LETTER FROM THE CHAIRPERSON

The countdown to the annual meeting is on. All of you who have sent your e-mail addresses to Marianne Mason for the SIS Directory should have received a message about the Sunday SIS business meeting. Instead of holding the standard SIS business meeting during this time slot, we will have an opportunity to discuss the restructuring of and budgetary concerns about the Depository Library Program. Sheila McGarr, along with some of your AALL colleagues, will be on a panel to discuss the issues. Please read through the Dupont Circle Group and the report “Alternatives for Restructuring the Depository Library Program” before the meeting so we will have a common base for discussion. On Tuesday evening, the SIS will hold a second business meeting to continue the discussion, as well as to hear committee reports, the election results, the treasurer's report and the message of the incoming Chair.

PATENT WORKSHOP

We have some bad news about the convention. The Patent Workshop, which was heavily endorsed by the PLL/SIS and by the GD/SIS, had to be canceled due to low enrollment. With so many good workshops to choose from and so little money available for the additional night and registration, we did not reach our "break-even" point for registration. We are going to submit this proposal again when the convention is closer to Washington, D.C. when speaker expenses would be lower (and hopefully money is not so tight).

STATE BIBLIOGRAPHIES

We are looking forward to some new state bibliographies to be prepared for the convention. The ones which are completed will be distributed on a first-come basis at the Tuesday business meeting.

ANOTHER SUCCESSFUL YEAR

It's been a successful year for the GD/SIS membership. We have a directory of e-mail addresses which can be used to communicate quickly with members of the SIS. We will have added a few more state bibliographies to the AALL Occasional Papers series. We were able to support attendance for three of our members at government documents meetings. An SIS representative will attend the CONELL bazaar to Inform new members of the benefits and joys of GD/SIS membership. We are co-sponsoring programs at the AALL annual meeting. Thank you all for your hard work.

I have enjoyed my year as Chair. It was pleasure to work with such people as Veronica Maclay, Mary Shearer, David Batista, and Marianne Mason, who are enthusiastic and energetic and concerned about the future of government documents and the SIS. I would especially like to thank Susan Dow for her advice and for the example which she set as last year's SIS Chair and Veronica Maclay for her responsiveness to questions and her
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willingness to undertake special projects, such as the redesign of the SIS brochure. I look forward to continued work in the SIS. Thanks.

See you in Boston! Don’t forget; I expect to see you at TWO business meetings, one on Sunday and one on Tuesday.

NEW JURISDOCS EDITOR STILL WANTED:

I am still looking for someone to replace me as editor for JURISDOCS. If anyone is interested please call, write, or E-mail and I will be happy to discuss the position.

Access to an Apple Macintosh and a laserprinter would be the preferable setup (a copy of PageMaker v.4.01, original disks and manuals, and all of my back issues on Mac disks). The lucky winner will also inherit the growing pile of SIS and chapter newsletters that all of the AALL newsletter editors receive, as well as assorted back issues of JURISDOCS.

Some of the more powerful DOS machines can perform the work necessary to prepare the camera ready copy. I am sure the GD/SIS would purchase a DOS copy of PageMaker if the next editor was a DOS user.

If nobody volunteers before Boston be prepared for industrial strength haranguing and button holing at the Annual Meeting.

SUBMISSIONS FORMAT

As I have mentioned in each issue, I would like to receive your writings on a disk. I can process 5.25 and 3.5 inch disks, in either Macintosh or DOS format, and in any density. If you send a DOS disk please save your file(s) in either Word Perfect or as generic ASCII text. If you send a Macintosh disk please save your file(s) in McWrite, McWrite II, Word, or text.

There has been a problem with the 3.5 inch DOS disks that are not HD but are formatted with the default HD format command. Such disks can only be read by the PC’s that format them. The two best solutions are to 1) send a 3.5 inch HD DOS disk if you format the

FROM THE EDITOR

THIS ISSUE

This is the third, and last, issue of the 1992-93 GD/SIS year. We have a number of articles for you thanks to the diligent efforts of Susan Tulis and Sushila Selsn. The articles are about the future of the Depository Library Program, the Federal Depository Conference, and the Depository Library Council meeting. You will note the ever present forms at the back of the issue that ask for more volunteers. Both Susan Tulis and Sushila Selsn wrote articles on the April 19th Regional Depository Seminar and I have included both because each gives a different view of the meeting.

THANKS FOR THE MEMORIES

I have enjoyed being editor of JURISDOCS for the past four years. It gave me a chance to work with some of the most committed and dedicated librarians I have ever met. There is something about government documents that either attracts high quality librarians or transforms normal ones into powerhouses. I have found the enthusiasm of our members to be contagious and I have always been proud to have my name associated with the GD/SIS and its work. Thank you all for this experience.
disk with the default format settings, or 2) format with the special DD (double density) format command if you are sending a 3.5" DOS DD disk.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Spring, 1993

Once again, there were no LETTERS TO THE EDITOR for this issue. This may disappear with the arrival of the new editor since no one seems moved to express their opinions in writing.

FUTURE OF THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Submitted by
Susan Tulis, AALL, Assistant Washington Affairs Representative
Georgetown University Law Library
111 G St., NW
Washington, DC 20001
202/662-9200
E-Mail: tulis@guvax.georgetown.edu

In preparation for the discussion during the Sunday Government Documents SIS (GD/SIS) Business meeting, I would like to provide the following background about restructuring the Depository Library Program (DLP).

The DLP is a long established cooperative program between the federal government and the nation’s library community. The framework of the present depository library program, a system of access to and dissemination of government information, has its formal establishment in the mid 1800’s.

DLP PROBLEMS

While this program has served the information needs of the public for many years, it is clear that the system as designed in 1895 no longer fits the current environment. There are a number of problems - the program has not been adequately funded, not all publications make it into the system, regional libraries are bulging at the seams, and concern exists over where electronic information fits into the general scheme of things.

COMING CHANGES

Along the same lines, in the past few months, developments have been unfolding that could have a profound effect on depository libraries. First, there is a new leadership in Washington committed to developing a national information infrastructure; the office of the Public Printer is in transition; and both the Executive and Legislative branches seem committed to cost reductions.

Second, several bills currently before Congress directly relate to electronic information and depository libraries. The GPO Access bill, presently awaiting the President’s signature, requires GPO to provide an online Congressional Record and Federal Register free to depository libraries and at incremental costs of distribution to others. It also permits federal agencies to voluntarily disseminate their electronic publications through the same system. The NREN Implementation bills, as well as the Paperwork Reduction Act reauthorization bills, all have some provisions that would impact depository libraries.

Third, structural and operational problems with the present DLP and access to government information have been identified by various groups with proposals for change. The FY 1993 budget crisis at GPO and the resulting cuts in services, titles, and format changes have served to highlight some of these problems. It is clear to many that the status quo can not remain, change in the program is inevitable. If depository libraries are not going to be able to receive the government information required to meet their pa-
trons’ needs, then something needs to change.

**DLC, ALA, JCP**

The Depository Library Council (DLC), an advisory board to the Public Printer, spent its Fall 92 and Spring 93 meetings working on a discussion document which outlines various scenarios for restructuring the DLP. At the 1993 American Library Association Midwinter Meeting, the Government Documents Round Table received a “challenge” from the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) asking librarians to acknowledge a downward trend in funding and to identify cost-saving alternatives for the DLP. Although the subsequent change in leadership at JCP rendered this challenge no longer in effect, the chairs of Council and GODORT decided to take this opportunity to begin to examine and reevaluate the mission, goals, and structure of the DLP.

**DUPONT CIRCLE GROUP**

An independent group of practicing librarians got together to put something down in writing which might serve as the starting point for community-wide discussion of the issues and problems facing the DLP. This group, known as the Dupont Circle Group (DCG), has put together a discussion draft which includes a draft mission and goals statement of a depository library program and various scenarios for effectively disseminating government information. At this point, the depository library community is still discussing the report; no final recommendations have been made by anyone.

Unless changes are made to the current DLP, less and less information will be available to citizens, businesses, students, scholars, researchers, etc. What is available through the DLP will be in untimely, inappropriate, and unusable formats. As electronic government information continues to be disseminated without structure or organization, it will be more difficult for the average citizen to access it. Unstructured dissemination will further divide citizens into the information “haves” and “have nots.”

**THE FUTURE OF THE DLP**

It is not clear who should be the major administrator and supervisor of the DLP. Should GPO continue in this role? Should it be split, with GPO distributing the print-based products and another agency coordinating access to electronic information services? Or should a new or existing agency serve the role of disseminator of government information?

Once it is decided who is administering the program, the structure of the program also needs to be hammered out. Many feel that the current structure of regional and selective libraries no longer works. Do we really need 53 libraries all receiving 100%, keeping it forever? Should there be another layer of depository libraries - a system of super-regionals or electronic regionals? Does everything need to be kept forever if it can be accessed electronically at a moment’s notice?

The following quote from the Dupont Circle Group sums up the situation depository librarians are facing:

In the rapidly changing electronic environment of today, the means by which government information is disseminated and made available to the public are becoming increasingly diverse. Whether or how the Federal Depository Library Program remains a part of the emerging national information infrastructure rests squarely with the depository library community. It is our collective responsibility to articulate the needs and benefits of the program and to participate in making the necessary changes if it is to be a viable program in an electronic world. As the stewards of the public’s right to know for the past century, it is up to us to ensure this right for the next century.

As you can see there are more questions than answers. The key one this group needs to address is “how will restructuring the DLP affect law libraries?” I hope this background will give you something to ponder before arriving Boston so we can get right to work. I look forward to hearing your thoughts and ideas.
"EFFECTIVE LIBRARY NETWORKING"
THEME OF 2ND FEDERAL DEPOSITORY CONFERENCE

Submitted by
Susan Tulis, AALL, Assistant Washington Affairs Representative
Georgetown University Law Library
111 G St., NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202)662-9200
E-mail: tulis@guvax.georgetown.edu

The second Federal Depository Conference was held April 21-23, 1993 at the Rosslyn Westpark Hotel in Arlington, VA. The Regionals met on April 19, 1993. Although the official theme of the conference was effective library networking, the underlying theme was the future of the depository library program.

GOVERNMENT SPEAKERS

Mike DiMario, Acting Public Printer, was only able to address the Regional meeting. In his short remarks, he commented on the importance of the depository library community to the nation and the fact that the Depository Library Program (DLP) is the only program where there is a direct return to the public. The role of the regionals in this program has gotten more and more burdensome. Advice from this conference will assist Mr. DiMario in shaping the future of this program. He also commented on the fact that we are still defining what role electronics will play in this program - a question Mr. DiMario asked some 12 years ago.

Wayne Kelley, Superintendent of Documents, highlighted three issues in his talks Monday and Wednesday - money, technology, and the structure of the program. There isn’t enough money. Mr. Kelley suggested that we ask ourselves what is best for the community. He stated that GPO needs to transform itself. The chances of an individual finding the information he/she wants are getting slimmer and slimmer. If we are not care-

ful, we will be back to where we were in the mid 1800’s, with every agency disseminating their own stuff. The government publishing program is in disarray and Mr. Kelley doesn’t see the adoption of a government wide policy that will affect all publishing. He also questioned what forces will drive technology and who are the players in the new technology. Mr. Kelley does believe that depositories have an electronic future, but the next year or two will be interesting. He ended his talk by stating that depositories have a supportive partner in GPO.

Judy Russell, Director of Library Programs Service, noted that this year’s theme of networking builds on last year’s theme of partnership. There must be a sharing of resources and communication. The strength of the DLP is its diversity, but diversity also brings challenges. It is clear that GPO can’t do everything, so we must target the most important things, set priorities (which is difficult), establish practical options, and deal with competing needs.

Various other LPS individuals highlighted their activities, but not much new was revealed.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE SESSIONS

Some things came out during the Information Exchange sessions, where individuals brought up their concerns and problems. Highlights from the sessions I attended are as follows:

1. March List of Classes has been delayed, due out by the end of May.
2. Item selection update will be mailed out at May 1st, due back July 1, 1993.
3. Some formats changes are being reconsidered - Economic Indicators and FCC Record are going back to paper.
4. Cataloging has contracted out the cataloging of Flood Insurance Studies.
5. Federal Depository Library Manual has been delayed while it gets reorganized and updated. It is now scheduled to be out in July.
6. GPO is in the process of assigning libraries to the new Congressional districts.
7. GPO is looking at the feasibility of doing self-studies for inspections. GPO has also
gone to a compliance/non-compliance system for inspections.

8. GPO is working on developing a collection development policy for what materials get disseminated through the DLP.

COMMUNICATIONS AND RESTRUCTURING OF THE DLP

The rest of this report will be about related meetings held that week that dealt with communications and restructuring of the DLP. There are a number of things going on right now that you need to be aware of.

First, the DLC has issued its draft report entitled “Alternatives for Restructuring the Depository Library Program.” The full report will appear in an upcoming issue of Administrative Notes. The report is broken into 3 parts:
1. History and Objectives of the DLP,
2. Assumptions, and
3. Alternative Scenarios for a Restructured Program. Please read and comment on this report.

JACK SULZER

Jack Sulzer, in setting the stage for a discussion on restructuring, during the Regional meeting, told us that the genie is out of the bottle - electronics are here now. We need to figure out where depositories fit into all of this. There is much activity in the online environment right now and we, as depository librarians, need to make sure we aren’t left behind. The Boucher bill, H.R. 1757, does require that depository libraries and other sources of government information be connected to the Internet to enable access to federal government information and databases in electronic formats, as well as to other information. The Coalition for Networked Information is undertaking an Access to Public Information Program (APIP) which has the overall purpose of improving public access to networked government information via the Internet. Mr. Glenn Tenney, from San Mateo, CA, has put together a business plan for Government On-Line Depository (GOLD). GOLD is a not-for-profit depository library with the mission of offering free access to public-domain federal, state, and local data via the Internet. Some of these proposals utilize depository libraries, some do not.

GARY CORNWELL

Gary Cornwell reiterated his comments from the ALA Midwinter meeting that maybe the time had come for the creation of a separate organization to represent the depository library community. There was discussion both for and against this idea, but my guess is that you will be hearing more about this very soon.

COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

The Communications Committee of DLC held an open meeting to discuss how to improve communications between GPO and the depository community, between Council and the depository community, between the agencies and the depository community, and how to allow the depository community to have input to the agendas of the Federal Depository Conference and the Interagency Depository Seminar. This committee will make a full report later on, but some suggestions were:
1. have the Council meeting in conjunction with the Federal Depository Conference.
2. have a column in Admin Notes on operational issues.
3. establish an Operations Subgroup within Council to work with the GODORT Depository Operations Working Group.
4. establish a Friends group in support of GPO activities.
5. let agencies know about the Federal Depository Conference either through Federal Register announcement or using the GODORT agency liaison program.
6. making it a requirement that depository librarians attend the Federal Depository Council at a minimum of every 5 years.
7. due to the importance of Administrative Notes as a communication tool, is there a way to get into hands of the documents librarian in a timely fashion?

DUPONT CIRCLE GROUP

Another meeting that took place during the conference was an open session to discuss the work of the Dupont Circle Group. There has been much concern voiced recently for the future of the DLP. There are many difficulties facing the DLP and change is inevitable. We are all aware of GPO’s budget situation and their cost-savings alternatives for the program. The GODORT and Depository Library Council
leadership took the initiative to organize a group of volunteers and charged them with the task of getting something down in writing which might serve as the starting point for community-wide discussion of the issues and problems facing the DLP.

The packet that was available for discussion included such materials as: notices describing the construct of the group; mission statement and goals for a federal information access program; benefits of the program - both to the public and government agencies; results of the status quo for the DLP; various scenarios for an effective system for disseminating government information; list of short-term proposals for change to the program; an evaluation sheet; and a list of participants.

While not complete, and raising more questions than answers, this packet does serve as a jumping off point for focused discussion of the issues. It also offers a way to solicit input from the entire depository community. The follow-up to this meeting is that every Regional librarian will be provided a clean copy of the Dupont Circle Group’s work and be asked to distribute it to the selectives in their region. They will also be asked to coordinate the discussion and feedback from the selectives in their areas. There are many upcoming national, state and local meetings which will provide an opportunity for discussing this and other materials. The ultimate goal of the group is to develop a document that articulates the goals, benefits, and structure of an improved depository library program, while building support for and strengthening the public’s right to government information.

Hopefully, all of you by now should have received a copy of the DCG document. My only request is that you take some time from your busy schedules to read this packet of information, and then offer comments, talk to others, etc. Otherwise there won’t be a Depository Library Program much longer.

I am one of the members of the Dupont Circle Group so please feel free to contact me about questions, comments, etc. Thanks in advance for your time and attention.

SUMMARY, SPRING MEETING, DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 17-18, 1993

Submitted by
Susan Tulis, Council Secretary
AALL, Assistant Washington Affairs Representative
Georgetown University Law Library
111 G St., NW
Washington, DC 20001
202/662-9200
E-mail: tulis@guvax.georgetown.edu

The Spring 1993 Depository Library Council (DLC) meeting was held May 17-18, 1993 in the Carl Hayden Room at the Government Printing Office (GPO). Council began the meeting by setting a goal of working through its draft document “Alternatives for Restructuring the Depository Library Program” so that it could be issued not as a draft, but a report of Council.

WHY RESTRUCTURING?

The first question addressed was “why are we talking about restructuring anyhow?” Council suggested five possible reasons for restructuring the program. The changing nature of information dissemination, moving from print to electronic is one reason. The second reason is a response to the economic crisis surrounding the program. A third reason is addressing the fact that there is a better way, a better vision for disseminating government information. A paradigm shift to a user driven system is the fourth reason. Lastly, with all the electronic initiatives taking place right now, restructuring may be needed to redefine the depository library’s role in the new information environment.

While it might be true that changing formats and a better vision may be upper most in many people’s minds, the economic crisis is still a large factor that can’t be dismissed. Observers pointed out that it might be a political crisis or an economic reality as opposed to a economic crisis.
VALUES & GOALS OF THE DLP?

The second question Council addressed was “what are the values/goals of the DLP?” Seven such values/goals were identified and Council felt that it was possible to define a role for depository libraries in each of them.

Values/Goals
1. Informed electorate - government accountability.
2. Economic benefits - building better economic potential or opportunities.
3. Education
4. Intermediaries - librarians know what information is out there and how to find it. Libraries serve as information utilities.
5. Neutral sites - libraries serve as the boy/girl scouts of the information arena. Libraries don’t have an ax to grind, there is no spin put on the information. As Senator Kerrey said, “People trust libraries.”
6. Libraries are the heart or focal points of communities and therefore the obvious link to get government information to citizens.
7. Libraries serve as a way of sharing information - between federal government, state governments, and citizens.

It was mentioned a number of times that the $30 million dollar program to “inform the nation” is such a small amount when you are talking about a trillion dollar government budget. The current federal budget proposal includes $261 billion in incentive programs. Is the DLP part of the group that should be involved in an incentive program to have an informed nation or is it part of the group that needs to be sliced out of the budget so that you have the money for the incentive program? There is a need to illustrate to Congress the value of the DLP. In some respects, the DLP is a victim of its own efficiency. The program has made do with the funding it has received, but the limit has been reached of what else can be done with limited funding.

REPORT DISCUSSED

Next, the report itself was discussed. After some discussion, assumptions one and nine have been amended and will appear in the next issuance of the report.

The alternative scenarios that appear in the report are the result of brainstorming. They can be grouped into three clusters - economically oriented, access to electronic, and relationships between different kinds of depositories.

Downsizing was the first economically oriented scenario that Council addressed. Downsizing means two different things - reducing the number of libraries in the system and also reducing the number of items selected by libraries.

Picking up on the Basic Service Centers outlined in the Dupont Circle Report, some Council members felt that some libraries might be willing to receive a predetermined core set of items in exchange for different overhead responsibilities (ie. no inspections, no disposition lists, etc.) The question was raised as to why libraries don’t just select less? Besides the fact that this proposal would reduce the overhead burden, there are mixed signals coming from GPO in terms of how much libraries are supposed to select. The inspectors are telling libraries that they have to select a certain percentage, and others within GPO are telling libraries they need to select less.

Another option mentioned was to allow libraries to select a core collection, with reduced overhead responsibilities, and then shift some of the money saved to purchase equipment needed for accessing electronic information. (Similar to what the Patent and Trademark Office does with it Patent Depository Libraries.)

Another aspect of downsizing is requiring libraries to meet some sort of minimum requirements or standards to be a depository library. But what exactly is meant when we say minimum requirements or standards? Are we talking about overhead responsibilities, computer workstations, shelving, staffing, or service? And are we trying to increase or decrease the standards? In some instances we may be trying to decrease the overhead burden so the quality of service can be increased. Equipment requirements might be used to convince a director of the need for such equipment in order to stay in the Program. But lowering the overhead burdens may result in the Program not do what it was intended to do by Congress.

Reducing the number of libraries in the system raises a whole host of other questions/concerns. The Council report states that one of the strengths of the Program is that depository libraries are in every Congressional district - can we turn around and start pulling libraries out? How do you handle redistricting and
grandfathering in which produces more than two libraries per Congressional district? The law currently doesn’t allow for undesignating a depository library. That is why there is a strict inspection program to meet certain standards.

It was suggested that maybe reducing the number of libraries couldn’t exist on its own - maybe it needs to be done in conjunction with another scenario. While it is true that reducing the number of libraries in the Program would address the economic concerns, it may not address the other reasons for restructuring. If there are two or three depository libraries in one district, do they all need to be of the same service level? Can you restructure so you have different criteria for law libraries, federal libraries, etc.? Or different criteria levels dependent on the number of items selected? Or could you require that all the libraries in one Congressional district can’t collectively select more than 125% of all available items (this assumes Regionals are excluded in this formula)?

It was suggested that we might want to recommend a moratorium on appointing new depository libraries. It was not clear whether this was possible to do, legally. But it might work if done in conjunction with minimum technical requirements for a library to become a depository. It was also unclear whether Council was trying to say there should be no more depository libraries or there should be fewer than the current 1400. It was suggested that we study this more and come back to it at the Fall meeting.

The other economically oriented scenario is the direct support model. This model has as its basis the notion that customer satisfaction or empowerment from the perspective of the consumer is the best measure of success and the best place to control the system. It relies on knowing how much each library costs the system and how much money is available to support them. Each library then gets to chose how to spend its allocation - either on products and services from GPO or from any other provider.

There were many questions about this model. Can GPO, would GPO give this much control to libraries? The additional administrative aspects to implement this are astronomical. How do you assign value to items - by publications, by item numbers, or what? How do you determine the base budget for each library?

How do you know when a library has spent all their money? How do you allow for new publications? What benefits does this system provide to users? Who is going to take the less glitzy stuff and how will librarians know who has what?

COUNCIL'S SCENARIOS

Four of the Council scenarios fit into the electronic access cluster:

1. GPO as the primary point of access,
2. electronic depositories,
3. minimum technical requirements, and
4. renaming the program to recognize changes brought on by the era of electronic information.

The first question Council addressed was “what is the role of GPO in providing access to electronic government information?” Is it limited to tangible products and services as is suggested in one of the Dupont Circle Group models? Should GPO concentrate on the print products, the things they do well, and look for another source for depository libraries to receive the electronic information, so they don’t have to split resources to get into a whole new ballgame?

There are many who feel that the time for centralized coordination has passed. Should GPO’s role in electronics be having a locator or access system? Is it wrong to say that depository libraries are going to be able to fulfill their mission with only online sources from GPO in the future?

Or should GPO act as an intermediary to acquire electronic services for the DLP rather than bringing them up themselves, build its own computer system or tie into a supercomputer in the sky? Many believe that GPO should serve a procurement role on behalf of the DLP. One way for GPO to do this is for GPO to become a Gopher site, gopher into other federal data sources, or if necessary, telnet to get into other sources.

Or instead of GPO serving as a central gateway, should you have electronic depositories serving as nodes themselves, serving a more distributed function?

Although Council never answered the question as to whether GPO should be in the business of providing access to electronic government information online, the answer is in the GPO Access bill. Assuming it passes, the spe-
specific provisions as to what GPO should be doing are outlined in the bill. If GPO doesn't do a good job of fulfilling the requirements of the Access bill, the question is a moot one because GPO won't be involved in it anyway.

What would be lost if users went directly to the agencies as opposed to a GPO gateway? Would there still be low cost or free access to information if the direct access method is used? Our fundamental principles should not disappear just because the formats have changed.

**DUPONT CIRCLE GROUP**

Discussion of the third cluster of scenarios, the relationships between different types of depositories, was incorporated into the discussion of the Dupont Circle Group document.

In talking about the Dupont Circle Group document, the discussion moved from GPO's role in all of this to the actual structure of the dissemination program. It was the general consensus of Council that the status quo was not a viable option.

The Dupont Circle Group document has as its Service Model 1 - Federal Information Service Centers. This is based on having three service levels - basic, intermediary, and full. It was decided that the depository community should be surveyed to determine if enough interest exists for GPO to pursue this as a viable option. While it was decided that more than one core collection would be necessary (e.g. law, sci/tech, general), the incentives would still be reduced administrative overhead. The core list would not be restricted by format.

The intermediate service center seems to be the model of the average selective depository. What makes the intermediate service centers unique? How are they different from full service centers? It would appear that intermediates would serve as the linkage or transition between full and basic service centers. It became clear that intermediate service centers are very hard to describe since they cover a number of different people and collections.

The full service center seems to get into the role of regionals. What is the incentive for a library to be a full service center? Should full service centers act as libraries of last resort? It was hard to see full service centers as separate from regionals or subject based libraries. It was suggested that shared regionals might be the way to go - does every regional have to get ev-

erything? Or could 2-3 libraries share that responsibility for a given number of states?

**ODDS AND ENDS**

GPO is watching to see what happens with the Dept. of Commerce installing an Internet connection for its Electronic Bulletin Board. It it works for Commerce, then GPO will copy them. GPO's plan is to have telnet access through the Internet to its bulletin board, allowing screen capture and supporting kermit file transfer, but no FTP.

Council witnessed a demonstration of a prototype online Congressional Record. The software demonstrated was Electronic Book Technology by Dynatext. It is fairly sophisticated and supported a windows application. The company had done some customization for GPO, such as always showing you what page number you were on and who was speaking. Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML) was needed so that sections within sections within sections could be located. At present, GPO is working to make their typesetting program accept SGML tags.

It is still not clear how this would be distributed to depository libraries. Libraries might dial up to GPO to search, libraries might receive the SGML tagged data so they could put it up on their local systems, or libraries might get a monthly cumulative CD-ROM. It is assumed that one year of the Congressional Record would take 2 disks.

Joan Lippincott, Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), spoke about CNI's Access to Public Information Program (APIP) which has the overall purpose of improving public access to networked government information via the Internet. One of the initiatives is to improve GPO Depository Library connectivity to and programming of networked Federal information. Council was very much interested in this particular initiative since it may be a way to test out what the issues are in terms of providing service to networked information, how to receive it, how to archive it, how the receiving library can get information out to others, both on Internet and those not on Internet, etc. No libraries have been chosen yet for this project.

Mike DiMario, Acting Public Printer, briefly touched on a number of topics. (The full text of his remarks appear in Administrative Notes, vol. 14, no. 11, May 31, 1993, pp. 1-2.)
While it is true that he is in an acting capacity, GPO is not in a holding pattern. Some changes he proposed are linking the Council meeting with the annual Federal Depository Conference, moving the annual meeting and the Spring Council meeting around the country, that new appointments to Council will come from the ranks of working depository librarians, and possibly changing the plan for the distribution of the Serial Set.

There was concern by Council members about Mr. DiMario’s suggestion that being a working depository librarian might be a prerequisite to being a member of Council. Mr. DiMario stated that it was his sense that other interested parties should be made ex-officio members of Council. They would still participate fully in the deliberations, but not vote. Members of Council felt that a balance needed to be struck in the membership of Council.

A fuller summary of the Council meeting as well as Council recommendations will appear in an upcoming issue of Administrative Notes. Beth Duston is now Chair of Council and Jack Sulzer will be serving as her assistant until a Chair-Elect is chosen at the Fall meeting.

REGIONAL DEPOSITORY SEMINAR

Submitted by
Sushila Selness
University of San Diego
Legal Research Center

Twenty-seven regional depository librarians attended the Regional Depository Seminar on Monday, April 19, 1993. Ridley Kessler, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, was the moderator.

MORNING SESSION

The seminar opened with welcoming remarks from Michael DiMario, the Acting Public Printer. He affirmed that the regionals are a prime resource in disseminating information to the general public as well as to industry, and the academic world.

He acknowledged that the service role for regionals has grown more burdensome over the past thirty years as the number of selectives grew from approximately 500 in the sixties to about 1,400 today.

Mr. DiMario concluded by saying that he will be an advocate for the depository program. While he does not expect that all answers will flow from this conference, he hoped that many ideas will.

SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS REMARKS

Wayne P. Kelley, the Superintendent of Documents, in his opening remarks drew similarities between the current debate and the issues from 1895 and pointed out that the continual need for changes has existed since 1895. While nine amendments have been added to the Bill of Rights since 1895, only two major changes have occurred in Title 44, the first one in the sixties when the number of selectives doubled and then in 1978 when law libraries were added.

We are faced with challenges as we head into a new decade of limited government resources and rapidly changing information technology. This is a period in which people are redefining themselves and their roles.

The questions before us are:
1. Where does the GPO fit in?
2. Who are our competitors?
3. What are the driving forces?
4. Does the structure of our program meet our needs today?

Mr. Kelley said that he hopes three things will emerge from this conference:
1. We need to have a plan. Indeed, planning is more important than the plan;
2. What our priorities are; and
3. The need to focus. Instead of trying to do everything and do it poorly, we need to attempt fewer things and do them well, especially in the area of electronic dissemination.

LIBRARY PROGRAMS SERVICE DIRECTOR

Judith C. Russell, Director, Library Programs Service, followed Mr. Kelley’s opening remarks. She pointed out that this year’s theme “Networking and Communication” builds on last
year’s theme "Partnership". She emphasized the leadership role that Regionals will play in re-examining the structure of the Depository Library Program (DLP).

REGIONALS

The next speaker, Duncan Aldrich, Regional Librarian, University of Nevada, Reno, reviewed the results of an Association of Research Libraries (ARL) survey of its U.S. depository members, both regionals and selectives, who made significant contributions in resources to support the depository library program. In Fiscal Year 1991-1992, regionals allotted $306,000 and selectives $280,000 to depository operations. These did not include facilities management, overhead and storage costs. Twenty-two Regionals are ARL members. During this period each regional answered an average 26,000 reference questions and circulated over 19,000 items. At least five circulated 45,000 items.

The selective depositories who are ARL members spent a total of $201,000 on staff costs. It is expected that staff costs will escalate with an increase in the release of information in electronic formats.

The selectives answered over 25,000 reference questions and circulated over 20,000 items to users. At least ten of the selectives circulated over 51,000 items.

In summary, the depository library community spent $26 million in support of depository library operations and GPO spent $27 million! State and local governments, colleges, and universities assume a considerable proportion of the distribution burden.

Melissa Lamont, Documents Librarian, University of Connecticut, shared her library’s experience providing access to the Geographic Information System (GIS)

Her library is one of 66 participants in the ARL/GIS Literacy Project. She gave an overview of the problems encountered when a new technological marvel is introduced. The problems relate to, but are not limited to hardware, software, staff and user training. Her brief overview provided a good perspective on what the electronic future holds for libraries.

Jack Sulzer, Head, Reference Services, Pennsylvania State University, directed his remarks to focusing on the new information envi-

ronment, not the electronic environment but the information environment, that we have to deal with. The political environment is different now. Use of computers and telecommunications and the need to promote wide access to government information through a diverse array of resources is high on the list of priorities with the new administration. Several information technology initiatives are being introduced. Legislation regarding the National Research and Education Network (NREN), is being put on a crash course. The second NREN bill will provide institutions with funding support to connect to NREN, that is, build "off-ramps" to the super highway.

Gary Cornwell, chair of Depository Library Council had three important points to make regarding Council: 1) GPO is operating in a time of severe budget restraints; 2) There are a lot of initiatives out there regarding access to electronic information; and 3) there is a need to restructure the DLP.

Council has been looking at the last issue. A draft report resulting from these discussions is being made available to the conference attendees. Some assumptions Council has made are: The DLP is and will continue to be a vital link in the dissemination of government information. However, its current structure is floundering. It needs restructuring for future viability. The regionals cannot keep everything for ever. The DLP will continue to provide print and electronic products in the future. Information professionals as intermediaries are a key part of this program. Some libraries will be active partners in this change.

GPO is committed to opening new lines of communications with depositories. At the last Council meeting a Communication Committee was set up. Gary invited all present to attend the open forum on communications issues to be held on Thursday, April 22 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

The last speaker of the morning, John Weiner, chair of the Federal Publishers' Committee, reiterated the need for more direct communications between depository libraries and federal agencies. The agencies have been challenged by the new administration to make government information widely available.
AFTERNOON SESSION
The afternoon session consisted of an open forum discussion on the following four topics:

1. Does the regional concept still work?
2. Are super regionals possible?
3. How will the creation of electronic gateways affect regionals?
4. How can regionals help other regionals to improve performance, outreach and service?

Some of the suggestions focused on interregional cooperation, cooperative collection development, and implementation of document delivery using all available resources, including electronic file transfers. The latter was deemed to be particularly useful in western states where distances between the regionals and selectives are large. The problem of having to bypass traditional interlibrary loan procedures (ILL) was also discussed. Most felt that in many libraries documents are not cataloged and therefore it is not easy for ILL personnel to identify holdings. Also, the ILL departments tend to be overburdened and slow. There was a general feeling that document delivery through traditional interlibrary loan departments was not effective. The consensus was that we should use any system that works best for the particular situation.

Ridley Kessler concluded the program with a summary of the discussions.

SECOND ANNUAL FEDERAL DEPOSITORY CONFERENCE
Submitted by
Sushila Selnec
University of San Diego
Legal Research Center

About 300 documents librarians gathered at the Rosslyn Westpark Hotel in Arlington, Virginia, to attend the Second Annual Federal Depository Conference from April 21-23, 1993.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21ST
The Conference opened with welcoming remarks by Wayne Kelley, Superintendent of Documents. Focusing on GPO’s limited funding and the move towards an electronic world he pointed out the need for GPO to transform itself in the face of these two challenges. He called the current state of affairs at GPO “management by loophole”, that is, doing what is not specifically prohibited. The dissemination of information is a vital part of an agency’s mission. For example, how can the EPA carry out its mission without getting information out to the public? While there are many players in the new technological environment, the GPO and depositories as partners perform the most important function for agencies in disseminating information to a diverse public. Many information policy related bills are pending in Congress. However, Mr. Kelley does not see adoption of a government wide policy regarding electronic dissemination of information. He reiterated that what is needed is an “Access to government publication act”, publication regardless of medium. In his closing remarks he called the next couple of years watershed years for GPO. Noting that change is inevitable he urged depository librarians “to ride that wave and make it work for you.”

The next speaker, Judy Russell, director, Library Programs Service (LPS), emphasized that GPO takes seriously its role in increasing public access to government information. Identifying diversity of content, formats and libraries as the greatest strength of the Depository Library Program (DLP) she called it also its greatest challenge. GPO cannot do everything and do it well. They need to focus and prioritize in order to find a balance in the delivery of high quality information in a cost effective and timely manner.

The next series of speakers, J. Baumgardner, (Deputy Director, LPS), Gil Baldwin, (Administrative Support), Carl Redd, (Depository Distribution Division), Laurie Hall, (Systems Support), Earl Lewter, (Classification), Steve Gray, (Acquisitions and Micrographics), Thomas Downing, (Cataloging Branch), and Sheila McGarr, (Depository Services), gave progress reports on the various initiatives within their respective departments at the GPO.

After the morning break, Ridley Kessler, who moderated the Regional Depository Seminar the previous Monday, summarized for the audience the highlights of that Seminar. The
three top issues of discussion were the need for increased networking, possibility of cooperative collection development among regionals, and developing ways to improve communications with each other and within the rest of the depository library community.

Gary Comwell, chair of the Depository Library Council (DLC), followed with a summary of his remarks at ALA Midwinter. The DLC tries to be very aggressive in being an avenue for change. However, we seem to be lacking a certain amount of cohesiveness in our efforts. There are a lot of fragmented efforts. Also, lots of initiatives are taking place in Washington and they will be implemented with or without our knowledge. Council needs to take advantage of every opportunity that comes along. Perhaps we need to establish an independent Depository Librarians' Association. We need to get our voices heard.

Julia Wallace, chair of GODORT, referred to the Discussion Draft Report of the Dupont Circle Group which was made available to the attendees. She admonished everyone present to take a look at the mission statement published in the report and ask if we are doing what is outlined in the goals and objectives section. She also highlighted the activities that GODORT is involved in, namely restructuring of the DLC, establishing a committee to look into GPO operational matters since they have been removed from the purview of the DLC, the Agency Liaison program, and the Annual Legislative Update cosponsored with the D.C. Librarians' Association.

The last speaker of the morning, Jim Walsh, (Boston College), gave some background and an update on the Preservation Packet which will be distributed to all Depositories by the GPO. Details about the packet were published in Administrative Notes, v.14, no.6, March 15, 1993.

AFTERNOON SESSION

During the afternoon session, John Kavaliunas, Bureau of the Census, and Ken Rogers, Office of Business Analysis, producer of the NESE CD-ROM, gave updates on the two agencies' activities. We can look forward to lot more information in electronic formats from these agencies.

The rest of the afternoon was devoted to small "Information Exchange" breakout sessions during which individuals voiced their concerns and problems and DLP staff tried to answer these. Some of these concerned the format changes for Economic Indicators and FCC Record, (GPO will change back to paper); the delay in producing the Federal Depository Library Manual, (it will be out in July); and GPO trying to revamp the inspection system, (they are looking at allowing depositories to do self-studies similar to those done in advance of academic accreditation inspections).

THURSDAY, APRIL 22ND

In keeping with the theme of "Effective Library Networking", the speakers reported on the various networking activities going on in their regions. Some of the creative solutions offered during the morning session were the use of an electronic bulletin board to disseminate depository information by the New Jersey State Documents Association, the Ohio Union List Project undertaken by GODORT Ohio, and the CD-ROM Networking Project being proposed by the Oakland (PA) Library Consortium to link the CD-ROM databases at three libraries in the area, including Carnegie Mellon University Library, Carnegie Public Library, and the University of Pittsburgh Library.

The afternoon sessions included a presentation on the Boston Library Consortium, a local depository network that strengthens services to users of member institutions through mutual access to research materials and publication of union lists. This was followed by a description of the Heart of Texas Documents Consortium (HOTDOCS) project that attempts to overcome the large distances in Texas with a document delivery system that uses all available channels including fax service; the Twin Ports Government Documents Depository Consortium based in Duluth, Minnesota, which tried to overcome poor bibliographic control of area documents holdings by combining resources to produce an accurate list of holdings, share technical expertise regarding computers, and increased outreach and improved referral services in the region.

The formal presentations concluded with a description of the activities of the Southeast Florida Library Network (SEFLIN) which strives to eliminate the barriers to "libraries without walls" by networking.
Two additional meetings were scheduled for Thursday evening. One on "Improving Communications with GPO" and another on "Alternatives for Restructuring the Depository Library Program." Despite a full day of programs the meetings were well attended showing a real concern among the depository library community regarding these issues. A detailed report about these two meetings is published elsewhere in this issue.

FRIDAY, APRIL 23RD

The theme of networking was further carried out by two more presentations on networking alliances. Collection Development Policies for CD-ROMS was the result of efforts to select CD-ROM databases to put on a network by the University of Maryland Library. The Department of Library, Archives and Public Records in Arizona looked at the business community as an ally in trying to expand its base of support. The cooperative effort led to establishment of EDIC, the Economic Development Information Centers Project, a statewide effort to pool the information resources and expertise of public and community college libraries to support state and local economic development.

The Conference concluded with a U.S. Geological Survey update. Gary North, from the National Mapping Division, USGS, announced that thousands of CD-ROMs will be forthcoming from his agency. Since most Earth Sciences data involve maps, depository librarians can look forward to upgrading existing computer systems in order to access these.
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GD/SIS NETWORK

The Government Relations Committee for the GD/SISis trying to establish a network to distribute information rapidly among members of the GD/SIS. Input, reaction, and response to the infamous GPO survey this past fall is an excellent example of the information that could be dispersed through this network. Below is a form to be filled out if you would like to be included in the network, help create it, or are willing to help in the network’s operation.

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE!

NAME ____________________________________________

TITLE ____________________________________________

LIBRARY __________________________________________

ADDRESS __________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

PHONE ___________________________  FAX __________________________

E-MAIL ____________________________

Yes, I am interested in being included in the network.

Yes, I would like to help set up the network.

Yes, I would like to help with the operation of the network after it is set up.

Send this form (or a photocopy of it) to Marianne Mason, Documents Librarian, Indiana University School of Law Library, Third St. & Indiana Ave., Law Building, Bloomington, IN 47405-1001; (812) 855-4611.

VOLUNTEERS NEEDED FOR SIS COMMITTEES FOR 1993/94

Government Relations: Help keep the members of the SIS informed of changes in governmental information policy.

Newsletter: Provide input on the contents and organization of JURISDOCS; assist the editor and help solicit contributions for each issue.

Program: Assist the Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect with planning programs for the Seattle Annual Meeting; suggest ideas for new programs.

Grants: Receive and review grant applications; award grants within dollar limits set for current year.

Nominating: Prepare a list of candidates, prepare, mail and count ballots, and announce election results according to SIS bylaws.

Please complete and return this form by ASAP. Committees are to be in place before the Boston meeting.

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE!

NAME:__________________________________________

COMMITTEE(s):_________________________________

LIBRARY:_______________________________________

TELEPHONE NO.: (____) ___________  E-MAIL ADDRESS: ____________________________

Please return to: Veronica Maclay, University of California, Hastings College of Law Legal Information Center, 200 McAllister St., San Francisco, CA 94102 (E-Mail: 70740.3723@Compuserve.com)