed. Bob Oakley from Georgetown has been involved in developing relations. The representatives want to ensure that there is continued dialogue with the membership. FAX numbers to contact Joanne Zich (202-885-2703) and Bob Oakley (202-662-9202) were provided.

3. Mary Shearer reported that she and Gayle Webb are indexing the first twelve volumes of JURISDOCS [Editor's Note: Due to Gayle Webb's withdrawal from the index project, completion of the index has been delayed. Faye Couture is now working with Mary and they hope to complete the index by July, 1991.]. They would like suggestions on indexing software. They plan to complete the index, which will be published as a special issue of JURISDOCS, by the end of 1990.

4. GD/SIS member survey - Marsha Baum reported that the response rate was very low for the survey. Only 47 of 470 members returned a completed survey. In response to the question of spending SIS funds, respondents largely favored providing travel grants to SIS members to attend documents related conferences, meetings, programs, and workshops (39 out of 47). Other types of grants were acceptable to 11 out of 47 (24%), with various types of projects such as research and creation of state bibliographies listed. Travel funds to SIS members to attend only specific meetings, programs, etc. was acceptable to 5 respondents. Only 3 respondents were in favor of providing travel grants to any AALL member. Many responses stated that specific guidelines and criteria were needed.

5. Proposal to establish a grants program - following the report on the members survey, Cheryl Nyberg explained that the AALL Executive Board has considered sending all SIS dues received to the SIS's. This would increase the amount in the SIS accounts. Cheryl prepared the survey to determine the views of the SIS members on appropriate uses for the funds and to determine if a committee to award funds should be established. After discussion by the members of the possible uses for SIS funds, a resolution to establish a travel program having specific criteria to provide funds for members of the SIS to travel to documents related programs was passed.

New Business

1. Report of the Nominations Committee - Sharon Blackburn
   With a return rate of 54% (253 of 468 ballots were returned), the following officers were elected: Susan Dow, Vice Chair/Chair Elect; David McFadden, Secretary/Treasurer. The suggestion was made to send ballots without return envelopes next year because of the low return rate. The motion to destroy the ballots was seconded and passed.

2. 1991 AALL Convention theme is “Building Bridges”. Program suggestions should be sent to Susan Dow before the August 1st deadline for submissions of programs.
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6. A column profiling SIS members in the **AALL Newsletter** is being started. Sally Holterhoff suggested Em House, who was instrumental in starting the SIS.

7. Responsibility for work on the Strategic Plan for AALL was passed to Mary Ann Nelson. The areas of GD/SIS responsibility in the Strategic Plan were noted. The target date is 1992/93. Cheryl Nyberg asked all members to review the entire Strategic Planning document to consider areas in which the GD/SIS can contribute.

8. Proposal to establish standing committees - Cheryl Nyberg proposed the establishment of three standing committees. Standing committees can be established by the membership at the annual meeting. After discussion, the following motions were made and adopted: 1) The SIS shall establish a Program Committee with members having overlapping terms of office and from various types of libraries and documents collections. 2) The SIS shall establish a Publications Committee to assist the editor(s) of **JURISDOCS** and to assist the Chair of the SIS in oversight of the State Bibliographies Series and other projects as they arise. 3) The SIS shall establish a Government Relations Committee to work with the AALL Government Relations Committee (AALL GRC) to communicate issues that the AALL GRC should follow and to provide the AALL GRC with information.

9. David McFadden asked for suggestions for the committee on the superseded list.

10. Sharon Blackburn suggested that a clearinghouse of collection development policies be started.

11. Joanne Zich reported that the Library of Congress Law Library has not been providing publications to GPO. The problem is not limited to the Law Library of Congress; for example, CRS publications, by law, can not be disseminated. The problem was given to Mary Ann Nelson for action.

12. Bob Oakley reported that the opinions of the U.S. Supreme Court have been successfully transmitted to ten sites.

13. Sally Holterhoff invited any interested persons to stay after the meeting to discuss cataloging documents and the problem of GPO's backlog and cataloging after distribution.

**Installation of New Officers**

The meeting was turned over to the new Chair, Mary Ann Nelson. Mary Ann discussed her plans for the coming year and her desire to expand the coverage of the SIS in the areas of state and international documents.

Respectfully submitted,
Marsha L. Baum

---

**REAUTHORIZING THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT**

by Bruce M. Kennedy, Edward Bennett Williams Library, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C. (Adapted from his presentation at the 1990 Legislative Update program.)

The AALL Government Relations Committee was inaugurated to national politics with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). Ironically, no issue demanded more of the Committee's paper and ink. To condense this saga into manageable proportions I propose to sketch the stake of the library community in the PRA and then outline the evolution of the legislative proposals now before Congress.

The Stakes.

The first PRA statute was signed by President Carter in 1980 for the noble purpose of reducing the mass of paper that citizens and businesses must file with federal agencies. Unfortunately the Reagan Administration put the law to ignoble ends. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
used the PRA to curtail the flow of federal information to citizens by promoting private-sector dissemination of government information. This privatization outraged the library community.

The PRA was crafted in a manner that requires periodic reauthorization by Congress. It was renewed and amended in 1984 and 1986 and again came up for renewal on September 30, 1989. This deadline passed with a wimper. The latest reauthorization cycle involves three new dimensions which make a daunting process even more challenging.

First, Congress is now aware of the need for a conscious and comprehensive federal information policy for executive agencies. Consequently the PRA is an effort to transmute a simple paperwork reduction law into a comprehensive information management policy. That policy would regulate the entire "life cycle" of information held by federal agencies, including information collection, compilation, storage, dissemination, archiving and destruction.

Second, electronic information technology has created a wealth of business opportunities. Electronic publishers view government information dissemination as a brave, new, and above all, lucrative world. Their lobbyists, notably the Information Industry Association, have worked untiringly to recast federal law to lay a foundation for a supportive business environment. That environment would promote competition among commercial publishers but limit government publishing which might pre-empt business opportunities. Part of their vision is to acknowledge - in the PRA itself - the role of the private publisher in the dissemination of government information. Such statutory recognition is unprecedented.

Finally, this reauthorization effort is different because the library community is actively involved in the political process. The activism of library organizations is understandable; not only because of the prior bad acts of the OMB, but also because an expanded PRA would impose a new layer of regulation between providers and users of federal information.

Four library associations actively worked on the PRA: the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), the American Library Association (ALA), the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), and the Special Libraries Association (SLA). These groups share a belief that the PRA should advance four broad policies.

1) The American public has a right to ready and equitable access to government information which is prepared at taxpayer expense.

2) The Federal government should bear primary responsibility for disseminating government information to the public. Private publishers - who are under no statutory duty to disseminate government information - play an important, but decidedly secondary role, in the dissemination process.

3) Primary responsibility for dissemination of government information should rest with Federal agencies and not with OMB. OMB should play a supportive role in coordinating agency efforts to maximize the availability of government information to the public. Congress, in turn, should oversee OMB and agency dissemination practices.

4) Finally, agencies should be required to convey information in all formats to Federal Depository Libraries.

In a nutshell, a triad of values converge on the PRA debate: public access to government information, market competition, and governmental efficiency. Differing admixtures of these values color the various PRA bills now before Congress.

II The Legislative Drama.

Like the PRA to a drama - an absurdist drama in four acts. The acts overlap in time sequence and meander to no satisfying finale.
Entitle Act I: Negotiation. Two months before the PRA authorization was scheduled to expire, the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on paperwork reduction and federal information policy questions. An ALA witness delivered testimony which was jointly supported by the AALL, the ARL, and the SLA.

In the wake of these hearings, Mr. Robert Gellman, a staffer attached to the Government Operations Committee, convened a series of 'working group' meetings to hash out compromise bill language for the dissemination section of the PRA. On the working group were two library representatives (from ALA and ARL), two 'public interest representatives (from the American Civil Liberties Union and the Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility) and two 'industry' representatives from the Information Industry Association (IIA). The working group met three times and during the negotiations, interested parties (including AALL representatives) analyzed nearly a dozen bill drafts.

Dissatisfied with the results of the working group, the library community wrote its own dissemination provisions for the PRA. All four library groups began this process but ALA dropped out and the proposed draft was eventually approved by AALL, ARL and SLA. This language was shopped around to non-library public interest groups, Congressional staffers, and, finally, the IIA. In all, the proposal went through approximately fifteen editions.

After several negotiation sessions with IIA, it became clear that no compromise would be reached. Nevertheless, the AALL/ARL/SLA bill language was submitted to Mr. Gellman and some of the underlying ideas found their way into the House PRA bill.

Entitle Act II "Bills Hit the Hopper". To date, three PRA bills have been introduced. The working group negotiations eventually resulted in the introduction of a bipartisan bill, H.R. 3695, sponsored by Representatives John Conyers (D-MI), and Frank Horton (R-NY). Accompanying H.R. 3695 was a "side agreement" signed by Representative Conyers and OMB Director Richard Darman. This side agreement defines procedures for OMB's review of regulations proposed by federal agencies. While this "regulatory review" issue is not directly linked to information dissemination, it addresses a part of the PRA which has long been a source of conflict between the executive and legislative branches.

On the Senate side, two bills have been introduced. One, S. 1742, sponsored by Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) is similar to the House bill in its intention to manage federal agency information from a 'life-cycle' perspective. The other bill, S. 2291, sponsored by Senator Roth (D-Del), is a minimalist measure. It merely reauthorizes the PRA with a budget increase for OMB.

H.R. 3695 and S. 1742 are long, complex, and subtly different. A detailed comparison of the bills would defeat this attempt to survey the PRA. That wider survey is better served by a summary description of H.R. 3695 - the bill which AALL invested most of its time and energy - with only strategic comparisons to S. 1742.

H.R. 3695 contains many positive features which will limit OMB's capacity to privatize government publishing. The bill is structured so that OMB shall deliver "guidance" to federal agencies. OMB guidance shall promote certain dissemination goals including:

* providing equal access to public government information,
* disseminating government information on an equitable basis and in a manner useful to the public, and
* encouraging a diversity of public and private providers of public government information.
OMB guidance is also authorized to assure agency compliance with a filigree of required, permitted, and prohibited acts. For example:

* agencies are required to disseminate information in electronic formats “when practicable” with “available” software,

* agencies must make publications available to depository libraries to the extent required by federal law,

* agencies must provide public notice before they initiate, terminate, or significantly modify a publication,

* agencies may waive user fees normally charged for dissemination of a publication,

* agencies may not enter into restrictive distribution agreements or arrangements that impair equal access to government information, nor can agencies exact royalties for the resale of public information, and

* agencies may not charge a user more than the “marginal cost” incurred to disseminate an information product but no similar requirement applies to electronic information services.

Notwithstanding these positive aspects, H.R. 3695 has two major drawbacks. First, because OMB has budgetary authority over agencies, OMB “guidance” will have a mandatory tone. Consequently the bill still would give OMB tremendous power over information dissemination. AALL would rather see some of this authority flow directly from Congress to federal agencies so that a “balance of power” situation is created between OMB and the agencies.

A second and more serious problem concerns a provision in the bill which is popularly known as the ‘checklist’. Before a federal agency can disseminate its own information product or service, the agency must “consider” a checklist of factors. One such factor is whether there is an existing product or service from a public or private source which is “equivalent” to the agency’s information product or service and which reasonably achieves the dissemination objectives of the agency. The library community fears that OMB and budget-starved agencies will seize upon this factor to cease publishing when a private sector product or service appears in the market-place.

Although S. 1742, is different, it too contains the same “checklist” provision and would also concentrate tremendous power in OMB. For these reasons, AALL has taken the position that it can support neither bill.

Abruptly the curtain raises on Act III: Breakdown. The PRA bills have been buffeted by all three branches of government. On the eve of the hearings on S. 1742, the Supreme Court decided Dole v. Steelworkers, which narrowly construed OMB’s statutory authority under the current PRA to veto a set of OSHA right-to-know regulations. In the wake of this decision, the sponsors of the S. 1742 pondered if amendments to the bill were needed to cure defects in the existing statute. In the final analysis, Dole had little effect on the bill.

A much greater thunderbolt came from the executive branch when the Bush Administration announced that it would not honor the side agreement that it signed with Representative Conyers. While this agreement did not address information dissemination, its loss destroyed an essential part of H.R. 3695. Effectively, the Administration has delivered a pre-veto on the House bill. The change in Administration policy has also clouded the future of S. 1742. In a pair of letters from OMB Director Darman to Senator John Glenn, the Administration has indicated that unless basic features of the Senate bill are changed a veto will be forthcoming.

Within Congress itself, S. 1742 sus-
tained a minor setback when its sponsor, Senator Bingaman, moved from the Committee controlling the bill to another committee assignment. This slowed, but did not stop, the bill.

Now Act IV is entitled "Damage Control". Two schemes are afoot to salvage parts of the House and Senate PRA bills. On the House side, Mr. Gellman is attempting to sever the information dissemination portion of H.R. 3695 and append it to another bill as a rider.

In the Senate, after three postponements, S. 1742 has been marked up in Committee with only nominal changes to the dissemination portion. Some staffers hope that the House and Senate will pass differing versions of the bill to trigger a conference committee. At the conference stage, Bush Administration advisors would be informally consulted and an inter-branch deal would be struck to clear the way for passage of a bill unclouded by a veto threat. This is where matters stand as Congress disperses for its August recess.

So the play is yet unfinished but clearly must end. Like a budget bill, the PRA is fundamental legislation and must be reauthorized in some form. Nevertheless Congress may not be able to pass a PRA bill which creates a comprehensive federal information management policy. Desperate legislators may enact the minimalist bill, S. 2291, which merely extends the term of the current law. Should this happen, one should turn to Shakespeare for the closing lines of this play. The 1990 PRA debate may be merely a tale "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

FALL 1990 DEPOSITORY
LIBRARY COUNCIL
MEETING

Despite the continual threats of the government closing down, the Fall 1990 Depository Library Council (DLC) meeting took place in Arlington, Virginia on October 24-26, 1990. This meeting had the highest attendance rate on record - over 350 people attended. Quite an accomplishment these days since many libraries have cut their travel budgets. Many people paid out of their own pockets to attend.

Mr. Robert Houk, Public Printer, began the meeting by presenting the Distinguished Service Award to Ridley Kessler, past DLC Chair. The award consists of a certificate of appreciation and a gold medal for all his hard work and dedication. An honor appropriately bestowed. The freshmen members of the Council were introduced. They are: Gary Cornwell, University of Florida; Sandy Morton, Special Libraries Association; Robert Oakley, Georgetown University Law Library; Susan Tulis, University of Virginia Law Library; and Mark Vonderhaar, Congressional Information Service, Inc.

After introducing the new members, Mr. Houk went on to tell Council that in addition to input on procedures, he would like more input on policy issues/framework, especially in these times of fiscal constraints and electronic dissemination of information. He raised a number of questions for our consideration. Where is the Depository Library Program (DLP) going? How are we going to get there? Does the program need to be restructured? If so, how? What electronic products should be in the DLP, under what conditions and at what costs? How can the DLP best serve the needs of the American public? No single answer has emerged and none are on the horizon. Mr. Houk is taking steps to insure that the appropriate members of Congress understand GPO's stand on electronic information. He has recently informed the JCP of GPO's strategic plan. Mr. Houk would like our advice on how to coordinate the effort to move ahead, define the future, and set a course of action. He pledges continued support for library access to government information and will see that the government resources are applied effectively and efficiently. It is up to us to draw on
our deepest reserves of thought and creativity to assist him in his mission.

Mr. Barnett’s report on the legislative front was short and sweet - although there was activity on both Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) and the Bates bill (H.R. 3849) since the Spring Council meeting, nothing passed and Congress has now recessed. Look for more reports next year.

Bonnie Trizas followed Mr. Houk’s theme when giving the Library Programs Service (LPS) update. She stressed the need to start working on a decision making framework. It must be rigorous and specific enough to provide guidance, but general enough to accommodate new situations. To what degree is consensus possible? How do we gather input? Meetings? Forums? What is the role of the Council in gathering information? LPS is always under pressure to make decisions, usually on an ad hoc basis and not always in context. We need to start looking in terms of the larger overall picture. The responses to the Spring 1990 recommendations reflect this attitude. LPS just completed an inventory of currently performed activities in the hope of showing improvements in present activities and to try to come up with new activities. GPO has always maintained that format isn’t a barrier to inclusion in the DLP, but choices still have to be made. They still won’t be able to do everything. How should LPS approach these situations? Bonnie suggested some categories for online systems: A) was the information previously in the system in paper, but is now only available online, B) does the system contain information never before available in paper, and C) does the online duplicate the paper version currently in the DLP. Should one category be given more priority over another? Should electronic formats replace paper formats, substitute, be in addition to paper, or what? Should libraries receive two formats or three formats? And on top of all of this there are the cost questions. Limited resources make all decisions tough. Ms. Trizas would also like to see more depth of thought in our decisions with two levels of consideration: 1) is this an appropriate, good, and necessary thing to do? 2) if so, are there resources available? If there are no resources, the outcome is the same, but someday there may be resources. We need to determine what are the good things to do and Bonnie is willing to work really hard at this. Her final thought for us was that last year 130 people in LPS distributed 24 million publications, inspected 270 libraries, and cataloged 28,000 publications.

The Depository Services Report was given by Joe McClane and updated us on the information found in the conference issue of Administrative Notes. Roger Haley, Senate Librarian, had asked that a survey be done about the need for the listing of Senate Hearings and Prints. 23% of the libraries responded, with 90% saying it was not essential and 7-8% saying very essential. As a result the Senate Library will discontinue compiling this list. The ten year cumulative index to Administrative Notes will be distributed to libraries on a floppy disk (90-003-E), in ASCII format, as a test. No decision has been made yet on a paper version. Since the FAX claims for Regionals test was such a success, this capability will be opened up to selectives as well. Regionals will still have priority when it comes to filling claims. A new FAX number will be announced for FAXing in your inquiry forms. The 1991 Biennial Survey will use machine scanable forms for your answers. There will also be a form for the director of the library to sign which says that the figures given are the best available to his/her knowledge. Joe is still working on coming up with a cost survey - to determine how much libraries actually spend by being depositories. LPS will be moving ahead with an electronic bulletin board, since they have the equipment for Project Hermes. The present plan is to start with Regionals having access to Project Hermes, put Administrative Notes on the
bulletin board and proceed from there.

Gil Baldwin gave the Cataloging Update. GPO has finally increased their staff to 23 catalogers. Starting in June, cataloging productivity increased significantly over previous years. He expects 1991 to be the most productive on record, but it does not mean that the cataloging backlog will disappear. As the acquisition backlog is decreasing, it means an increase in the cataloging backlog. The abridged cataloging effort got underway in June and 2000 records appeared in the September Monthly Catalog. The 1986-1990 cumulative index to the Monthly Catalog is due out in 1991, in microfiche only.

The Information Technology Program (ITP) update was given by new Manager, Jane Bartlett. Three of the five pilot projects are implemented. The Congressional Record CD-ROM should go to depositories in November 1990, and the DOE pilot has a February 1, 1991, start date. Jane went on to propose some new directions for ITP. ITP's original mission was to design, test, and evaluate the pilot projects. But ITP took on a much larger role as it became responsible for many of the related issues of new information technology since no other mechanism existed within GPO. Special procedures had to be created to deal with the electronic information systems on a case-by-case basis. Jane received requests from librarians asking her to obtain fugitive electronic products, provide training to librarians, impose standards on agencies, and resolve federal information policy issues. Quite a task! Jane sees three things happening in the near future: 1) she will be a more active participant in helping to develop the framework that Bonnie spoke of, 2) establishment of a criteria for the acquisition of offline electronic products, and 3) more reliance on networking with contacts in the agencies and encouraging librarians to continue to notify GPO about existence of new electronic products. Jane has already taken steps to help normalize things at ITP - the electronic stock has been moved to the same building as the paper and fiche, claims procedures have been set up, the "E" shipping lists have been developed, and new materials will be surveyed along with paper and microfiche, not on special surveys. Jane also plans to revive the "Electronic Corner" column in Administrative Notes and welcomes contributions from us.

Along these lines, after Council adjourned on Wednesday, Jane Bartlett moderated a LPS/Depository Library brainstorming session on electronic technology acquisitions issues. The purpose of the session was to identify and discuss some of the mechanical issues surrounding the acquisition and dissemination of government publications in electronic format. Feedback from the librarians at this meeting would help LPS develop guidelines for future operations. Real life scenarios were presented, five minutes of discussion was allowed and then a show of hands was taken to decide how to proceed. The issues were as follows:

1. Distribution of data in electronic format without providing access software.
2. Distribution of CD-ROMs or floppy disks without paper documentation.
3. Item count needed immediately but no survey data exists.
4. Paper documentation but not the electronic file provided to LPS for dissemination.
5. Public domain software exists but is not distributed by LPS.
7. An electronic file available in multiple formats - e.g. floppy disk, microfiche, CD-ROM.
9. Shareware on CD-ROM.
10. Items in electronic "package" available for distribution at different times.
Robert Cox and Meredith Arneson spoke on GPO Requisitions. Mr. Cox is responsible for handling the customer agencies in Washington, D.C.; Meredith Arneson handles the regional printing procurement offices. Both agree that constant education about the depository library program is needed due to the turnover rate in their agencies’ staffs. LPS item numbers and quantities are now being put into their system and it is hoped that this will help with the shortage problems. Another activity that might help is the combining of forms 3868 and SF 1.

Rick Oleszewski, Joint Committee on Printing (JCP), announced that depository libraries should get the Congressional Record on CD-ROM in mid-November. It will consist of two disks, an operator’s manual and software. Nothing is set in stone, but he expects the CD-ROM to supplant the microfiche version and possibly the paper version. It is also possible that the index volumes in paper may fade as the CD-ROM gains acceptance. In terms of the DOE pilot, JCP felt there should be some level of telecommunications support during the pilot, so that libraries shouldn’t have to pay for debugging and training time. Rick also told us not to expect this telecommunications support down the road. This is not to say that our Congressmen can’t be convinced to support such a program. He mentioned that JCP has contacted the Administrator of the EPA about EPA technical reports not getting into the DLP. The next edition of the Directory of Depository Libraries will be reformatted and streamlined, but will not include E-mail addresses. A question was raised during this discussion about passing on telecommunication costs to our users. The answer given was confusing, not satisfactory, and possibility incorrect. As a result, recommendation 12 was written.

The 1990 Decennial Census Update on Thursday gave us an overview of the various products we can expect to see coming out of the Census Bureau. Census is not putting everything on CD-ROM, but there will be things that we have never seen before in that format. For the 1990 Census, the Public Law 94-171 Counts File, and STFs 1A, 1B (extract), 1C, 3A, 3B, and 3C are available on CD-ROM. These products will utilize an open architecture format which allows the data to be used with a variety of software packages. Retrieval software will probably not come with the CD-ROM disks. It is possible to obtain some software from the Census Bulletin Board (317-763-1580). The best summary of what products will be available and when is in 1990 Census of Population and Housing Tabulation and Publication Program, available free from Customer Services, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233 (301-763-4100). CENDATA and other online systems will have selected items and excerpts from 1990 census reports as they become available. Block level maps will only be available from customer services, for the cost of reproduction.

Tim Jones, Census Bureau, talked about the TIGER files - a digital cartographic database, containing such things as streets, water features, railroads, political and statistical boundaries, addresses, zip codes, political and statistical codes, landmarks, and longitude and latitude coordinates. Extracts of the TIGER database are available in Precensus TIGER/Line files. These Precensus files will be going to 35 libraries in a pilot that the Cartographic Users Advisory Council (CUAC) is handling. No software will be supplied; but the Census Bureau will provide references about existing software through the National Clearinghouse for Census Data Services. CUAC has contacted vendors to see if they will be willing to donate software for the pilot.

Tim Jones and Mary Redmond, New York State Library, gave a report about the State Data Centers. These centers are a cooperative arrangement between the states
and the Census Bureau to provide census material to the public. The State Data Centers do operate independently, and the quality varies from state to state. Ms. Redmond offered four suggestions for linking the State Data Centers and depository libraries: 1) regular and structured communication between the depository libraries and the State Data Centers, 2) continued incorporation of census products into the DLP, 3) regular publicity by both Administrative Notes and the State Data Center newsletter, and 4) more involvement at the local level.

Gary North, United States Geological Survey (USGS), brought us "hot off the press" news of a revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A16 - "Coordination of Surveying, Mapping, and Related Spatial Activities", signed October 19, 1990. USGS will have responsibility for producing the base maps which other agencies build on. USGS has just put out a CD-ROM, produced through GPO, consisting of the raw data found in 1:2,000,000 scale maps from the 1970 National Atlas, updated to 1979. There is some software so you can move the data around to get a feel for it. The discussion on this topic highlighted several problems - one, what do depositories do when the agency buys proprietary retrieval software and therefore have no rights to copy or distribute? Two, this new technology affects map "naming" - since it allows you to relocate the center of your map, what does such a changed map's name become? Also, maps are being revised by categories, instead of whole maps, so you could end up with a series of dates on the printed versions. A cataloger's nightmare to say the least. Another question raised, but not fully discussed, was how often are we going to take snapshots of electronic records?

Friday morning offered us the opportunity to hear from three agency printers/publishers. Henry Lowenstein, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and current Chair of the Interagency Council of Printers and Publishing Services (ICPPS), began with a discussion of BLS activities. He was pleased to be able to announce that by working with Mr. Houk they were able to reduce the price of the softbound edition of the Occupational Outlook Handbook to $17. BLS is currently looking at how best to present their information on CD-ROM. Mr. Lowenstein has encouraged Mr. Houk to take an entrepreneurial role in terms of CD-ROMS. The agencies do not have enough experience to do it on their own, and GPO could help with standards and marketing. Henry then talked some about ICPPS - an advisory board that was created in the 1970's to deal with agency problems with GPO. ICPPS presented Mr. Houk with a list of key issues important to the agencies and asked him to address them. There are communication, procurement, sales program, and pricing formula. Some of these issues need further study. The Public Printer did create a special panel to study the pricing policy and its report was released to JCP on November 1st.

John Weiner, Energy Information Administration and chair of the Federal Publishers Committee (FPC), asked for our comments about CD-ROM products. He mentioned a daily, FAXed publication, Energy Situation Analysis which deals with the Persian Gulf situation that has been going to 400-500 people since August 10th. He realized that this is probably a fugitive document according to our definition. He agreed to talk to GPO about providing depository distribution for this title. Mr. Weiner then spoke about his committee. Their purpose is information sharing and advocacy. They meet ten times per year and have specific topics and speakers at each meeting. Currently, there are three task forces within the Committee: marketing and promotion, subscriptions and periodicals, and electronic publishing and data transmission. FPC raised many of the same issues ICPPS
raised with GPO. In trying to make sure his people realize the importance of the DLP, Mr. Weiner proposes three avenues: 1) having a presentation about DLP done for the FPC, 2) hold future meetings on depository issues with either GPO or a depository librarian as a speaker and 3) set up a task force on library issues - all types of libraries, not just depositories.

Dana Pratt, Library of Congress, was the third speaker. He entertained us with a number of quotes from a recent LC publication, Respectfully Quoted (LC 14.2: D56), a compilation of various quotes the CRS staff has been asked to locate and verify over the years.

OPEN FORUM

The majority of Open Forum centered on a discussion of cost sharing and user fees. There was concern that none of the pilot projects currently underway will provide data on a totally cost-free basis to the depository environment. Concern also was expressed that cost-sharing results in a disjunction of philosophy of the Depository Library Program. Other comments included:

* Philosophy doesn't matter in times of economic constraints.
* GPO is committed to getting information to users for the least cost.
* People are assuming cost-sharing is a foregone conclusion, a reality and nothing else is being explored.
* If we pay telecommunication costs now, will we pay postage down the road?
* What is our bottom line as depository librarians? Where do we negotiate from here?
* It is not an issue of accepting cost-sharing, we already agreed to cost-sharing by being a depository library. With electronic information, we are not sure where the library door is. We need to decide what costs we will accept.

* Maybe Depository Library Program needs to be changed to "Technology Transfer Program."

ODDS AND ENDS

* Spring DLC Meeting is scheduled for April 17-19, 1991 in Boston, MA.
* GPO Marketing is trying to get GPO Sales publications listed in Books in Print with ISBN #’s.
* GPO Marketing has stickers available that have the depository logo and the words “Federal Publication” for putting on documents.
* Six weeks ago, marketing started using 6 government bulletin boards to promote both the sale of GPO publications and the DLP. The six agencies are: USGS, Department of Energy, National Science Foundation, Bureau of Mines, Census Bureau, and the Export/Import Bank.
* Readex has determined that 22% of the items listed on PRF have not been distributed to the DLP.
* Anne Diamond is coordinating the revision of the Federal Depository Library Manual. The 3 core collections are being revised, and there will be 2 new sections: preservation and electronic records. Distribution date is scheduled for October 1991.
* General Accounting Office (GAO) has released its management audit of GPO. It is entitled Monopoly-like Status Contributes to Inefficiency and Ineffectiveness. (GGD-90-107)

DLC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. DLC is pleased with the draft report on the Electronic Bulletin Board System. The Council urges immediate implementation of the Bulletin Board with electronic mail capability.
2. DLC is pleased to learn that enhancements have been proposed to improve the lighted bin system at the GPO. In order to improve the sorting and delivery of documents, the DLC urges the Public Printer to approve funding for the implementation of these enhancements.

3. DLC was interested to learn that GPO is preparing a 5-year cumulative index to the Monthly Catalog to be issued in microfiche. Council recommends that the Public Printer investigate whether those indexes that have been issued in microform could be re-issued with a single cumulative index on CD-ROM, covering the years 1976-1990. As a further enhancement, DLC recommends that the Public Printer consider whether the Monthly Catalog in its entirety could be converted to compact disk for the period July 1976 to the present, to continue on an ongoing monthly basis.

4. DLC recommends that, where possible, files distributed through electronic products and services be in open architecture formats to (1) facilitate access through a variety of software packages, (2) encourage the development of new software to improve access and (3) enable the recovery, downloading, and exchange of the original data for transfer to other media for further processing. Council further recommends that the Public Printer appoint a Standards Committee to establish appropriate standards for the distribution of government data to depository libraries in readily accessible forms. Such standards should be incorporated into the Agency Procedural Handbook for the Procurement of Commercial Printing Services. While we recognize that such standards might be different for different kinds of files, such as text or statistical data, a small number of basic standards would facilitate access. Such a Committee should also identify appropriate freeware or shareware compatible with the accepted standards for the use of libraries which cannot afford or do not have more expensive commercial packages.

5. DLC remains seriously concerned about the prospective elimination of the paper version of the bound Congressional Record. Although the Council applauds the development of the CD-ROM version, the Council believes that the Congressional Record has important historical and archival value to the nation. As a result, the Council strongly urges that the Public Printer work to retain the funds to continue to reprint and make the paper bound Congressional Record available, at a minimum, to Regional Depository Libraries and to fill any gaps between 1983 and the present that might have occurred due to lack of funding or for any other reason. Council still supports the production and dissemination of the microfiche version of the bound Congressional Record as stated in Recommendation 1 of the Spring 1990 Council Recommendations.

6. DLC recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service continue to offer print/microfiche publications for selection when corresponding electronic products or services become available.

7. DLC regrets the continued non-compliance with the provisions of Title 44 U.S.C. by the Library of Congress and the Environmental Protection Agency. Council recommends that the Public Printer directly contact the Librarian of Congress and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the legal requirement for including their publications in the DLP.

8. DLC recommends that the Public Printer explore the means by which the forthcoming database of the Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, can be made available to the DLP and archived for public access.
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9. DLC was pleased to learn that the Public Printer is engaged in a long term strategic plan for the GPO. Council endorses this effort, offers it support and assistance and asked to be included in the review process relating to the DLP before final publication of the plan.

10. DLC is concerned about proposals that appear to raise the possibility of cost sharing for the dissemination of government information in electronic form. Council believes that the basic principle of free access to government information should not be compromised, and that no charge should be levied for the information itself or to the end user.

Council understands that there may be costs—such as telecommunications costs—associated with the distribution of electronic information that are (a) highly variable and (b) not within the control of the government. Council recommends that the Public Printer identify the means of disseminating such information to depository libraries at the lowest possible cost. Council further recommends that the Public Printer investigate low-cost telecommunications and other strategies. The pilot projects now underway should yield valuable information about usage and actual costs.

Council is troubled by proposed legislation that would permit "cost sharing" in the statute. Such proposals to date have been vague, undefined, and open-ended. As such, they threaten to compromise some of the basic principles of the Depository Program, as indicated above. Council recommends that the Public Printer philosophically oppose such proposals.

11. DLC recommends to the Public Printer that the Depository Library Services staff recommend for Council's review minimum technical guidelines for depository libraries. These guidelines should include, but not be limited to, basic applied information technologies, such as:

1. Workstation configurations including computer processing power, monitors with adequate graphics capability, adequate mass storage, adequate random access memory (RAM), CD-ROM drives and printers;
2. Appropriate software including database management systems, telecommunications and word processing which can accommodate ASCII files;
3. Telecommunications including modems and e-mail;
4. Staff training to use the basic information technologies recommended and;
5. Appropriate storage medium for the information products and equipment.

Once the final guidelines have been published in Administrative Notes, implementation of these guidelines should serve as goals for existing depositories and all new depository libraries. These guidelines should be annually reviewed and revised to reflect advances in information technologies. Further, GPO should develop and maintain an agency and/or library contact list of resource personnel who can provide technical assistance and support for the application of information technologies.

12. Uncertainty arose at the Fall 1990 DLC Meeting concerning the question of whether costs that may be associated with receipt of electronic information distributed through the DLP may be passed on to library users. Although the Council believes this should not be done, Council requests the Public Printer to seek the advice of his legal counsel on the dissemination of information in electronic form and its associated issues such as costs and to provide copies of the resultant legal opinion to the DLC and printed in Administrative Notes.

Susan Tulis
LETTER FROM THE PUBLIC PRINTER
June 16, 1990

Dear Ms. Nyberg:

I am pleased and honored to have received an invitation to address the annual meeting of the Government Documents Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL). Unfortunately, a prior commitment prevents me from attending the conference. I would like to take this opportunity, however, to communicate briefly some of my thoughts about the Depository Library Program and law libraries, with the hope that at a later date, I will be able to expand upon this message in person.

As you know, I was confirmed as Public Printer on March 8, 1990. As I become increasingly familiar with the Depository Library Program, I am more and more impressed with the hard work, dedication, and knowledge of all those whose efforts support the Program. Your enthusiasm and devotion to providing the American people with access to the wealth of Government information is widely recognized. The partnership formed between the Government Printing Office and the library community unquestionably makes the Depository Library Program one of our government's finest programs.

I would like you to know that I share your commitment to an informed public, and assure you that the Depository Program has my full support. This is not to say that we do not face challenges in the coming years, challenges that will require cooperation and compromise on all our parts if we are to arrive at workable solutions. But we are all familiar with challenges; if we were not, probably none of us would have reached where we are today.

Law libraries play a special role in the Depository Library Program. In addition to the responsibility for providing government information services to the general public, an obligation which most law depositories share with other depository libraries, law depositories also have more specialized requirements as a result of their pre-eminent role in serving the nation's legal community. As I continue my discussions with representatives of the law library community, representatives such as Susan Tulis of the University of Virginia and Bob Oakley of Georgetown University, to name only two, my understanding of the scope and role of law libraries, and of the importance of government information to them increases.

In closing, I would like to emphasize again the Government Printing Office's commitment to supporting the Depository Library Program, and my own personal intention to continue the dialogue with representatives of the library community. Although I am not able to attend this year's annual meeting of AALL, Bonnie Trivizas will be representing GPO on a panel that will be discussing various aspects of the dissemination of machine readable information through the Depository Library Program.

I wish you all a productive and enjoyable conference, and I look forward to having another opportunity to address your group.

Sincerely,
Robert W. Houk
Public Printer

Preparation for the Electronic Depository
1990 AALL Program Review

Reported by Cheryl Nyberg

Bill Walker (Vanderbilt University) coordinated and moderated this program held on June 20, 1990, 10:30am-12 noon.
Susan Tulis (University of Virginia), Bonnie Trivazas (GPO) (replacing scheduled speaker Jan Erickson), and Steve Hayes (University of Notre Dame) spoke.

SUSAN TULIS

Susan Tulis described recent legislative and regulatory activity, including several bills to reauthorize the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), which expired in September, 1989. [Editors’ Note: See also Bruce Kennedy’s article in this issue on the PRA drama.] H.R. 3695, Paperwork Reduction and Federal Information Act, was introduced by Representatives Conyers and Horton on November 17, 1989. The bill allows OMB to provide guidance to agencies to disseminate useful electronic formats with appropriate software and mandates that agencies use GPO for the production, procurement, and dissemination of information products and services. Additionally, the bill requires agencies to serve notice to the public and to GPO before discontinuing or initiating products or services. [Editors’ Note: This provision would have been useful in dealing with the Department of State’s unilateral decision to discontinue the Department of State Bulletin.]

Agencies would also be prohibited from establishing exclusive distribution arrangements which would interfere with timely public access to the information. Resale fees are prohibited, as are user fees that exceed marginal costs. Agencies would be prohibited from establishing sales programs without first going through GPO.

Library groups object to section e, the infamous checklist. Agencies would be permitted to disseminate information only if such dissemination was necessary to the agency’s function. Agencies would have to determine if there is a comparable source—public or private.

The committee’s report on H.R. 3695 was issued on March 13, 1990. A side agreement between OMB and Conyers was made and later rescinded by the Bush Administration. If the bill does not move forward, the dissemination provisions may be added to another bill as a rider.

S. 1742, the Federal Information Resources Management Act, addresses the whole life cycle of government information. It is similar to the House bill but omits some sections. Both bills empower OMB and contain the checklist.

The bill was marked up and reported out on June 7, 1990. However, the chairman of the committee, Sen. Bingaman, has been reassigned to another committee and his removal may slow the progress of the bill. Further, the administration threatens to veto the bill if passed by Congress.

H.R. 3849, Rep. Bates’ Government Printing Office Improvement Act of 1990, concentrates on definitions. [Editors’ Note: Rep. Bates revised his bill, incorporating many changes sought by the library community, and mark-up occurred on September 18, 1990.] Online information services are left out; librarians object that the definitions are too format-specific. Access to online services is permitted, but not mandated. Library users and libraries would be required to share the costs of online access. Other versions of definitions of “government publications” and “government information products and services” are floating around, with a view to making the definitions inclusive enough for future formats and technological developments.

In May, Rep. Bates formed a librarians’ task force (composed of past and present chairs of the Depository Library Council and ALA/GODORT, including Susan Tulis) to work out amendments and report language acceptable to the library community. He is aware that he cannot move the legislation without library support. He also believes that he cannot get support for the bill from the legislative appropriations committee with a cost-sharing provision. The first meeting was free and open; many ideas were discussed.
but no conclusions were reached.

A related issue is that of archiving information delivered by online information services. On May 8, 1990, the National Archives published guidelines in the Federal Register for electronic records retention. [55 FR 19,216-19,224]

BONNIE TRIVAZAS

Replacing Jan Erickson, who was assigned to another position in GPO, Bonnie Trivazas reviewed GPO's progress on matters relating to electronic dissemination of government information. The new Public Printer, Robert Houk, is emphasizing public access to government information. He has made contacts with library groups and their representatives and other stakeholders in the debate about access to government information in electronic formats.

This is an opportune time during the information policy debate, with PRA, the Bates bill, the OTA study, NCLIS all involved—a harmonic convergence of events and interest in this issue.

GPO is ready to assume a more active role. For example, GPO applied for and received a port for Project Hermes, the Supreme Court electronic opinions network. GPO is also investigating a bulletin board system for depository library administrative information and it is forging ahead on the pilot projects.

GPO's speed on the pilot project should be considered in context. The Ad Hoc Committee first began its investigation in 1983. And progress has occurred. The first CD-ROM product, Census Test Disc 2 was distributed to 143 test sites in September 1988 and the remaining depositories received their discs in May 1989. GPO is in an evaluation phase which will continue until September 1990. Depositories will be surveyed.

The speaker reviewed the status of the pilot projects. The Toxic Release Inventory project began in May 1990 with approxi-mately fifty libraries. A two-part evaluation of this project will cover questions on installation and training. Statistics on use will be made in February 1991.

The final Congressional Record, volume 131, 1985, including index will be sent to all depositories. The disc is being developed by JCP and GPO. On June 19th, a demo of the prototype was conducted with an expected summer or fall distribution planned. Again, two questionnaires will be distributed and the evaluation period will extend to June 1991. [Editors' Note: A status report on the bound Congressional Record appears at p. 13 of the October 15, 1990 Administrative Notes, vol. 11, no. 21.]

The Economic Bulletin Board project is scheduled for June 1, 1990 through December 31, 1990. Evaluation will take place during the first quarter of 1991. Three-hundred and sixty-one libraries applied for the one hundred pilot spots. Eighty-six libraries were selected at random and fourteen discretionary selections were made on the basis of the libraries' applications.

The Department of Energy program was awaiting approval of an interagency agreement before detailed planning will begin. Online access to DOE's integrated information system as well as electronic mail capability are anticipated. Also planned is a shared cataloging component, with options for downloading files in Marc format for records corresponding to microfiche.

Other CD-ROMs will be distributed to depositories outside of the pilot projects. And some aspects of the pilot projects have been overtaken by other events. Soon the distribution of CDs will be business as usual at GPO. GPO intends to be proactively contacting agencies about their electronic information products and in promoting the depository library program.

STEVE HAYES

Steve Hayes addressed equipment and personnel issues. Minimum equipment
needed to access and use electronic government information include a personal computer with at least 30 megabytes of memory, a monitor, Microsoft extension software, a CD-ROM drive, and a reliable printer. Additionally, a modem (operating at 12, 24, or 96 hundred baud—the faster rates of transmission will result in lower telecommunications charges) and a network will allow maximum use of the information. Notre Dame has developed a proposal for a $60,000 network; write to Mr. Hayes for details.

Some of the CDs distributed to depositories so far come with software that serve only to “turn pages.” For instance, the Census Test Disc provides the same information in the same format as the printed version. Simple “page turning” can be accomplished with PC File.

More advanced software (DBase III or Lotus 1-2-3) facilitates true manipulation of raw data, cross-file searching, and downloading. Public domain or shareware software may be useful. The private sector may become involved in the development of appropriate software for some products, if a large enough market develops.

Mr. Hayes recommends that libraries find a good “techie” that doesn’t look down on librarians. Downloading and data manipulation will take additional training time. Because users won’t go back to paper after using CD-ROM, libraries may need to invest more bibliographic instruction time for CD-ROM products than for paper sources. Small group instruction or mini-courses for students will be useful. Although you may not be overwhelmed by attendance initially, use of the material will increase.

A close relationship with the staff at your institution’s computer center will be essential. Go with a network if you can afford it.

The novice end-user is a new population for these products. Agencies are used to dealing with sophisticated end-users with mainframes and programmers at their disposal. Agencies need feedback on the utility and problems with their electronic products, since they (not GPO) are the real producers of the information.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Compiled by Cheryl Nyberg


Results of a 1987 survey of the secretaries of the fifty states, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands. The survey form covered retention of records and legal documents filed with the office, off-site storage, archival-quality storage, use of microform and optical disk for records storage, and certification of records. Forty-five (81%) of those surveyed responded.


The author, a legislative attorney at the Congressional Research Service, discusses the Supreme Court's recent shift away from the use of legislative history documents and the hierarchy used by the courts to distinguish types of legislative documents appropriate for consideration. Also in this issue of the Duke Law Journal (pages 160-92) is a student-written article on "Justice Scalia’s Use of Source in Statutory and Constitutional Interpretation: How Congress Always Loses."
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Prepared under a contract from the General Services Administration and OMB, the report compiles public comments on FILS, summarizes findings from interviews with key stakeholders in the public and private sectors, and offers suggestions on the development of GIILS, a government-wide information/inventory/locator system. Those who participated in the study generally agree that the "Federal government has a responsibility to develop some type of a [sic] inventory/locator system to improve the access to and dissemination of public information resources."


A useful review of recent legislative, regulatory, and political developments. Covers competing interests, the role of the OMB, present agency practices, legislation, activities in the judicial branch, state and local experiences, application of FOIA, and legal issues. Appendixes contain OMB Circular A-130 ("Management of Federal Information Resources," December 24, 1985) and subsequent notices on further policy development; excerpts of OTA reports on electronic dissemination and federal scientific and technical information; testimony by representatives of ALA, IIA, and ACLU at the February 1990 Senate hearing on S. 1742; and copies of two Paperwork Reduction Act bills, S 1742 and H.R. 3695.


"This report identifies the National Archives and Records Administration [NARA] overall strategy for dealing with the use of data exchange standards for electronic records in an archival setting. The report covers: strategy for an evolving standards environment; data administration policy; data base transfer policy; and the place of exchange standards in systems life cycle design. Based on the policy outlined in the document, NARA will actively monitor and, where appropriate, participate in the definition and implementation of data exchange standards. The strategy is based on a report prepared for the Archives by the National Institute of Standards and Technology."


Discusses preservation of electronic records, including data files, databases, machine readable indexes,
word processing files, electronic spreadsheets, electronic mail, and other text or numeric information. "Electronically recorded data that meet both of the following conditions are federal records: 1) they are made or received by an agency of the United States government under federal law or in connection with the transaction of public business; and 2) they are preserved or appropriate for preservation as evidence of agency activities or because of the value of the information they contain." (pp. 4-5) Covers inventories, general record schedules, identification of potentially permanent electronic records, and format requirements for transfer of electronic records to the National Archives. Reprints text of regulations on electronic records management and transfer of machine readable files to the Archives, NARA Bulletin 88-8 on the use of optical disk systems to store permanent federal records, a glossary of electronic records management terms, and a list of acronyms.


"This article elaborates on certain parts of the author's work for the Administrative Conference of the United States, which led the Conference to adopt recommendations on December 7, 1989."

Covers the market for electronic information (information as an economic good, defining new electronic information products in terms of value at five processing stages, the demand for electronic information, suppliers of electronic information and the roles of private and public sectors) and the Freedom of Information Act as a constraint and a stimulus for policy (is an electronic document or record a FOIA

record, who chooses between paper and electronic access, programming and who pays for it, access to indexes and software, FOIA protection of private investment, pricing as a signal and a tool, implementing electronic release and pricing policies by contract under FOIA, and principles for defining public and private sector roles under FOIA. The author is also the contact person for the ABA's "Dissemination Recommendation" on electronic dissemination of government information (June 1990).


Describes the records management responsibilities of House committees. Discusses administrative, legislative, oversight, investigative, and reference records; archiving procedures; management of sensitive records; and personnel. Includes a glossary, copies of House rules governing records, and sample letters and forms used in records management.

PROJECT HERMES

Since the first of November, law school depository libraries have been eligible to access GPO's Project Hermes Bulletin Board (PHBB). The full text of U.S. Supreme Court opinions will be available within eight hours and the bulletin board is accessible around-the-clock.

Along with regional depositories, law school depositories are beta test sites for the
system. So even if you routinely access WESTLAW or LEXIS for just-released Supreme Court opinions, sign-on to use the bulletin board and try it out. GPO is relying on us to provide useful feedback.

A one-page flyer describing the PHBB was included in a depository shipment from early November. In case you didn't see it, here's the basic information: phone number: (202) 275-7923; modem settings: 8 bits, no parity, 1 stop bit; user id: your depository library number; downloading capability: one day after initial sign-on session; assistance in using: (202) 275-2471, Monday-Friday, 8 A.M. - 4 P.M. EST.

DOCUMENTS TO THE PEOPLE & GD/SIS

The GD/SIS was profiled in the "GODORT's Friends and Relations" column in the latest issue (Vol. 18, No. 3, Sept. 1990) of Documents to the People, the quarterly newsletter of ALA/GODORT. Although the article contained a few inaccuracies and omissions (Keith Buckley is the Business Manager of JURISDOCS, not the editor, and Mary Ann Nelson has succeeded Cheryl Nyberg as Chairperson), it provides a useful profile of AALL and the GD/SIS for ALA members. The article was written by Duncan Aldrich, University of Nevada, Reno.
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