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Government Documents Round Table, American Library Association
Documents to the People (DttP) is the official publication of the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT), American Library Association (ALA). DttP provides current information on government publications, technical reports, and maps at the local, state, national, foreign, and international levels; on related governmental activities; and documents librarianship. DttP is published quarterly (March, June, September, and December). The opinions expressed by its contributors are their own and do not necessarily represent those of ALA/GODORT. Acceptance of an advertisement does not imply endorsement by ALA/GODORT of the products or services offered.

Editorial Staff

Editor: Jim Walsh, Tisch Library, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155; 617-627-3959; 617-627-3002 (fax); jwalsh@library.tufts.edu

Associate Editor: Ben Amata, Documents Department, University Library, California State University, 2000 Jed Smith Drive, Sacramento, CA 95819-6039; 916-278-5672; 916-278-7089 (fax); bamata@csus.edu

Advertising Manager: Maurie Kelly, University Library (M/C234), Box 8198, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60680-9243; 312-996-2738 (voice); 312-413-0424 (fax); u60005@uicvm.uic.edu

Distribution Manager: John Maxymuk, Paul Robeson Library, Rutgers University, P.O. Box 93990, Camden, NJ 08101; 609-225-6034; 609-225-6428 (fax); maxymuk@zodiac.rutgers.edu

COLUMN EDITORS:

- DttP Bibliography on Documents Librarianship and Government Information: Jim Hammons, University of Tennessee; Steven Higaki, San Jose State University; and Linda Johnson, San Jose State University
- DttP Index: Judy Horn, University of California—Irvine
- International Documents Roundup: Chuck Eckman, Stanford University
- Mapnews: Melissa Lamont, Pennsylvania State University
- New Publications: Susan Anthes, University of Colorado–Boulder; Marcia Meister, University of California–Davis
- News Notes: Dena Hutto, Pennsylvania State University
- State and Local Documents Bibliography: Kathy A. Parsons, Iowa State University
- State and Local Documents News: Jim Igoe, University of North Carolina–Asheville
- Washington Report: Mary Alice Baish, Georgetown University Law Library

SUBSCRIPTIONS: DttP is sent free to ALA/GODORT members on a per volume (annual) basis. Prepayment is required in the amount of $20 in North America; $25 elsewhere. Checks or money orders should be made payable to "ALA/GODORT" and sent to the Distribution Manager. Changes of address and claims within six months of the date of issue should be sent to the Distribution Manager. Back issues may be purchased from: UMI, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

ADVERTISING: Inquiries about rates and specifications for regular and classified advertising should be sent to the Advertising Manager. Classified advertising is accepted for Positions Open, Positions Wanted, and for services, sales, products, personals, and general announcements that are related to government documents.

CONTRIBUTIONS: Articles, news items, letters, and other information intended for publication in DttP should be submitted to the Editor. All submitted material is subject to editorial review. If possible, contributions should be submitted on a 3.5" floppy diskette using an unformatted ASCII file. WordPerfect® 5.1 is the preferred word processing software, but others may be used so long as they can be converted to an ASCII file. The name of the file and the word processing software that is used should be indicated on the file label. Each floppy diskette should be accompanied by printed copy for reference. If word processing facilities are not available, contributions may be submitted typed, double spaced, with at least one inch margins. Contributions should include the names of all authors, their titles, and organizations. The deadline for submission of material is: January 15 (March issue); April 1 (June issue); July 15 (September issue); and October 1 (December issue).

INDEXING: DttP is indexed in Library Literature beginning with vol. 19, no. 1 (March 1991).

GODORT Membership: Membership in ALA is a requisite for joining GODORT. Personal and institutional members of ALA are invited to elect membership in GODORT for an additional fee of $15/year. ALA dues for personal members vary. For more information about ALA membership, please contact: ALA, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611; 1-800-545-2433.
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Support GODORT...

Order These GODORT Publications

GODORT earns a royalty on each sale of these reference works created by GODORT members.

Guide to Country Information in International Governmental Organization Publications

This new volume offers thorough access to information on individual countries in IGO publications, both print and electronic. It is an excellent companion to the award-winning Guide to Official Publications of Foreign Countries (see below).

Designed for quick use, the guide organizes publications by geographic area. Within each area, publications are arranged by subject category and, within each subject, by issuing agency. For each publication, the entry describes the subject matter covered for specific countries and regions, giving full bibliographic citations. There are separate indexes for issuing agencies and titles. The guide provides all issuing agencies’ addresses, making it easy to acquire the actual publications.


Guide to Official Publications of Foreign Countries

Now one indispensable guide brings together all the information you need to identify and acquire key foreign government publications. With the guide you can:

- **Identify** publications by looking under a country’s name. The most important publications are listed, grouped under 17 key subject categories. Most listings include a brief abstract of the publication, so you can evaluate a title. English translations are provided for titles of non-English language publications.

- **Acquire** publications easily. Each entry contains the name and address of the distributing agency or vendor and includes information on acquiring publications in microform. Numbers useful for identifying the publications for interlibrary loan are included as applicable.


“*The best source for citing government documents is now even better. Highly recommended...*"

Government Information Quarterly, 11/4

This guide updates and expands *The Complete Guide to Citing Government Documents: A Manual for Writers & Librarians*, published by GODORT in 1984. New chapters cover foreign government publications and electronic government sources (including bulletin boards, CD-ROMs, online databases, and floppy disks). It provides complete information on how to cite major types of government documents and electronic sources in bibliographies and footnotes. Hundreds of examples show the correct treatment of international as well as U.S. federal, state, regional, and local government resources. The volume also includes a detailed index for quick access to individual examples.


Send your order to:

CIS
Congressional Information Service, Inc.
4520 East-West Highway
Bethesda, MD 20814-3389 USA

For faster service, call toll free
800-638-8380
Fax: 301-654-4033 or
E-mail: info@cispubs.com

Postage and handling are additional unless payment accompanies order.

NOTE: FDTF=Federal Documents Task Force; IDTF=International Documents Task Force; SLDTF=State and Local Documents Task Force. This list is current as of February 1, 1996. An * indicates that this person is a member of the GODORT Steering Committee for 1995–1996.

GODORT OFFICERS

GODORT Chair*
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Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 496-2532; (617) 496-0440 (fax)
dgarner@fas.harvard.edu

GODORT Asst. Chair/Chair-Elect*
Andrea Sevetson
Government & Social Sciences Information Service
223 Library
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-6000
(510) 643-9346; (510) 643-6650 (fax)
asevetso@library.berkeley.edu

GODORT Secretary*
Myrtle S. (Smittie) Bolner
Business Administration & Government Documents
Middleton Library
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-3304
(504) 388-2570; (504) 388-6992 (fax)
notmsb@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu

GODORT Treasurer* (1997)
Judy Horn
Government Publications/Microforms Department
Main Library
University of California
P.O. Box 19557
Irvine, CA 92713
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GODORT Past Chair*
Mary Redmond
Cultural Education Center
New York State Library
Albany, NY 12230
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Anne Watts, Coordinator*
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1301 Olive Street
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Erminio D’Onofrio, Coordinator*
Documents Section, Room 225
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Awards Committee
Susan Tulis, Chair* (1997)
University of Virginia
Law School Library
580 Massie Road
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Social Sciences Team
University of Arizona Library
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University of Minnesota
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Documents/Maps Section
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In an election year, when your patrons are focused on campaigns, congressional races, voting records, gubernatorial races, key votes, the mood of the voters, the presidential race, Congress, new bills, legislative histories, old bills, legislative analyses, dead bills, resurrected bills, legislative outlooks, and anything else that enters their heads...

...Steer them to the CQ Weekly Report.

As a government information professional, you know more than most about just how busy things get in an election year. It’s at times like these that you could use a little help.

...Know what’s happening on Capitol Hill now. Our 60-member newsroom is dedicated to bringing you weekly status reports on every major political and legislative development.

...Know what bills mean. The CQ Weekly Report is written in plain English. Clear, objective insights cut through complex legislative language to explain the meaning and show the significance of congressional action.

...Know how Congress voted. Turn to the CQ Weekly Report for a clear, concise description of every roll call vote in any given week and how each member voted.

...Know what’s happening on the campaign trail. The CQ Weekly Report covers all the congressional and presidential primaries with candidate profiles and election results. Know who’s up, who’s down, who’s out — and why.

If these are the kind of things your patrons request routinely, you need Congressional Quarterly’s Weekly Report. After all, CQ’s been giving this support to government information professionals for 50 years — with the same hallmark accuracy, objectivity, and comprehensiveness. So why not call us about a free, no-obligation trial! Start the election year off right — with the CQ Weekly Report at your side. Call (202) 887-6279 now for details. Outside Washington, D.C., call (800) 432-2250 ext. 279.
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How Well Have Federal Agencies Been Doing Their Jobs?

FIND OUT FAST WITH

Reports Required by Congress

CIS Guide to Executive Communications and companion microfiche collection

Each year, federal departments and agencies file thousands of reports with the U.S. Congress to comply with statutory requirements. These reports detail how agencies have (or have not) responded to specific legislation.

Despite the value of these reports to a wide array of researchers, only a small fraction of them are published by GPO and find their way into depository libraries. Individual libraries' efforts to systematically acquire them are often unsuccessful.

Now, however, libraries can have full access to these valuable information resources with Reports Required by Congress: CIS Guide to Executive Communications and companion microfiche collection. Published quarterly, this resource is a researcher's best source for information on how federal agencies carry out their missions—a must for librarians, attorneys, policy makers and others.

To subscribe, or to receive more information, complete, photocopy, and mail the form below.

YES. Please start our 1996 quarterly subscription to Reports Required by Congress as follows:

☐ Printed index at $595 (first 1996 issue June 1996)
☐ CD-ROM index at $595 (first 1996 issue May 1996)
☐ Print and CD-ROM index at $745
☐ Send us more information, including pricing for the microfiche collection.

Name

Title

Organization

Address

City/State/Zip

Mail to: Congressional Information Service, Inc.
4520 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814-3389 USA

Telephone: 800-638-8380 or 301-654-1550
E-mail: info@cispubs.com
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Documents
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Government Documents Program
Charles C. Wise, Jr. Library
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890
(919) 962-1151; (919) 962-4451 (fax)
leveg@davis.mhs.unc.edu

Membership Committee
Sandra da Conturbia, Chair (1996)
Documents/Microtext
Sterling C. Evans Library
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-5000
(409) 862-1046; (409) 845-6238 (fax)
sdacounturbia@tamu.edu

Jill Moriearty (1997)
Documents Division
Marriott Library
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
(801) 581-8394; (801) 585-3464 (fax)
jmoriearty@alexandria.lib.utah.edu

Sherry Mosley (1996)
Library, Documents Department
Florida International University
8th Street SW & 107th Avenue
Miami, FL 33199
(305) 348-3137; (305) 348-3408 (fax)
smosley@servax.fiu.edu

Roberta Palen (1996)
Government Publications Department
Chicago Public Library
400 South State Street
Chicago, IL 60605
(312) 269-3021

Norma Carmack (1997)
Trinity University Library
715 Stadium Drive
San Antonio, TX 78212
(210) 736-7345
ncarmack@trinity.edu

Linda Johnson
Government Publications Department
Clark Library
San Jose State University
San Jose, CA 95192-0028
(408) 924-2814; (408) 924-2701 (fax)
johnsl@si.sjsu.edu

Karen Russ (1997)
Documents
Queens Borough Public Library
89-11 Merrick Boulevard
Jamaica, NY 11432
(718) 990-0769
karenm@queens.lib.ny.us

JoAnn Calzonetti
Government Documents Program
Charles C. Wise, Jr. Library
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890
(919) 962-1151; (919) 962-4451 (fax)
leveg@davis.mhs.unc.edu
The Serial Set maps, although widely owned, have been largely ignored because they are so difficult to access. The CIS Index and Carto-Bibliography will remedy this fault and add a vast corpus of original cartographic artifacts to the usable archives of American history.

— Robert W. Karrow, Jr., Administrative Curator of Special Collections and Curator of Maps, The Newberry Library

The more than 50,000 maps in the U.S. Serial Set constitute a record of the intellectual and cultural history of the United States from its youth through its maturity. They reveal the world — including the natural resource base of the North American continent — as it was known, and document the ways in which the land was explored and forever changed.

Often folded inside the published volumes, researchers have had to search page by fragile page to find those maps they knew to exist. But most Serial Set maps have remained undetected and unused.

First Time Access to Maps in the US Serial Set

CIS's new Index provides detailed access to Serial Set maps through four separate indexes: Subject/Geographic Area, Map Title, Personal Names, and Corporate Names.

The Carto-Bibliography thoroughly annotates each map, including a description of any special features, and lets you evaluate a map before retrieving it.

After you consult the Index and Carto-Bibliography, you can conveniently retrieve a reproduction of the map from the CIS US Serial Set on Microfiche, or use your library's hardcopy collection of the U.S. Serial Set.

The Index and Carto-Bibliography of Maps is being produced under the editorial direction of Donna P. Koepp, government documents and map librarian at the University of Kansas. The indexing work was done at the University of Kansas with support from the University. Additional support was provided by National Endowment for the Humanities grants and by a U.S. Department of Education Title II-C grant.

The maps from 1789–1897 cover a wide range of topics

- Inland transportation — lakes, rivers, and other natural waterways; canals; Indian trails; routes used by explorers, settlers, and the military; wagon roads and railroad routes
- Native Americans — population levels, ceded lands, migrations, reservations, villages, burial grounds
- Battlegrounds — Native American vs. European, United States vs. Mexican, Civil War
- Location of forts, trading posts, towns, warehouses, slaughter houses, mills, mines (gold, silver, lead, copper, iron ore, coal), furnaces
- Economic conditions — commerce, trade, mining, and manufacturing
- Early plans and population levels of towns and cities — Chicago, Washington DC, Key West, and other sites
- The environment — shoreline and inland vegetation, erosion, sediment buildup
- Navigational features — tides, coastlines, depths, ocean streams, water temperatures, dangers
- International areas — Canada, Mexico, Europe, and more

Publication Schedule

1789–1897 segment Available now
1897–1925 segment Fall 1996
1925–1969 segment Fall 1997

Each segment will comprise 4 or more hardbound volumes of some 600 pages each.

YES! Please send us more information on CIS US Serial Set Index, Part XIV: Index and Carto-Bibliography of Maps, 1789–1969

Name/Title
Organization
Address
City/State/Zip

Photocopy, complete and mail this form to:
Congressional Information Service, Inc.
4520 East–West Highway
Bethesda, MD 20814-3389 USA
Call toll-free: 800-638-8380
Outside the USA and Canada: 301-654-1550
Fax: 301-654-4033 • E-mail: info@cispubs.com
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The Congressional Research Service (CRS) produces hundreds of reports for Congress each year on a broad range of subjects, including the economy, foreign affairs, the environment, and many more. These reports are widely respected for their accuracy, thoroughness, and objectivity. CRS reports are not published or distributed to the general public. Now, however, UPA makes these valuable studies available to researchers everywhere in a convenient, accessible format.

"...an especially good resource for the documents or reference librarian to put into the hands of an undergraduate writing a term paper."  

Microform Review 12/4

Quarterly issues keep you current
UPA's quarterly index and microfiche service gives researchers quick access to the most up-to-date CRS analyses on current affairs. The index provides cumulative access by subject, CRS document number, and title. A cumulative reference bibliography contains abstracts of CRS items identified by the index, so you can evaluate a publication before retrieving it.

The companion microfiche collection, also updated quarterly, provides a current and convenient source for CRS reports.

Congressional Research Service Index on CD-ROM
Now UPA has brought the fact-finding speed and power of CD-ROM to Major Studies and Issue Briefs of the Congressional Research Service. With CRS on CD-ROM, researchers can quickly and easily locate CRS reports by subject, author, CRS report number, title, or by any word in the abstract provided for each title.

Both an annual edition (1995) and a retrospective edition (covering 1916-1994) are available now.

Send for Information...

Send us more information on Major Studies and Issue Briefs of the Congressional Research Service, including the new CRS Index on CD-ROM. We understand there is no obligation.

Name
Institution
Address
City/State/Zip

Photocopy and mail to:
University Publications of America
4520 East-West Highway
Bethesda, MD 20814-3389

Call toll free: 1-800-692-6300
Fax: 301-657-3203  E-mail: info@upapubs.com
(216) 991-2030; (216) 991-5951 (fax)  
shadm@library.cpl.org

Carol Turner  
University of Florida  
Library West  
Gainesville, FL 32611  
(904) 392-0342; (904) 392-7251 (fax)  
carturn@nervm.bitnet

Lucia Snowhill  
Government Publications Department  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106  
(805) 893-8724; (805) 893-4676 (fax)  
snowhill@library.ucsb.edu

Arlene Weible  
(See address under Education Committee)

Julia Wallace  
(See address under Awards Committee)

Cynthia Etkin  
(See address under FDTF)

Ad Hoc Committee on Statistical Measurement (1996)  
Nancy Kolenbrander, Chair (1995)

Documents Unit  
Hunter Library  
Western Carolina University  
Cullowhee, NC 28723-9002  
(704) 227-7252; (704) 227-7380 (fax)  
kolenbran@wcuvax1.wcu.edu

Sally Reeves (1995)  
Libraries  
University of Alabama  
Box 870266  
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0266  
(205) 348-6046, 1487  
(205) 348-8833 (fax)  
sreeves@ualvm.bitnet  
sreeves@ualvm.ua.edu

Government Documents and Maps  
Kennedy Library  
California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407  
(805) 756-1364; (805) 756-1415 (fax)  
jbrown@library.calpoly.edu

Government Publications Department  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9010  
(805) 893-4109; (805) 893-4676 (fax)  
lb10ceiz@ucsbuxa.bitnet

Government Documents  
Alderman Library  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, VA 22903-2498  
(804) 924-4337; (804) 924-4337 (fax)  
bms8e@virginia.edu

MISCELLANEOUS  
GODORT Liaison  
Patricia Muir  
ALA Washington Office  
American Library Association  
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.  
Suite 403  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 628-8410; (202) 628-8419 (fax)

Policy and Procedures Manual  
Sandra K. Peterson, Editor (1997)  
(See address under Publications Committee)

Documents to the People  
Jim Walsh, Editor (1996)  
Tisch Library  
Tufts University  
Medford, MA 02155  
(617) 627 3959; (617) 627-3002 (fax)  
jwalsh@library.tufts.edu

---

Editor of Documents to the People: Job Advertisement

The position of editor of Documents to the People (DttP) will be available January 1997. The position is a three-year appointment, with the option of reappointment for an additional three-year term. The initial appointment covers the period of January 1997 through December 1999 (DttP, volumes 25-27; four issues per volume).

The editor is responsible for: editing material submitted for publication; preparing final copy and layout; arranging for printing and mailing; delivering the final copy of each issue to the printer and the mailing house; and soliciting and appointing columnists and/or special articles. The editor also serves as a member of the GODORT Publications Committee and chairs and schedules the DttP Staff meeting at the ALA Annual and Midwinter Conferences.

Candidates must possess excellent writing and editing skills, organizational capabilities, the ability to meet deadlines, and the commitment to attend the ALA Annual and Midwinter Conferences during their term of appointment.

Benefits of the position include a $500 annual travel stipend and free registration at the Annual and Midwinter Conferences as a member of the press. Additional arrangements are negotiable (please state anticipated needs in your letter of application).

Send a letter of application, brief resume, and the names and addresses of three references to:

Timothy Byrne, Government Publications, Norlin Library, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0184;  
(303) 492-8834; (303) 492-2118 (fax)  
byrnet@spot.colorado.edu

The application deadline is May 15, 1996. Interviews, if possible, will be held during the 1995 ALA Annual Conference in New York City.

Selection will be made by the GODORT Publications Committee with the approval of the GODORT Executive Committee.
Check-in with DECK!

How DECK Works

We take every shipping list from the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) and transfer information to our Depository Express Check-in Kit (DECK) Shelf List Disk. This disk can be matched to your library's depository selection profile, so you receive records for only the items you select.

Bernan's Shelf List Disk allows you to maintain your depository shelflist in electronic format. This means you can reduce processing time and maintenance expenses, while increasing bibliographic control for government documents. With records in electronic format, you can do keyword searches on the title, as well as searches on the SuDoc classification number and item number.

Each Shelf List Disk is packaged with a printed list corresponding to the shipping lists contained on the disk. To receive records faster, Shelf List Disk subscribers can download their data from our Government Publications Network. Simply telnet to kraus.com and login as gpn.

DECKLIST Software

The Shelf List Disk is available in MARC and dBase formats. The dBase disk can be used with DECKLIST, a software package available from Bernan. DECKLIST is an intuitive, easy-to-use program designed to manipulate the bibliographic data on the Shelf List Disk. Also, the dBase disk can be used with dBase or any dBase-compatible database management software; this includes Paradox and Microsoft Access. Our MARC record disk can also be used in conjunction with Auto-Graphics' GPO Tape Extraction Service. The shipping list records on the Shelf List Disk can be replaced on a library's local system with the corresponding full cataloging records from Auto-Graphics' GPO Tapes. Also, a file can be modified to contain check-in dates, location and other information relevant to your library.

DECK fields include:

- Item Number
- Title
- SuDoc Classification Number
- Shipping List Number

"Reduces staff time for processing, shelving and shelflisting. Your product is the ultimate GPO depository tool."

Bill O'Brien, Government Publications Librarian
Washington University

Bernan Press 4651 F Assembly Drive, Lanham, MD 20706 USA • Internet: query@kraus.com
(800) 416-4378 • (301) 459-7666 (local) • (800) 465-3450 (fax)
From the Chair

Diane Garner
GODORT Chair

Transition to a More Electronic Depository Program

GODORT's time in San Antonio was largely occupied with reacting to GPO's by now famous Transition Plan, and a very constructive time it was. With careful preparation from Federal Documents Task Force, the Legislation, Education, GITCO, and Cataloging Committees and the Steering Committee, GODORT succeeded in writing:

* resolutions that were passed by ALA Council.
* a formal response to GPO (delivered on February 6, 1996).
* a more detailed informal response to GPO.

The text of the response can be found on GODORT's Web page at: www.lib.berkeley.edu/GSSI/gdlbn.html

It was a massive undertaking and special thanks should go to Anne Watts for organizing the FDTF work group meeting to get input, to Gary Cornwell and the Legislation Committee for writing resolutions into the wee small hours, and to Cindy Elkin who spearheaded the writing of the formal response.

The concerns expressed at the Midwinter meetings and incorporated into GODORT's response centered around several themes:

* TIMING of the transition—the general consensus was that October 1998 is much too soon for government agencies, for GPO, and for libraries and users;
* FUNDING— we passed a resolution calling for full funding for the Depository Library Program during the transition period; the program is going to cost at least as much during the transition as it has in the paper/microfiche era. Lacking hard data, we suspect it may even cost more.
* APPROPRIATE FORMATS AND ACCESS— Effectiveness, efficiency, equity—the Big 3 E's that along with no-fee public access remain the criteria by which we judge the Depository Library Program. Our response stresses that a variety of formats, suitable to the material and to the needs of the public, and fully accessible to the public should be maintained.
* PRESERVATION—GPO and NARA need strong statutory support to ensure an effective program to preserve access in a dynamic electronic environment, including migrating to new platforms.

The work goes on. The "Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a Successful Transition to a More Electronic Federal Depository Library Program" is due in Congress in March. On February 6 GPO convened a meeting of the Advisory Group to go over the Study Task Force reports that were finished by that time. ALA was represented by Carol Henderson and Anne Heunne, GODORT by yours truly. Other GODORT members there under other hats—Dan O'Mahony, Mary Alice Baish, Julie Wallace, Maggie Farrell Parmamovich, and Jan Fryer. LC, NARA, CENDINCTIS, OMB, and of course GPO had representatives. The Advisory Group reviewed the five Study Task Force reports released by that time. (These five TF reports appeared on GOVDOC-L in February with an invitation to comment to GPO. I hope that GODORTers took the opportunity to share their reactions). The source data in the TF reports serve as the background for the final Study report that will appear about the same time as this issue of DtP. The TF reports themselves will be appendices to the final report. Some of the questions that emerged in discussion of the TF reports included:

* authentication of authoritative content of electronic government publications.
* Web sites and Bulletin Boards plans seem to concentrate on government Web sites, but what about EBBs? Which files are covered?
* cost comparisons of file vs. electronic as a dissemination medium and/or a preservation medium.

Meanwhile, the library group that brought out the "Model for a New Universe..." (ALA, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Association of Research Libraries, the Medical Libraries Association, and the Special Libraries Association) has responded to the Transition Plan using GODORT's response and the resolutions passed at Midwinter as a basis. This document will also be used as an attachment to the testimony of ALA President, Betty Turock, at GPO's appropriation hearing on March 6.

It's been a long road from Dupont Circle to Chicago to the Forum in Washington D.C. last summer and now to the Transition. GODORTers have been pushing all the way. It feels at last as if many streams are coalescing into a movement, slow but inexorable. It feels at last as if we are having an effect. While it is too early to celebrate, we can at least pat ourselves on the back for hard work and persistence.

ALA President Candidates

Candidates for the ALA Presidency visited the GODORT Business Meeting at Midwinter, and an impressive group they were. They all expressed appreciation for GODORT and the work it does. They all had concerns about the electronic future (or present). And at least two of the candidates talked about problems of ALA organization and the issue of round table representation. Although neither the Business Meeting nor the Steering Committee voted to formally endorse a candidate, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal preference for Barbara Ford. She is a GODORT member; she was one of the Founding Mothers of GODORT. She has actively sought our support and input for months. In Barbara Ford we would have an ALA President who knows our concerns from long experience. In Barbara Ford we have a most sympathetic ear. She's one of us. I urge GODORT members to vote for her.

From the Editor

Jim Walsh
Editor, Documents to the People

This will be a very short column this month. This issue, along with the regular columns, includes some feature articles, including the papers from GODORT's "Shotgun Marriages and Amicable Divorces" program (Miami, 1994). I apologize for the delay with this issue, but a number of technological (hardware and software) problems appeared one after another and production was at a standstill. Deadline for the next issue (June 1996) is:

April 1, 1996
Available now from CIS —

Index by Reported Bill Numbers
Part XIII to the CIS U.S. Serial Set Index

An essential resource for fast, thorough legislative research

The U.S. Serial Set is perhaps the single most valuable collection of American historical documents in existence. The publication of Parts I through XII of the CIS U.S. Serial Set Index brought unprecedented access to publications that make up the U.S. Serial Set prior to 1970. These include committee reports, documents, House and Senate journals, rule manuals, executive branch publications, and much more.

Now research using the Serial Set is faster and easier than ever before with Part XIII, Index by Reported Bill Numbers.

Precise access by bill number to thousands of legislative reports

With one fast and easy look-up in this index, researchers can quickly identify legislative reports that reported on individual congressional bills. For legislative history research, the Index by Reported Bill Numbers is a vital time saver.

It gives you fast, reliable access to some 100,000 congressional reports from more than 150 years of history. For bills that became law—and bills that did not—this index is critical for those who need to determine legislative intent. It is a valuable stand-alone reference even for libraries that do not own other parts of the CIS U.S. Serial Set Index.

“CIS’s new index by reported bill numbers is another in a long line of finding aids that will save patrons time and law librarians headaches. With 150 years worth of legislation so thoroughly indexed, the fear of missing an important factor of legislative intent will be a thing of the past.”

Charlene Cain, Law Librarian
Louisiana State University

A must reference for law libraries and others with Serial Set holdings
Arranged similarly to the other numerical lists in the first 12 parts of the CIS U.S. Serial Set Index, the Index by Reported Bill Numbers shows in chronological order:

• The Congress in which the bill or resolution was introduced
• The bill or resolution number
• The number and title of the relevant congressional report
• The Serial Set volume number where the report can be located.

After consulting the index, researchers can conveniently retrieve the full text of the report by consulting the CIS U.S. Serial Set on Microfiche. Or, alternatively, they can use a library’s hardcopy collection of congressional documents.

Complete, photocopy, and mail the form below to order.

-----------

Yes! Please send us
CIS U.S. Serial Set Index, Part XIII: Index by Reported Bill Numbers

Special price for past buyers of the complete CIS U.S. Serial Set Index (Parts I–XII):

☑ $1,195

List price:
☑ $1,320

Order Form

Name__________________________ Title__________________________
Organization__________________________
Address__________________________
City/State/Zip__________________________

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
4520 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814-3389 USA

Speed your order! Call toll-free 800-638-8380 • Fax 301-634-4033 • E-mail info@cispubs.com
GODORT Treasurer's Report FY 1994 -- 1995 (year end)

Judy Horn, GODORT Treasurer
(Reported at the 1996 ALA Midwinter Conference, San Antonio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110</td>
<td>Sub. DTTP</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>7,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4140</td>
<td>Advert. DTTP</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>Conf. Reg. Fees</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301</td>
<td>Grants/Awards Non-Govt</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4421</td>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,991</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5016</td>
<td>Professional Memberships</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5122</td>
<td>Bank Service Fees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5151</td>
<td>Duplicating Outside</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5210</td>
<td>Travel/Transportation</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5212</td>
<td>Lodging &amp; Meals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5216</td>
<td>Business Meetings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300</td>
<td>Facilities/Rent</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5301</td>
<td>Conference Equipment</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5302</td>
<td>Meal Functions</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5303</td>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5304</td>
<td>Speaker/Guest Expense</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5306</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>3,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5350</td>
<td>Program Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5401</td>
<td>Typesetting/Compos. Outside DTTP</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5402</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>23,960</td>
<td>20,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410</td>
<td>Mail Service</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5414</td>
<td>Supplies DTTP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500</td>
<td>Supplies/Operating</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5520</td>
<td>Equip. Rental/Lease</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5522</td>
<td>Telephone/Fax</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5523</td>
<td>Postage/E-mail</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>2,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5560</td>
<td>ALA Wash. Office</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5902</td>
<td>IUT Data Processing</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5909</td>
<td>IUT Dist. Ctr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5910</td>
<td>IUT Reprographics</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5911</td>
<td>IUT Overhead</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5999</td>
<td>IUT Misc.</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,595</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,856</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenues** 39,991

**Net Revenue** 2,135

**Fund Balance (8/31/95)** 49,773
U.S. Government Periodicals Index

Find articles in federal periodicals quickly and easily

CIS's U.S. Government Periodicals Index gives you quick and easy access to articles contained in some 180 key U.S. government periodicals. Each quarter, this detailed index covers over 2,500 articles in a wide variety of fields — the environment, public health and medicine, agriculture, defense and the military, business, food and nutrition, rural development, transportation, labor, and much more. The interdisciplinary coverage makes the U.S. Government Periodicals Index the ideal resource for any library serving patrons who use government periodicals.

Choose from several formats

To meet the wide-ranging needs of all types of libraries, the U.S. Government Periodicals Index is available in print, CD-ROM, and tape formats. It is also available now through CitiDel® and soon on UnCover® and other popular library database systems. And for easy retrieval of articles identified by the index, CIS offers a fast and reliable article delivery service.

Complete and mail the form below to subscribe or receive more information.

Yes. Start our one-year subscription to CIS's U.S. Government Periodicals Index as follows:

- Print at $835
- CD-ROM
  - Single workstation/single building network at $835
  - Campus-wide network at $1,335
- Print and CD-ROM
  - Single workstation/single building network at $1,045
  - Campus-wide network at $1,465
- Magnetic tape at $1,870
- Send us more information about retrospective coverage.

Mail to: CIS
Congressional Information Service, Inc.
4520 East-West Highway
Bethesda, MD USA 20814-3389

Telephone: 800-838-8380 or 301-854-1550 • Fax: 301-854-4033
E-mail: info@cispubs.com
This preliminary budget was presented at Midwinter, 1996 for consideration by the GODORT Steering Committee and membership. The 1997-1998 budget will be approved at the 1996 Annual Conference, New York, July 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110</td>
<td>Sub. DTTP</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4140</td>
<td>Advert. DTTP</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>Conf. Reg. Fees</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>Grants/Awards Non-Govt</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4421</td>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5016</td>
<td>Professional Memberships</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5016.1</td>
<td>COPAFS</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5016.2</td>
<td>Freedom to Read</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5016.3</td>
<td>APDU</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5016.4</td>
<td>CUAC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5122</td>
<td>Bank Service Fees</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5151</td>
<td>Duplicating Outside</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5210</td>
<td>Travel/Transportation</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5210.1</td>
<td>Round Table Chair</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5210.2</td>
<td>Legislator Chair</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5210.3</td>
<td>DTTP Editor</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300</td>
<td>Facilities/Rent</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5301</td>
<td>Conference Equipment</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5302</td>
<td>Meal Function</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5303</td>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5304</td>
<td>Speaker/Guest Expense</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5304.1</td>
<td>Preconference</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5304.2</td>
<td>GODORT Program</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5306</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5306.1</td>
<td>C.J. Reynolds</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5306.2</td>
<td>J.B. Childs</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5306.3</td>
<td>B. Hoduski</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5306.4</td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5350</td>
<td>Program Allocation</td>
<td>(425)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5401</td>
<td>Typesetting/Compos. Outside DTTP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5402</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>23,960</td>
<td>23,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5402.1</td>
<td>DTTP</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>22,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5402.2</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410</td>
<td>Mail Service</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410.1</td>
<td>DTTP</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410.2</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5414</td>
<td>Supplies DTTP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMYSTIFYING DOCUMENTS: 
Finding Federal Government Information

A preconference workshop designed for reference professionals who are learning to incorporate federal government information into their reference service and developing government information reference skills.

JULY 5, 1996, 9:00 am to 4:30 pm
ALA Annual Conference, New York City. (Location to be announced)
Cost: $75
Sponsored by:
GODORT Education Committee
RASD Business Reference and Services Section
ACRL Law and Political Science Section

For more information contact: Yvonne Wilson, (714) 824-2542 or ymwilson@uci.edu
Arlene Weible, (503) 375-5343 or awelble@willamette.edu

Presenters

Beth Woodard, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL.
"Selecting Training Strategies for the Generalist Providing Documents Service"

Marilyn Moody, SUNY at Buffalo, NY.
"Searching for Government Information: What's the Difference?"

Michael Lavin, SUNY at Buffalo, NY.
"Business sources: The Business of Government Is Business"

Larry Romans, Vanderbilt University, TN.
Yvonne Wilson, University of California at Irvine, CA.
"Social Issue sources: They have Your Number!"

Arlene Weible, Willamette University, OR.
Karen Diller, Washington State University at Vancouver, WA.
"Legislative sources: Knowing the Process"

Registration Form

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
Institution: ____________________________
Email: ____________________________ Telephone: ____________________________ FAX: ____________________________

Is your institution a federal depository library?   ___Yes   ___No

Registration Deadline: May 17, 1996.
Space is limited, so please register early!
Return form with $75 registration check, payable to GODORT, to:
Arlene Weible
Periodicals and Government Documents Librarian
Willamette University
Mark O. Hatfield Library
Salem, OR 97301
FAX: (503) 370-6141
Web Development

Many of the resources formerly on the gopher at UC Berkeley are now maintained on the UC Berkeley Library's Web site as part of the "Resources of use to Government Documents Librarians" homepage. You may find them by using a Web browser and opening http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/GSSI/gdlibn.html

For those without a Web browser, there is also a lynx interface. Simply gopher to:

    infolib.berkeley.edu 70
    login: guest

After you set your terminal type, choose "Library Web Server via Lynx" Select "Help/Search" and search for "GODORT" (a unique word). A list of items matching your query will appear. Select the title "Resources of Use to Government Documents Librarians"

For your reading pleasure, there are sections pointing to Depository Library Council resources, GODORT resources, other Professional Associations, "Electronic Future" documents, and Fact Sheets.

Should you forget, there is an announcement of this page on the gopher listing the URL and giving the lynx instructions.

Andrea Sevetson, GSSI, Rm 223, Library, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-6000; asevetso@library.berkeley.edu

GODORT Committee Opportunities!

For those of you interested in serving on GODORT Committees, there are openings on all GODORT Committees! If the amendment to the GODORT bylaws is passed, there will be an additional standing committee - a committee on Rare and Endangered Documents.

There is information about GODORT committees on the web page: http://www.library.berkeley.edu/GSSI/gdlibn.html located in the GODORT Bylaws and the GODORT Policy and Procedures Manual. To get a feel for the recent committee activities, consult your earlier issues of DttP for the minutes of the committees.

Volunteers need to be GODORT members, willing to commit to four successive ALA's (midwinter and annual), and be willing to work! Please contact me by letter or e-mail if you would like to be considered for a committee appointment.

Andrea Sevetson, GSSI, Rm 223, Library, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-6000; asevetso@library.berkeley.edu
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION IN THE ELECTRONIC ENVIRONMENT
(A GODORT WHITEPAPER)
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January 1996

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and
never will be...If we are to guard against ignorance and remain free, it is the responsibility of every
American to be informed. Thomas Jefferson
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I. INTRODUCTION

Government Documents librarians have always risen to the challenges of locating government information on behalf of citizens
and they have worked diligently to preserve free and unrestricted access to government information. However, as the Internet, and
the proposed National Research and Education Network (NREN), and the National Information Infrastructure (NII) systems were
being developed in the early 1990's, government document librarians were faced with a new scenario of delivering information.
Would librarians be able to ensure free and open access to government information in the new electronic environment? How
would Federal Depository Libraries continue to provide their traditional "safety net" for public access to the democratic process?
Concerned about these questions, the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) of the American Library Association
(ALA) formed an Ad Hoc Committee on the Internet to look into electronic delivery of information and to present their findings to
the government documents community in a whitepaper.

This whitepaper addresses several topics including, the nature of electronic information, access, preservation, education, legislation
and regulations. The whitepaper also examines the future role of depository libraries and possible scenarios. Although the
whitepaper cannot predict the future of government information on the NII, hopefully it will raise the awareness of policy makers and
librarians as the information superhighway continues to develop.

The process of investigating and writing on issues regarding the Internet and government information was indeed challenging for the
committee. New legislative proposals and technologies were being developed as the committee worked on the whitepaper causing the
committee to fear that the whitepaper may be out of date as soon as it was published. However, it is the committee's hope that the
whitepaper will contribute to the ongoing dialogue of electronic government information and preserve the fundamental right of
accessing government information for future generations regardless of technology.

It is the goal of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Internet to contribute to the current discussions of the role of depository libraries within an electronic environment. This whitepaper reflects the numerous discussions of the committee and is not official ALA nor GODORT policy. The whitepaper is a thought piece hopefully raising issues for future discussions within GODORT and among documents librarians. The Internet holds great potential in expanding access to government information and depository librarians are central in making this promise a reality.

II. NATURE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Information serves as the lifeblood of the American way of life. Indeed, a democracy functions best when citizens are guaranteed
affordable, if not free, access to government information and data. Technology now promises 24-hour access from one's home or
office to the information vital for participation in public decision-making. Librarians, who have historically served as intermediaries between government information and the public, can bring expertise to the content, usability, service, and policies of electronic information dissemination.
When the Government Documents Round Table appointed its Ad Hoc Committee on the Internet in June 1993, dissemination of government information on the Internet was new. Several Federal agencies had launched electronic bulletin boards in the 1980's, academic libraries had been distributing government information on their gopher systems for about a year, the Library of Congress launched its Marvel gopher the previous month, and the Clinton-Gore Administration was just beginning its efforts to establish a National Information Infrastructure. The committee's major challenge was convincing governments and libraries about the potential of a new medium.

Clearly this is no longer the case. Most Federal, many international and foreign, and some state and local agencies provide electronic access to their information via the Internet and/or World Wide Web. Most academic libraries provide electronic access to government information while connectivity is rapidly expanding between public libraries and private citizens.

The technology to which government agencies are increasingly turning as a replacement for paper-based publications is the Internet, the international network of networks forming the backbone of the Clinton Administration's National Information Infrastructure (NII). Internet resources such as Gopher and the World-Wide Web (WWW) have proven themselves as popular and effective distribution tools for government information. However, several questions arise concerning the cost of Internet-based databases and archival capabilities of computer media in general. GODORT, therefore, should vigilantly monitor all developments that might affect depositories and their ability to serve cliental. We should not have to choose between limited Internet access and cancellation of valuable print titles. Our goal is to raise these issues for further discussion among librarians and recommend concrete actions by which they can be addressed.

A. ISSUES

1. Content of Government Information
   a. What types of information are essential for participation in public decision-making at all levels of government? Examples: city ordinances, directories of government officials, case and statutory legal documents, bills, and legislative proceedings. Should guidelines be established to determine minimal goals for Internet distribution?

b. What types of information are amenable to Internet distribution as opposed to other media? Examples: timely information; short documents; longer documents which can be formatted into viewable, or easily downloaded, segments; data which can be manipulated by a user's own statistical software; and information with a low probability of public dissemination ("fugitive documents").

c. To what extent should Internet dissemination replace other information media, given the cost savings involved? To what extent should documents are disseminated in duplicate formats (i.e., both paper and Internet dissemination)?

2. Access to Government Information
   a. How can Internet connectivity best be extended to every American community and every library? When the White House introduced its World Wide Web home page in Fall 1994, many academic and public libraries were unable to connect. Indeed, some public libraries still lack connectivity to nongraphical sources on the Internet.

b. To what extent should governments provide free information, rather than placing it on a cost recovery basis? Both models currently exist within the Federal government. Are there certain types of information that should be free (e.g., legal information vs. economic data); does cost depend on the mission of the agency (e.g., Office of Business Economics vs. the Census Bureau); is it contingent on the availability of other formats (e.g., Government Manual in electronic or paper formats); or is cost-recovery appropriate for value-added products or documents that are electronically reformatted for enhanced usability?

c. Federal government information has seldom been copyrighted, providing the private sector and public institutions opportunities for remanipulation and redistribution of the material. Government downsizing initiatives raise several questions: to what extent will government information remain exempt from copyright laws; to what extent will government depend on the private sector for software development to access its raw data; will trademark laws be used in lieu of copyright laws to discourage information redistribution; and which publications of state, local and international agencies should be extended copyright exemption?

d. Who should be responsible for disseminating government information on the Internet? While most Federal agencies are distributing information via the Internet and World-Wide Web, there are numerous models: formal and informal cooperative partnerships between Federal/state government agencies and universities, free distribution of information purchased from the government and subsequently reformatted, commercial distribution of information purchased from the government and subsequently reformatted, local area freenets, and the use of commercial vendors such as America On-line.

e. What is the role of the Government Printing Office or a successor? Does GPO have the staff and expertise to serve as a clearinghouse? Would a clearinghouse function encourage or discourage electronic distribution by the Executive Branch?

f. Some fee-based government services are available free to depository libraries with a single-site or limited number of passwords. Should all electronic information be made available free to depository libraries under the current depository library law? Should depository libraries be permitted to network their passwords to their own communities? If site-wide access is allowed what obligations should depositories assume to guarantee both usage and support?

g. While electronic dissemination is often a cost-saving measure for the information producer, libraries are bearing additional costs for hardware, software, connectivity, staff training, and auxiliary items such as paper for printing. Will costs create a gap between the "information rich" and the "information poor?" Will the benefits of electronic access outweigh the costs?

3. Usability of Electronic Government Information

Software packages, access points, organization, and usability vary widely for both government and non-government information currently available on the Internet. Nothing is more frustrating than identifying the perfect file only to discover it is 140 characters wide, there are no definitions in the headers, the information is outdated, or it requires special software to view.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Government Information Technology Committee (GITCO) of ALA GODORT, in collaboration with the library
community-at-large, should encourage discussion of these issues, perhaps through an open forum, and establish guidelines for digital collections and archives (quality-control, depth of coverage, location of back files, frequency of backups, etc.). Other ALA groups should be invited to these forums and recommendations forwarded to the library community-at-large. GODORT might also sponsor joint pre-conferences or workshops with interested organizations or round tables within ALA.

2. ALA GODORT's agency liaison program should be expanded for state, local and international agencies. In future discussions, GODORT might wish to expand even further the mission of the liaison program to coordinate archive maintenance and collection development of electronic information through such partnerships as the DOSFAN network, a successful dissemination program of the University of Illinois at Chicago and the U.S. State Department. The program would also serve as a clearinghouse to match libraries and agencies who are interested in cooperative relationships.

3. The Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, state library organizations, local public libraries and GODORT agency liaisons should work with each other and their respective government agencies in implementing the minimal guidelines and recommend data or documents for scanning, or direct input into Internet-accessible media.

4. Long documents should be formatted into shorter segments which allow fast and convenient downloading (via FTP) or viewing online. If possible, text should be arranged by attribute or geographic area, to improve indexing and retrieval, thereby assuring relevance to the user.

5. Before replacing or eliminating disseminated information in traditional formats (e.g., paper, microform, CD-ROM) with Internet resources, the historical and/or legal value of the information should be considered. Likewise, decisions on which format to disseminate government information should reflect the fact that many citizens, as well as libraries, do not yet have Internet connectivity. Examples of documents that should allow multiple formats include the Congressional Record, National Park guides, weather data, and legislative digests. Examples which might not require format duplication include weather forecasts and press releases.

6. Government initiatives toward a National Information Infrastructure as well as the expansion of state-based and commercial dial-in connections to the Internet provide every reason for optimism that all Americans, regardless of location, will have access to the Internet. The Government Documents Round Table and American Library Association should support all legislative and commercial efforts that expand these services at a low cost to the consumer. In the meantime, GODORT and the Depository Library Council should recommend dual formats for critical government publications so that those without Internet connectivity may still access the information.

7. Freenets are an example of local initiatives and partnerships which encourage local connectivity. Legislation, regulations, and funding should be developed to encourage local efforts in building networks which support local interests and governments.

8. Free versus fee dissemination is a difficult, if not controversial, issue. GODORT and ALA's Washington Office need to carefully monitor the situation for appropriate legislative recommendations.

9. Recognizing the public good that depository libraries provide their communities as a safety net for those who cannot afford Internet access, legislatures should mandate free access to government information through state and local libraries.

10. A principle of minimum information needed for citizen participation in decision-making, or an Information Bill of Rights, could help establish a guideline for determining which documents and databases to make available for free. Titles should include Congressional and state bills, the Federal Register (and state and local equivalents), environmental impact statements, etc.

11. Copyright and trademark issues will become increasingly important in the electronic environment. GODORT and the ALA Washington Office should carefully monitor the situation for legislative recommendations.

12. A clearinghouse should be established within the Government Documents Round Table to document the existing agency-depository library partnerships, recommend guidelines for partnerships, and assist in the establishment of new partnerships for those agencies or institutions requesting assistance. The clearinghouse is specifically intended to encourage creativity, resource sharing, and greater cooperation between government agencies and depository libraries.

13. GODORT should commend the Superintendent of Documents for its recent efforts toward GPO Access and the Government Information Locator Service.

14. GODORT should encourage legislators to financially support GPO's activities. Should layoffs be necessary due to budget cuts, the Public Printer should be encouraged to retain on staff those key employees with the expertise for developing electronic services.

15. The Government Printing Office should be encouraged to obtain a minimum of one free password for all government fee-based electronic services. Libraries should be permitted to network their passwords to their own communities (academic libraries to their universities, main public libraries to their branches, etc.) provided they have means for authenticating the identities of their users. All electronic systems would be available to the public on a walk-in basis.

16. Studies on the cost of depository library status were conducted several years ago. The American Library Association, with assistance from GODORT, should conduct a new study on the cost of depository library status in an electronic environment and relay this information through its Washington Office as legislative opportunities develop.

17. Multiple format options should be provided to Federal depository libraries for the foreseeable future through the GPO item selection process.

18. The Government Information Technology Committee should publish guidelines for the organization of government information on the Internet, based on its own previous work and the existing literature. GITCO may even suggest a MARC-like format for bibliographic records, possibly using the Government Information Locator System (GILS) or the National Spatial Digital Infrastructure (NSDI) as models. In particular, guidelines are needed by libraries and library organizations for non-Federal documents. Elements include:
a. the timeliness and dating of files
b. metadata (information about the content and format of data and individual data elements)
c. help or "readme" files containing sources of information, definitions, software or installation instructions, contacts for additional information, etc.
d. file appearance (width, headers, etc.)
e. arrangement of menus (clear, descriptive titles, dates on submenus, hierarchies)
f. file indexing with instructions provided in the help file
g. standards which may be unique to specific Internet applications (e.g., Hypertext Mark up Language for the World-Wide Web). One standard might be the provision of shareware for viewing those files which require it.

19. Federal, state, and local government agencies should seek input from the depository library community, and other interested users, prior to publishing or creating new electronic information products or services. Libraries should evaluate new software, hardware and technology for its potential impact on access and usability. Libraries, in fact, are the ideal candidates for beta testing of new electronic or online products, and could offer useful advice to agencies on indexing and usability.

III. ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Issues of access to electronic government information are affected by the government agencies which publish the information, the Federal legislature responsible for establishing policies, the administration of the publishing agencies, the depository librarians who retrieve the information, and the electronic climate as it responds to software, hardware, and telecommunication trends and protocols. Hence these observations and recommendations for the future may be dated before they are even created.

The issues here attempt to create an information retrieval standard so that depository libraries speak the same language. This is an age of budget cuts, an uncertain future for the Government Printing Office and Library Programs Service, and a Congress in flux. When these factors are combined with the burgeoning number of users of electronic information, and the trend for agencies and legislative branches of government to move toward electronic media as a means of distributing their documents, there clearly needs to be some central method for organization. One central governing body, such as Library Programs Service within GPO, needs to coordinate the publishing and distribution of agency materials for their distribution to depository libraries, regardless of the media. The lack of ubiquitous user interfaces can only be alleviated if agencies organize and communicate. If all agencies who make their information available through the depository library program would tailor their products with user-friendly interfaces that correspond with other agency counterparts, this would alleviate many or the problems which libraries face. A central gateway on the Internet would be one solution, but tenuous electronic telecommunication currently makes the Internet an unreliable source. Furthermore there is a need for a central index which tracks titles based on their content regardless of format, particularly one that analyzes compendiums. The following points attempt to address specific issues relevant to the access to electronic government information.

A. ISSUES

1. Equipment

Perhaps the least common denominator is assuring that all depository libraries have the ability to comply with the minimum recommended guidelines for electronic equipment, as described within Administrative Notes. This includes Internet connectivity, CD-ROM access, and the capability to download information to disk or paper. These will be requirements for depository library status within the next two years. The question remains however, whether or not all depository libraries will be able to afford these standards. The expense entailed is due not only to the hardware implementation, but also the personnel costs, the cost of subscribing to the Internet, and peripheral expenses such as printing, upgrades to software, etc. Just as libraries currently comprise bibliographic consortia for all types of information, a support system needs to be in place to assure that those currently disenfranchised libraries can indeed support access to electronic government information for their communities. Government policy needs to address funding for depository access as it does for print distribution. The value of information delivery lies in its retrieval. Currently approximately 80% of depository libraries are connected to the Internet. There are layers of connectivity however, and once again a common denominator needs to be established.

Information can be transmitted through telecommunication channels or distributed physically on CD-ROM, floppy disk, and magnetic tape. The Internet is becoming an ever increasing popular carrier for information and interactive communication. The advantages are minimal time lags, distributed information servers which can be united via user-friendly interfaces, multimedia and text browsers which allow individuals to customize menus for their local environment, the ability transfer files, and log into remote sites. The drawbacks are that the future of the Internet remains uncertain as the government promises to hand the responsibility of managing the backbone to commercial vendors. Furthermore, access is not free; there continues to be a lack of standard interfaces; many users do not have the equipment to experience the full potential of the Internet (sound and graphics); broadband congestion can slow or disrupt connections; downtime may result from problems with remote or local servers; privacy is dubious; access is varied and depends on the type of Internet connectivity; and technical expertise continues to be lacking.

2. Freedom to access

The Internet is a potential medium for collaboration between libraries, LPS, politicians, and users of communities and backgrounds. Given that all U.S. citizens are entitled to public government information via the depository library program, access should be guaranteed and preserved. Given that electronic information is generally more flexible and economical than print, the potential is promising.

In an ideal world, all information is delivered through one central gateway and there is one telecommunications platform. There is one comprehensive search engine which retrieves the appropriate documents based on a weighted term search, which utilizes Boolean operators, and limits terms by specific fields. All libraries are connected with the state of the art equipment, there is never any downtime, cost is irrelevant, and all publishing agencies comply with designated standards which assure, among other things that the information is indexed and will never suddenly disappear. This information is provided to the users when there is a demand for it, as opposed to potentially stockpiling books on dusty shelves. Files can be downloaded to a diskette, to paper, or sent through electronic mail. Duplication is unnecessary, delay is minimized, and all libraries share the same potential collection and access capabilities.
In the world of government information this scenario is a bit farfetched, but it is quite acceptable when speaking in terms of commercial vendors of information databases. The difference is that commercial information is costly and is copywritten. Commercial vendors however can serve as a model for serving their clientele in a competitive era. Furthermore, although the government often contracts with private vendors, publishers, and software developers to provide an added value to information databases, this process should never be one which prohibits free access to government information.

3. Standardization
Creating standards for the future is a project which relies on collaboration at many levels, but which is only as good as its leadership at each level. The tiers which comprise the entire working system include government, the agencies, and the libraries and information professionals.

a. Government
The Federal government promised us a "National Information Infrastructure," yet to date the future of the Internet is still unregulated and tenuous. Funding must be appropriated to a central administrative body to assure equitable and efficient distribution of public information to depository libraries. Where collaborative projects between libraries and agencies exist, funding should be appropriated to reward those libraries for their time, expertise, and physical equipment. Network subscription costs for libraries and educational institutions should be affordable and nondiscriminatory. Rural and remote libraries should have equal participation as they often stand the most to gain.

b. Agencies
The creators of agency publications need to consider libraries when developing their products. To the extent that it is possible, all information which is distributed in electronic format should be accompanied by software and documentation. Efforts should be made to use software which is intuitive and does not require high-end equipment. Agencies should communicate with each other to find a common ground, and should likewise be in collaboration with government documents librarians and other information specialists. Agencies must acknowledge that although the World Wide Web has become an extremely popular platform, programs should not rely on multimedia components to be an official element to the content, as many libraries although connected to the Internet, still rely on text-only browsers. When at all possible, dial-in access should be provided alongside telnet capability. Such is the case with GPO Access which offers WAIS, SWAIS, and WWW capabilities.

c. Libraries
Information professionals must continue to provide public access to government information regardless of its format. In addition to understanding the content, they will need to be technologically savvy, and keep up with new innovations in electronic information delivery. They must provide honest feedback to administrators on all levels. Often agencies do not realize the barriers that exist within a library setting with regards to access to government information. Libraries have the clientele, the opportunity to provide training, outreach, and shared collection management with electronic materials. Such is the case at the University of Michigan, which offers data from the Department of Commerce's Electronic Bulletin Board on their Web server. The very nature of the Internet and its concept of distributed information servers make the potential for collaboration between libraries of all types, agencies, legislators, and constituents greater than ever before. The worst barrier to this, however, would be an information quagmire consisting of disorganized, duplicative efforts resulting from poor planning and foresight.

B. CURRENT INITIATIVES
Two projects are worthy of mention. The first is GPO Access. This database provides indexing and full text to regulatory information, including access to the Federal Register, Code of Federal Regulations, Congressional Register, Congressional bills, the public laws, GAO Reports, and other related materials. Access is offered via the Internet as a telnet session for those with direct Internet connectivity, or through dial-in connections via a modem. Initially a fee-based service with free access for depository libraries, this service is now provided free of charge to the general public. The WAIS software indicates relevance feedback to search queries. Documentation is available online. Time lags have been reduced to approximately 24 hours, and time can be of the essence when dealing with Federal regulatory information. However, there have been complaints with regard to user support, faulty documentation, the difficulty of downloading large documents, and the inconstancy in the directions given to librarians for registration. As a gateway prototype, however, GPO Access is a commendable model.

Another notable initiative is the Government Information Locator Service (GILS). GILS is a cooperative agreement between the U.S. Geological Survey, Syracuse University, and several ANSI Z39.50 implementors. 1 The purpose is to establish a standard syntax for records describing government publications, to create a corresponding subject locator based upon controlled indexing vocabulary, and to locate public sites which provide access to government information resources. A prototype currently exists for trial at the GILS WWW site. This creates perhaps the most ideal situation to date, although its worth will rely heavily on the collaborative efforts of many.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Federal governments should provide funding for depository access to Federal agency online databases. State and local governments should provide funding and access to local libraries for local electronic information.

2. Technology and network grants need to be provided for libraries to facilitate equipment purchases.

3. Legislation and regulations are necessary to ensure open access to electronic government information.

4. Regulations to guide agencies for common software and access standards are necessary to ensure uniformity across the government, as well as, ease of access.

5. Cooperative partnerships between libraries and government agencies should be encouraged.

6. Open standards, such as GILS, should be encouraged and required to promote easy access to various databases.

IV. PRESERVING AND ARCHIVING ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Free, timely and convenient access to Federal government information is a basic theme of this whitepaper. Much of the current discussion in the information community and the Federal policy environment focusses on issues related to development of the network communication infrastructure, appropriate search/retrieval
systems, information ownership, and pricing issues, among others. Issues related to preserving and archiving of the electronic "record" are rarely addressed during these discussions. The Clinton administration's "National Information Infrastructure: An Agenda for Action" included, as a core principle, the provision of access to government information. And yet, in the NII Progress Report 1993-94, the lack of progress in the area of preserving and archiving of electronic government information preservation was nowhere raised as an issue. 4

Nevertheless, the critical preservation and archiving issues raised by current and emerging electronic information technologies have not decreased in importance since the publication in 1989 of a Congressional report detailing the serious threat to future historical research posed by computer technologies. 5 More recently, a National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) study of the electronic information management policies and practices at fifteen Federal agencies determined that "generally, agency administrators do not view long-term information access as a significant issue at this time." 6

Public access to government information is likely in the future to be focussed within the framework of the National Information Infrastructure. Unless the issue of how to preserve the public electronic record is addressed in the context of the NII, the principle of free, timely and convenient access to future users of government information is clearly threatened.

A. ISSUES

1. Standards

Digital information is at a very early stage in its development. Information technology is a rapidly changing and volatile environment. The "hardware" on which information is stored, and the software used to access it, are constantly being upgraded and superseded. This environment is very threatening to users attempting to work with "older" portable electronic sources. An early example of an electronic records problem is the 1960 Census administrative records. The format of computer tapes used for census returns in 1960 became obsolete a few years later. There are now only two machines in the world that can read these tapes. 7 Examples from the optical technology world proliferate. For example, the earliest 1987 Economic Census publications required very specific software and auxiliary files designed within the Commerce Department and not consistently provided on the discs. Or, if included on the discs or separately published diskettes, the files did not function as written and corrected software had to be requested.

Aside from ensuring the access software is maintained, advances in operating systems and hardware are likely to cause interface problems when older access software is needed. A healthy 50-year-old CD-ROM disc is useless if the hardware and software required to use it is no longer available. Perhaps no government body is more aware of this grave situation than NARA. In its response to the 1989 Congressional report "Taking a Byte out of History," NARA focussed on the need for coordinated work with the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) on a wide array of electronic data standards issues. 8

Even in a networked environment, unless government agencies are responsible for maintaining permanent online access to their entire historical electronic publication record, there is a clear threat that the digital information currently available may become inaccessible in future years.

2. Data Loss

Considerable concern exists regarding the "file integrity" and "life expectancy" of different type of digital storage formats. 9 File integrity refers to the ability to consistently find a complete, current copy of a record in the expected location. Life-expectancy is the length of time that a copy of a document stored on a given medium can be expected to last. For information on magnetic tape, file integrity tends to be good in the short term, but deteriorates rapidly thereafter. Life expectancy for magnetic tape is several years with careful handling. The emergent optical technologies, such as CD-ROM, WORM, and magneto-optical, have excellent file integrity. However life expectancy for this medium is still unclear, with estimates ranging from 10 to 50 years. While optical media matches microfilm in terms of file integrity, neither optical nor magnetic media can match archival microfilm's life expectancy of 200-300 years.

Another way of looking at the issue of data loss is presented in the recent NARA Technical Information Paper on optical technology mentioned above. According to this report, maintaining "a long-term commitment to use digitally stored information also requires continuous data readability, data retrievability, and data intelligibility." 10 "Data readability" refers to the ability to process the information on a computer system or device other than the one that initially created the digital information or on which it is currently stored. "Data retrievability" means that identifiable records or parts of records can be selected and accessed. "Data intelligibility" means that the information a computer retrieves is comprehensible to another computer system or a human viewer.

The NARA report clearly indicates that these three conditions, readability, retrievability, and intelligibility, pose distinct challenges. A volatile technological environment combined with the lack of standards (made unavoidable in part due to the rapidly changing technologies themselves) makes it very difficult to ensure all three conditions will be simultaneously satisfied for future data users.

3. Manipulation

Perhaps the key advantage, and disadvantage, in terms of preservation access-electronic information is the ease with which it can be manipulated. The clearest case in which this radically changes the way in which government information has been used in the paper and microform environment relates to electronic mail. The so-called "PROFS" case is illustrative. The PROFS system was an electronic mail system used during the Reagan-Bush administrations. Recent litigation resulted from the Bush administration's attempt to exclude these as a category of public record. This case raised the question: what constitutes a record of interest to citizens and future historical research? How is it possible to trace policy development in the absence of a record of electronic communication, including all early versions of electronic communication? 11 In a report prepared for NARA by the National Academy of Public Administration, a critical problem was identified related to future historical research:

As more and more computers move into the workplace, as greater numbers of professional staff adopt electronic technologies, and the uses and variety of electronic media expand, and as electronic signatures become acceptable, paper retention will become less important. Not everything will be printed out, not everything will be retained on disk or tape, not all disks and tape will survive; not everything retained will be accessible—and the electronic media will not always be inviolable . . . . Thus, in the future, historians may often have to
be satisfied with final documents, focusing on what was agreed upon, or on important disagreements.\textsuperscript{11}

How feasible is it to create and preserve records at the level of electronic mail systems? The Society of American Archivists (SAA) has recently issued a strong statement in this regard.

Professional judgments regarding the long-term value of records should not be influenced by the presence of access restrictions. The Society of American Archivists recognizes that access must be restricted to some records with archival value to protect personal privacy, national security, identities of informants, trade secrets, and information obtained in confidence. The presence of private, confidential, or restricted information is not a reason to destroy records . . .\textsuperscript{12}

In part as a result of the PROFS litigation, NARA recently issued a revision of General Records Schedule 20 which provides guidance to Federal agencies about the kinds of records that may be destroyed and those that must be preserved.\textsuperscript{13} The new guidelines state that individual electronic messages, but not entire electronic-mail systems in general, which meet the criteria for a Federal record, must be migrated to paper or an electronic storage system and scheduled for preservation. Unfortunately, these guidelines grant the agencies themselves the authority to determine which records are of enduring historical value.

4. Authentication/Fixing Digital Information in Time
A critical question raised by government information and the Internet is how to provide consistent access to this information through citation and retrieval over time. One should be able to refer to a source over time and assume with reliability that it has the same content that it did when originally cited. This is particularly true for spatial data, but applies to all databases and official documents.\textsuperscript{14}

Moreover, in the case of government information, the user is especially dependent on the knowledge that this information has not been modified, censored, or otherwise transformed by the author or intermediary parties. Technological advances in digital signatures may resolve the question of consistent access to information through citation and retrieval over time. However, the question of censorship will require legislation and policies limiting the ability of officials to tamper with electronic records.

5. Content of Archived Information
An important issue is determining which Internet information should be archived. Should all information be archived "just in case" or only that information with permanent value? For example, is it necessary to archive press releases of temporary value or should one focus on the Current Industrial Reports, which are more detailed than the Annual Survey of Manufacturers? A related question is whether Internet information should be archived if that information is also available in another format. For example, the Congressional Record is currently available in electronic, paper and microfiche formats. And the Economic Bulletin Board's International Market Insights are published on the National Trade Data Bank CD-ROM. Should depository libraries retain all issues of the National Trade Data Bank for the sake of monthly data, even if GPO recommends discarding subsequent discs?

A related issue is who should determine the content of archived files, or even its value? What happens to our information access if new technologies make CD-ROM or Internet databases obsolete? How can the depository community influence decisions of information resource management in the interest of the users of government information?

6. Responsibility for Archiving
Who should assume responsibility for archiving Internet information: agencies initially producing the information; individual institutions; consortia such as the Committee for Institutional Cooperation; or partnerships among one or more of the above (e.g., the joint project between the U.S. State Department and the University of Illinois at Chicago)? How should the depository community assure that data and information deemed "valuable" is in fact stored permanently? Might files be deleted or otherwise lost due to the unavailability of storage space on government computers or other devices?

Another aspect of this issue is how to plan for redundant archiving. The depository library system provides a good model for a distributed system of information preservation. Multiple print copies of Federal government documents are sent to libraries in different geographic regions, thereby ensuring that no disaster caused by nature or human beings is likely to destroy all copies of the document. Current efforts to create digital collections generally tend to focus on establishing a single archive accessible to all over the Internet. Efforts do not generally support the creation of multiple, distributed sites with the same information in order to protect future access to information in case the primary site is destroyed. The problem with this approach was dramatically illustrated during the government closures of 1995 and 1996 when several Federal Internet sites with unique information resources were shut down and made unavailable to the American public.

B. CURRENT EFFORTS
1. NARA
In NARA's 1993 "Strategic Plan for a Challenging Federal Environment 1993-2001" the agency noted that in spite of funding problems, lack of standards, and the challenges posed by the rapid pace of technological obsolescence in electronic hardware and software, its commitment to electronic records management remained strong:

NARA must, by 1994, develop a formal strategy to address the complex and dynamic issues related to the use of changing information technology by other Federal agencies. We will establish an agency wide task force to identify strategies needed in the areas of records management, records storage, preservation, delivery of records and information, and outreach in the area of electronic records. We will devise a plan for accomplishment of our mission in these areas by 1994 and will fully implement the plan by 1997.\textsuperscript{15}

A critical element of NARA's strategy will be its Center for Electronic Records.\textsuperscript{16} Established in 1988, the Center will be a focus for those records identified by agencies and NARA as falling within the category of permanently valuable electronic records. Beginning in 1994, NARA began accepting CD-ROM as a transfer medium for permanent Federal agency records. Due to the lack of standards for archival quality of CD-ROMs, once NARA receives permanent records on CD-ROM, it copies them onto 3480 class magnetic tape cartridges for permanent storage.

The National Archivist chairs the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. In 1995 the Commission received Congressional appropriations of $4,750,000 to fund projects related to preserving the historic record of the United States. This year the
Commission is focussing on projects which further research and development in electronic records archive management.  

2. GPO Electronic Storage Facility  
The GPO Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993 required creation of an Electronic Storage Facility administered by the Superintendent of Documents that would provide continuous public access through depository libraries to government electronic information distributed via GPO. Currently, planning is proceeding for on-demand access for depository libraries to image and text data at the facility. This development is an extremely positive one in terms of providing for distributed access to government information over the long-term. If appropriately funded and managed, this operation could address many issues also of data integrity and life-expectancy.

3. Commission on Preservation and Access  
The Commission on Preservation and Access in Washington, D.C. has assumed a leadership role in promoting research, projects and awareness related to archival issues of digital information. In January 1995 the Commission established a joint task force with the Research Libraries Group to investigate the archiving of digital information, taking into account broad organizational, legal, economic, and technical issues. The group was asked to consult broadly among librarians, archivists, curators, technologies, and relevant government and private-sector organizations. The Commission issued its draft report "Preserving Digital Information" on August 24, 1995. This report focused on the need for concentrating efforts in two areas: (1) developing "data migration" methods and (2) creating a "system of certified archives designed to preserve the cultural record in digital form." The eight recommendations in the draft report focus on fostering pilot projects, developing needed support structures, and identifying "best practices."

4. NARA should be fully funded to support its role as agency that provides mechanism ensuring long-term access to historical records of the U.S. government. This will be especially important if NARA is to maintain the CD-ROM records it has recently begun accepting and transferring to digital tape.

5. NARA should be encouraged to explore partnerships with private vendors and libraries to develop archival electronic information products (parallel to its past partnerships in microform preservation of NARA records with UP and Scholarly Resources).

6. The GPO Electronic Storage Facility should be fully funded by Congress.

7. GODORT should continue to monitor developments regarding archiving and preservation of digital information under the aegis of its standing Government Information Technology Committee.

V. EDUCATION ISSUES REGARDING ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT INFORMATION  
Although the explosion of government information on the Internet brings to the fore on a daily basis the crucial and interdependent issues of professional education, retraining of the present workforce, and user instruction, these by large remain virtual subjects. Traditionally, documents librarians focused on acquiring and arranging documents resources. However, by 1985, documents reference service had become an issue of utmost importance. A decade later, the resolution of urgent policy matters forms the core of much professional activity. The exact nature and structure of government information systems in the new millennium are unknown at present. As the Federal Depository Library Program and distribution programs for other types of government information evolve as a result of the proliferation of electronic resources, now and in the future it is very likely that the consulting role of the librarian will increase dramatically whether this individual functions as a developer/designer, educator/trainer, manager, resource provider, and/or technologist in the realm of government produced information. In addition to the continued, dual emphasis on organizing and accessing information sources in available systems, documents librarians will be expected at the micro-level to obtain, define, and evaluate material which answers a user's general or specific need as determined by the librarian. In many cases, this specialist will also be responsible for transferring this set of skills to the user. At the macro-level, professional work will include the creation, development, and implementation of government information systems for distinct communities of users. "Federal information is used by all sectors of society" as other types of government information. Depository librarians perform a pivotal role, culturally and politically, as advocates, mediators, and interpreters, insuring the public's access to invaluable resources. The following defines the educational needs of both practitioners and users, reviews current training efforts, and makes recommendations concerning future goals and programs.

A. ISSUES  
1. Basic Skills  
Currently, what are the basic skills and knowledge depository librarians need to make proficient use of the Internet? Whether novice or expert, these professionals should possess an adequate understanding of the relevant telecommunications, networking and Internet terminology, comprehension of the Internet's environment, its history and policies, and sufficient familiarity with the various types of hardware and software on the market. In addition to UNIX, DOS, and Windows commands, the documents specialists should be comfortable exploiting the following tools: electronic mail, telnet, ftp, Archie, gopher, Veronica, WAIS, and the World Wide Web. Also essential is an in-depth comprehension of Web browsers, such as Mosaic, Netscape, and Lynx, in addition to available search engines. A thorough awareness of the relevant mailing lists and news groups is important as well. Application of authoring and design technologies in order to maximize access and to effectively employ the inherent educational facets of this network and its tools for local users is also required of today's professionals. The enhancement of relevant technical experience should be ongoing.

2. Required Skills for Electronic Information  
As previously conceived, library professionals handling government information must be:
1. politically aware at all levels of government,
2. able to identify historical and current publications regardless of format for all levels of government,
3. able to elicit information from all formats,
4. able to convey information,
5. committed to the dissemination of information with an advocacy stance.24

These abilities are even more mandatory in the electronic environment. Librarians must also be familiar with government information structures, including publishing, production, and management functions, keep up to date on policy issues and be acquainted with other stakeholders.25 Given their unique competencies and teaching responsibilities in terms of their user populations who frequently are newcomers to the complex world of government information, these specialists must also be cognizant of instructional design techniques, including active learning methodologies, and educational technology.

B. CURRENT INITIATIVES

A number of significant educational programs and partnerships have already been undertaken by groups directly involved with government information. These represent some of the types of training that is necessary if government information specialists are to remain primary participants and leaders in this knowledge domain.

ALA GODORT’s Government Information Technology Committee (GITCO), has organized a preconference, “Finding Government Information on the Internet” at the 1994 and 1995 Annual Conferences. This one-day workshop covers basic Internet skills, government information sites, and a preview of emerging tools and technologies.

The annual Federal Depository Library Conference, sponsored by the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), provides an excellent forum for training. GPO Access workshops, another GPO training program, are being offered in Washington, D.C., and other locales.

Some library and information science graduate programs have incorporated segments on networked Federal, state and local, and international resources into their government documents courses. Basic computer and network skills training could be included as a prerequisite for admission, or taught in a separate LIS course.

Documents to the People’s (DtP) “Internet Waves,” edited by Maggie Parhamovich, the Internet Connection, published by Bernan Press, and C&RL News’ “Internet Reviews,” edited by Sara Amato, as well as GOVDOC-L and NETTRAIN, serve as educational mechanisms by relaying announcements, descriptions, and/or critiques of new government information sites. Useful instructional material is featured regularly in columns or articles in the following representative journal titles: Computers in Libraries, Database, Educational Technology Review, Educom Review, Electronic Library, Internet Research, and Online, plus American Libraries and Library Journal.

Many web pages, such as Ken Mortensen’s Federal Web Locator (http://www.law.vill.edu/Fed-Agency/fedwebloc.html), Larry Schankman’s Government Information “The Buck Stops Here” (http://www.clark.net/pub/lshank/web/gov.html), and Eric Forte’s University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Documents Library (http://www.grainger.uiuc.edu/doc/default.htm) act as pathfinders to government information. In addition to a look at the nature of information production and distribution, these instructional devices provide a view of the structure and function of government.

The Office of Management and Budget’s initiative, the Government Information Locator Service (GILS), which uses ANSI Z39.50 and other relevant standards to support "agency-based, Internet-accessible locators" will similarly work as an instructional tool for professionals and users alike. These locators will provide descriptive, location, and access details for U.S. government information resources.26 The Government Printing Office’s prototype locator, which is GILS compatible, will also “accommodate locator systems other than GILS.”27

ALA GODORT’s Education Committee also contributes to the training process via its annual Disk Exchange, directed by Larry Romans. Documents librarians throughout the country contribute instructional guides to this ongoing program. At the 1996 Annual ALA Conference, the Education Committee will also offer a preconference for educating and training nonspecialists. Government information on the Internet will be featured in several sessions, and the keynote speakers will address training techniques for nonspecialists as well as documents librarians. ALA GODORT participates in the ALA Education Assembly, maintaining a liaison relationship in order to keep current on professional educational initiatives and to contribute to its evolution. ALA’s Internet Demo room, set up at Annual Conferences, is another way of becoming acquainted with Internet resources and receiving up-to-date instruction on new Internet resources. The Continuing Education Committee of the ALA/ACRL Instruction Section has made its June 1994 preconference materials on active learning available via ftp (ftp://library.uncc.edu/dist/alaa.94/active.txt).

Opportunities for Internet training are available from a multitude of sources. These include: online tutorials, Internet maps and games, often without fees; books, professional organizations; private consultants and businesses; nonprofit organizations, such as freecents; university-based public sector outreach units; and, in-house activities. Formal academic course work is, of course, another means of obtaining new knowledge.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

It seems appropriate that education and training are available from a variety of sources, including the government, professional organizations, and academic institutions. These activities should continue. However, there are associated strategies which could be effectuated to guarantee that throughout their career, depository librarians possess the requisite, standard knowledge, skills, and abilities that ALA GODORT members and the community of depository librarians may want to consider. One of the major goals of the model Federal Information Dissemination and Access Program, described in “Reinventing Access to Federal Government Information: Report of the Conference on the Future of Federal Government Information,” is as follows: To promote and coordinate training for librarians and other providers in the effective management and use of government information products.28 Excellent proposals related to education and training were also advanced at the Conference, held October 29-31, 1993, in Chicago. Work Group 5A developed three proposals: 1) strengthen training of depository librarians by requiring specific training programs or developing geographic-based structure for grassroots training; 2) require certification for government information librarians using the medical librarians and archivists as models; and 3) discontinuing depository library inspections so that GPO staff could focus on education and training in the field. Generally speaking, these inspections appear to be an economical
and effective means by which important connections and communication occurs between GPO and professional members of the depository library community. Training could be scheduled at a central location during an inspector’s regional visits without abandoning the evaluations all together.39

A viable environment for the geographic-based coordination and certification of specified educational programs is the university graduate school of library and information science which are affiliated with, or near, an institution that is home to a regional or large depository library. This arrangement would not preclude public libraries from participating. Such schools are already in existence throughout the nation. SUNY, Albany, UCLA, and UNC, Chapel Hill, to mention only three examples in disparate places, have strong traditions of training government information professionals and well-established depository collections. Criteria and review for the certification process and also regional continuing education activities could be established by a revolving peer group selected by ALA GODORT, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Depository Library Council, the Government Printing Office, other government agencies, and/or faculty. Additional representatives might be selected from ALA’s Committee on Accreditation, the Public Library Association, the Association of College and Research Libraries, and the Special Libraries Association, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA), and members of other interested organizations, including such nonprofit or government-sponsored groups as the Coalition for Networked Information, the Center for Civic Networking, Americans Communicating Electronically, as well as local community leaders and citizens. User collaboration is a requirement for the National Information Infrastructure proposed by the National Coordinating Committee on Technology in Education and Training.40 A grant-funded project to assess several model training and certification programs could be one indirect approach to addressing the question: “Should Congress provide funds/legislation to support agency education and training activities related to the legislation, or should such initiatives be a government-wide effort?” raised by Peter Hernon and Charles McClure.41 An alternative to an academic-based program, would be for ALA GODORT or GPO to develop and manage a continuing education program which would increase the technical competencies of all depository librarians, and ensure that they are capable of using information in electronic formats.

An “enhanced mentor” program, developed and coordinated by the ALA GODORT’s Membership Committee, the Education Committee, and the Government Information Technology Committee, could reinforce the training activities already undertaken by the round table. Such an effort could concentrate on matching GODORT members who were willing to share their Internet expertise with other government information librarians and depository library staff in need of upgrading their skills. A work group could be formed within GODORT to explore the feasibility of such a program.

Information that appears on GOVDOC-L regarding new Internet sites could be tagged and separately archived so that these messages could be readily examined, and form the core of an instructional database, along with relevant postings from NETTRAiN and BI-L. A work group or joint subcommittee formed of the Government Information Technology and the Education Committee’s memberships could begin an evolving homepage that focused on instruction. Links could also be made to other government information instructional pages and resources. Learning styles and knowledge levels of users vary, similarly as with librarians. Libraries could provide educational courses as a means of increasing the success rate of using electronic resources. Examples include: computer-assisted instruction (CAI), lectures, workshops, self-instruction through print or web manuals, or one-on-one instruction from a librarian. There is a minuscule amount of literature concerning instruction in the area of government information and depository library collections.42 The need for research and publication on this important topic remains unabated in the electronic era.

If the “New Universe” of Federal information access and dissemination truly becomes a Federal/state/local partnership, the need for managerial, networking, and information skills, as well as computer-related and instructional competencies, will be even greater. Librarians, and other educators, are uniquely qualified to develop and provide Internet instruction and interfaces. Librarians were among the first users of the Internet and many librarians are experienced trainers. “It is appropriate that librarians mediate between the user and information resources in a network environment just as within a print environment. Our professional role has traditionally been to identify resources, enhance modes of access to them, and enable users to connect with, and use appropriate sources.”43

VI. LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

The new electronic environment is challenging traditional methods of delivering and accessing government information. Existing laws and regulations were developed for printed information and do not consider the implications of electronic information. New legislation and regulations need to be developed in order to preserve access to government information. U.S. citizens are entitled to government information regardless of format. It is vital that legislation and regulations guarantee access and dissemination of government information to all citizens. Following are issues and recommendations which should be considered in developing and revising legislation and regulations.

A. ISSUES

1. Ubiquitous Access

The National Information Infrastructure (NII) holds great potential for changing how citizens access information and participate in the democratic process. The NII must ensure equal dissemination of government information for all citizens. If the NII is developed as a fee-based network, such as cable television, Federal and state governments should be provided with “government channels.” These channels should be free of charge. Setting aside public access channels will promote the use of the NII by all levels of government and citizens will be able to access government databases through their Internet or NII provider.

The Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) could be revamped into an electronic library network which would provide access for the public to government information.44 The electronic depository library system may be built upon the existing FDLP structure. This would require depository libraries to demonstrate their electronic capability and ability in providing multiple formats for citizens in the delivery of information. The electronic depository library program may not need to be geographically based such as the current system. A network of primary or regional electronic depositories would have electronic connections to local libraries for transferring files and data. There would be a reduction in the number of depository libraries but it may be...
would provide training opportunities for depository librarians and staff. The National Depository Library could develop a central electronic services center and, indeed, this might be the initial goal of the library while developing a retrospective paper collection as resources permit. The National Depository Library could be operated by GPO or in close cooperation with GPO.

The development of kiosks on the state and Federal levels which serve as information centers could be expanded into publications centers or referral centers for citizen requests. Instead of a central distribution point, the kiosks or information centers would be distributed information centers providing uniform services to citizens. Kiosks would be located in depository libraries, all libraries or distributed in locations which are accessible to many citizens such as post offices and agricultural extension stations. The kiosks may be operated solely by GPO or in coordination with other Federal agencies such as the General Services Administration and the U.S. Postal Service. Kiosks have been used by state agencies and are gaining in popularity as self-service information centers.

Regardless of structure, it is imperative that each citizen has equal access to government information. If access to government information is primarily available through electronic networks, then the system must provide a means of access for those citizens who lack electronic equipment or skills. The FDLP has been successful in providing free access to government information. The distributed network of depository libraries has placed government information in local communities. The promise of electronic networks is that citizens are not limited to a physical building for information citizens would be able to access or request the information from their home or office computers or place their request at a local computer network facility such as a library or town center.

2. Government Funding of Networks

Currently, access to the Internet is limited to those individuals who are provided access through their work, educational institution, or fee online vendors such as American Online or CompuServe. According to a 1995 study, only 17% of the population in the U.S. and Canada has access to the Internet. The majority of users use the Internet at their workplace. In order to provide for equal access for all citizens, it will be necessary to build an information infrastructure which will reach each citizen through their home, work, and/or community centers such as libraries.

To build the information superhighway, it will be necessary to develop partnerships between the telecommunication companies and government. Federal and local funding will ensure electronic networks for every community. The National Information Infrastructure Administration (NTIA) has provided a limited amount of demonstration grants which have been successful in building networks in various communities across the United States. Typically, the networks are partnerships between private sector and government. Current budgetary proposals eliminate or severely reduce NTIA grants and high performance computing and communications funding. Especially for rural and poorer communities, it is imperative that funding or incentives which support community networks are developed. If governmental support is not provided, there is the risk of “red lining” neighborhoods and communities. As technology develops, it will be essential for local communities to have the necessary resources to build networks. Federal, state, and local funding, in addition to legislative and regulatory incentives, will facilitate this development.
3. Intellectual Property

Government information in the United States has traditionally been exempt from copyright laws. The lack of copyright on Federal publications has facilitated wide dissemination of materials and placed Federal publications within the public domain. Lack of copyright has also encouraged private companies to add value to the original material, and then sell the value added products. In an electronic environment, government information should continue to follow this tradition. Government databases should not be copyrighted nor should there be fees to access the information.

When Federal and state agencies are mandated to recover or charge fees for government databases, every effort should be made to ensure free access for libraries in order to provide wide dissemination of information to all citizens.

Yet at the same time, electronic dissemination of information must protect the rights of creators of information and protect products which add value to "raw" government information. "How to preserve incentives for adding value, while minimizing monopolies of public information is a major dilemma for information policy." Copyright legislation will need to continue to protect public access to government information in an electronic environment and prevent private printing of electronic government information which has not been altered. Of critical concern is the lack of copyright protection for state and local government information. States must also forbid copyright on state and local publications thereby facilitating access for citizens to local government information.

4. GPO Guidelines

New technologies require additional guidelines for depository libraries. It is necessary for depository libraries to have access to the Internet and to provide for electronic services. GPO currently mandates minimum technical requirements for depository libraries. The technical requirements go beyond equipment and require depository libraries to provide Internet services for their users. In addition to depository library capabilities, depository librarians need to possess a basic skill level of technical capabilities as discussed previously in educational and training needs. GPO requirements need to go beyond current staffing and equipment requirements to knowledge and skill requirements of depository library staff.

5. Circular A-130

The central regulatory guidance for dissemination of executive branch information is Circular A-130 by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Circular A-130 sets forth the policies, principles, and guidelines for Federal agency dissemination of public information. Circular A-130 also provides pricing guidelines for dissemination of government information. While Circular A-130 is supportive of public access to government information, including electronic information, the policy does not go far enough in ensuring public access and utilizing the depository library program as a facilitator in making executive agency information available to the general public. Circular A-130 fails to take advantage of the partnership between the Federal government and depository libraries in enhancing access to government information. Strengthening Circular A-130 to mandate agency participation in the FDLP would significantly enhance public access to government information. This requirement should be viewed as an opportunity to fulfill agencies’ responsibilities for information dissemination as well as a means for Federal agencies to solicit public input on agency information dissemination plans. By making information available to the general public through the FDLP, agencies can meet their Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) responsibilities and will reduce FOIA requests. All branches of the Federal government should be supportive of initiatives which facilitate access to public information and Circular A-130 would be the key to improving access to Federal executive agency information.

B. CURRENT INITIATIVES

The Government Printing Office is currently conducting the “Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a More Electronic Federal Depository Library Program.” The study was recommended by GPO and was authorized by Congress. The goal of the study is to make a thoughtful transition to an electronic depository library program. The study will be completed in March 1996. Although it is clear that the study has political implications, hopefully the study will provide information for Congress which will assist in future policy decisions. The study can be a useful tool in determining the success of electronic dissemination through the depository library program.

As part of the study, GPO is developing a transition plan which will guide GPO in creating an electronic program. The Depository Library Council is assisting GPO by reviewing the plan and providing feedback. Council held lengthy discussions with the depository library community in October 1995 and concluded that “the basic philosophy of the Federal Depository Library Program remains the same in an electronic environment, that is, no-fee public access to government information.” This should be the goal as Congress, GPO, and Council work toward developing an electronic depository library program.

GPO Access was created in 1993 as part of the Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993. GPO Access is a database of various electronic publications including the Congressional Record, Federal Register, bills, and the U.S. Code. Subscriptions, based upon incremental costs, were sold but depository libraries were provided with no-fee access. GPO Access eliminated fee access on December 1, 1995. No-fee access to this important legislative resource is commendable and should serve as an example to other agencies in providing unrestricted access to electronic government information.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recommend that GODORT continue to participate in the ongoing discussions initiated by the Chicago Conference.

2. GODORT should focus more on goals and less on structure to achieve ubiquitous access to government information. As new paradigms are proposed, GODORT should be open to new concepts of delivering government information.

3. Recommend that ALA and GODORT monitor legislation, regulations, and policies regarding the FDLP. Although the structure of the FDLP might change, the goal of citizen access to government information should be the primary goal. Fundamental to any information dissemination program is equal access for all citizens.

4. GODORT and ALA should monitor the progress of the “Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a Successful Transition to a More Electronically Based Federal Depository Library Program” and provide feedback as appropriate.

5. GODORT should work in close cooperation with the Depository Library Council as the Council considers program changes and improvements.
6. GODORT Legislative Committee, with the ALA Legislative Committee, should monitor telecommunications reform legislation to ensure equal access to the NII.

7. GODORT and ALA should support efforts to ensure funding of NTIA technology grants and similar programs which assist in building the information infrastructure. Particular attention should focus on rural and poorer communities as well as library network funding.

8. GODORT Legislative and ALA Intellectual Freedom Committees should monitor legislation and regulations which may place copyrights on government information.

9. Librarians should oppose fees on government databases and should fees be enacted, should push for free access for depository libraries and/or all libraries.

10. GODORT should commend GPO for eliminated fee subscriptions to GPO Access.

11. GODORT should continue to encourage the Office of Management and Budget to include requirements for agencies to provide print and electronic publications for the Federal Depository Library Program.

12. The American Library Association has recently created the Office for Information Technology to provide technical analysis and guidance in legislative and regulatory reform. GODORT should utilize the resources of this office in examining information technology issues.

13. GODORT should work with other associations in the education and promotion of electronic government information. Other organizations can assist in building coalitions to influence legislation and policy.

VII. CONCLUSION

It is inevitable that electronic information will change the roles of depository libraries and librarians. There are three choices which can be made: ignore technology, fight the transition, or deal with the onslaught of technology. To ignore technology is a disservice to the American citizens. Information is increasingly becoming available only in electronic format and library patrons will miss critical information if they are limited to print products. To fight the transition to electronic dissemination is futile. During this era of cost cutting, Congress, state legislatures, and agencies see a cost savings in passing printing costs directly to libraries and citizens. To insist on only print publications or the duplication of publications in print and electronic formats is unproductive. The only choice for depository librarians is to work with the development of electronic dissemination of government information.

In recognizing that agencies and governments are moving to electronic dissemination of government information, depository librarians can assist in developing policies and legislation which takes advantage of the benefits of technology yet maintains the integrity, ease of use, and availability of print publications. Recognizing that not every publication will be in print, depository librarians can make intelligent suggestions as to which publications must remain in print and which are suitable for electronic dissemination. Depository librarians are the vital link between citizens and their government which provides librarians with expertise on how information is accessed. This expertise is essential to developing comprehensive and meaningful policies regarding electronic and print dissemination of government information. Proactive librarians are needed to make these issues known during this changing and turbulent era. Depository librarians can work through GODORT and other library associations as well as with their local governments in determining the future of electronic government information.

American citizens need skilled librarians to navigate the new information infrastructure. Technical skills in additional to traditional library skills such as identifying, locating, and evaluating information will be the fundamental skills of a depository librarian. These skills need to be taught and passed on to others. Education and training have a good foundation, but additional training opportunities need to be developed.

The future will require an information infrastructure which supports open and equal access to government information. Legislation and regulations must support this fundamental principle.

The Federal Depository Library Program and GPO will need to be flexible, innovative, and supportive of an electronic environment. Will GPO be able to overcome its cumbersome bureaucratic system in order to develop an effective electronic dissemination program? Will Congress be attentive to the needs of its constituents in providing an open government? Hopefully, Congress and state governments will take advantage of library expertise in formulating information dissemination policies.

Despite technical problems and lack of funding, there is the potential to develop systems and programs which provide for a wider participation in the democratic process. This whitepaper raises some additional questions, concerns, and thoughts. The dialogue is important as depository librarians decide the future of electronic government information. Now is the opportunity to take this dialogue beyond the library community to the policy makers. Future generations will benefit from today's activism.

VIII. ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>American Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Depository Library Council to the U.S. Public Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOSFAN</td>
<td>Department of State Foreign Affairs Network (Partnership between the U.S. State Department and the University of Illinois at Chicago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDLP</td>
<td>Federal Depository Library Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOIA</td>
<td>Freedom of Information Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>File Transfer Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILS</td>
<td>Government Information Locator Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GITCO</td>
<td>Government Information Technology Committee, GODORT, ALA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GODORT</td>
<td>Government Documents Round Table, American Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPO</td>
<td>Government Printing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>Library Programs Service, Government Printing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARA</td>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST</td>
<td>National Institute of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREN</td>
<td>National Research and Education Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDI</td>
<td>National Spatial Digital Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTIA</td>
<td>National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTIS</td>
<td>National Technical Information Service, Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>Society of American Archivists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MapNews

Melissa Lamont
Pennsylvania State University

Geospatial Data
Issues of electronic storage and access continue to present new options and concerns for map collections. The size and format of maps and other spatial data combined with questions of indexing and archiving create special problems. Researchers with the National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis (NCGIA), and others, are working on a digital library for spatially indexed information. The Alexandria Digital Library project (ADL) is one of six National Science Foundation programs designed to further digital libraries. ADL hopes to provide a framework for on-line spatial data. With search and access capability, they aim to distribute geospatial data across the internet. Their web page includes a slide show of the prototype in development. The page also contains a large number of links to other spatial data sites (http://alexandria.sdc.ucsb.edu).

While the ADL project looks at the mechanics of internet access to spatial data another site contains the proceedings of a conference on policy issues. The proceedings of the Conference on Law and Information Policy for Spatial Databases are available full text through the web or can be purchased in hard copy. Lawyers, law professors, and members of the academic, government and private
sellers all contributed papers concerning the legal and information policy issues surrounding geographic information systems and spatial data. The papers are divided into four sections: Access to Government’s Spatial Information; Intellectual Property; Privacy Issues; and Liability. A few of the individual titles give an idea of the range of opinions on these topics including: A Case for Commercialization of Government Information Products and Services and Public Interest and the Cost of Government Information: Experience under the Federal FOIA. These issues are of importance to all librarians, not just map librarians. Anyone interested in electronic government information and access to that data will find these proceedings thought provoking (http://www.spatial.maine.edu/tempe/tempe94.html).

The Government Printing Office (GPO) is also struggling with electronic dissemination issues. GPO recently published The Electronic Federal Depository Library Program Transition Plan, FY 1996-1998 in Administrative Notes (December 1995; v. 16, no. 1). As the paper emphasizes, GPO plans to distribute nearly all information electronically by the end of fiscal year 1998. The GPO should be applauded for an ambitious and forward thinking proposal. However, issues for maps were covered in a single paragraph. Maps — due to the unique physical and information characteristics of maps and charts, LPS will make cartographic products available to depositories in the format which they were issued by the originating agencies. LPS will contact the originating agency to identify an on-line electronic source for this information to which we can point depository users. The Transition Plan continues with a list of core documents that will remain in paper because of their importance to the democratic process. The only geo-spatial publication listed is the Congressional District Atlas. Some conflict is apparent between the paper core list, the problem that not all maps issued by agencies are now distributed in any format, and the suggestion that the program be 98% electronic in the near future. Clearly, map and spatial data issues will need further refinement.

Partially in response to the GPO Transition Plan the Cartographic Users Advisory Council (CUAC) will be meeting this spring. An exact meeting date will be announced later. The GODORT representatives to CUAC are Donna Koepp of the University of Kansas and Richard Fox from the Library of Congress.

For researchers working in spatial data or geographic information systems, the GIS Master Bibliography is searchable on the World Wide Web. Previously available through gopher, users can now key word search the database. The bibliography includes complete citations to articles on electronic mapping and GIS and even contains brief abstracts (http://thoth.sbs.ohio-state.edu/osugisbib/).

New USGS Pricing Structure
By now probably everyone is familiar with the change in USGS prices. All basic and thematic maps are priced at $4.00 per sheet plus a handling charge. A 40% discount will be given to those purchasing five or more copies of the same map and will only be valid on map orders placed at the Distribution Center in Denver.

Library of Congress Summer Project
The Library of Congress Geography and Map Division will sponsor the 36th Special Project this summer. Selected librarians will spend up to six weeks working with permanent staff members of the Division on various tasks including technical processing, bibliographic, and reference services. Past project participants highly recommend the experience. Contact the Library of Congress Geography and Map Division for more information.

Upcoming Meetings
Several upcoming conferences include programs for map aficionados.
The North East Map Organization will meet at Woods Hole, MA on June 6-7, 1996.

The Special Libraries Association Annual Conference will be held in Boston from June 8-13, 1996. The SLA Geography and Map Division program includes papers on The Literature of Map Librarianship and Publications of Cartographic Societies, as well as a session on GIS in News Libraries.

The American Library Association Annual Conference will be held in New York, July 4-10, 1996. The ALA Map and Geography Round Table will present Living with Maps featuring Dennis Wood, author of The Power of Maps. Map preservation through scanning and digitizing is the topic for the second MAGERT program.

Partial in response to the GPO Transition Plan the Cartographic Users Advisory Council (CUAC) will be meeting this spring. An exact meeting date will be announced later. The GODORT representatives to CUAC are Donna Koepp of the University of Kansas and Richard Fox from the Library of Congress.

The GODORT Nominating Committee

Tom Andersen
Chair, Nominating Committee

The GODORT Nominating Committee is pleased to present the 1996-1997 candidates for elected offices. Ballots will be mailed to all members in Spring 1996.

GODORT Assistant Chair/Chair-Elect
Dan Barkley
Bob Walter

GODORT Secretary
Carol Bednar
Jill Mortecarty

Federal Documents Task Force

Assistant Coordinator/Coordinator-Elect
Greta Marliott
Larry Romans

Secretary
George Barnum
Vicki Tate

International Documents Task Force

Assistant Coordinator/Coordinator-Elect
Kathy Tezla
Chuck Eckman

Secretary
Mary Horton
Michael Oppenheim
Documents to the People

3. It was moved and seconded and approved by Steering Committee (2nd Steering Committee, Midwinter Conference, San Antonio, TX, 1996) that GODORT Bylaws, Article X, Section 3(i) be amended to read:

"Rare & Endangered Government Publications Committee. This committee is composed of nine GODORT members appointed to staggered two year terms. One member per term shall be appointed by each Coordinator of the Federal Documents Task Force, the State and Local Documents Task Force, and the International Documents Task Force with the approval of the GODORT Steering Committee. Six members-at-large shall be appointed in staggered terms by the GODORT Chair. The Committee Chair shall be appointed by the GODORT Chair from among the committee members, with the approval of the Steering Committee. The committee shall identify rare and endangered government publications; evaluate materials for preservation and conservation; and plan programs or workshops on the preservation of these materials. Two liaisons from each of the following organizations shall be invited to participate as voting members: Map and Geography Round Table (MAGERT), Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), Library Information Technology Association (LITA), and Preservation, Archives and Restoration Section (PARS) of the Association of Library Collection and Technical Services (ALCTS).

Submitted by the Bylaws Committee.

Daniel C. Barkley, Government Information Librarian, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-1466; (505) 277-7180 (voice), (505) 277-4097 (fax); barkley@unm.edu

Internet Waves

Maggie Parhamovich
U.S. Government Printing Office

Spinning Your Own Web
The World Wide Web has facilitated the rapid growth of the Internet for businesses, education, and information. The simple program language of the Web, HTML, makes it possible to develop your own Web page. Whether for your own personal interests or for work, you can easily develop and write a Web page. There are several steps which should be undertaken prior to writing a Web page. First, decide the goals or direction of the Internet site. Who is your audience? What information do you want to convey? Once you know your intended audience and the goal of the site, you can move to the specifics of the Internet site.

What protocol should you use? Should your Internet information be on a Web platform or utilize Gopher protocols? Or perhaps should it be a Gopher with a Web interface? What protocols are used by your target audience?

Decide what information will be on your Internet site. For libraries, this can be determined by the reference questions which are being asked at the Reference desk. What subject specialties does your department or library specialize in? Some basic information for your department or library which you may want to place on an Internet site includes: hours of service, map of the surrounding area, library policies, standard reference materials, library guides and handouts. What information is already available...
Now that the details are worked out, it is time for you to develop your Web site. As you develop your Web site, keep the following tips in mind:

1. Keep it simple. Start out with a basic page and add graphics and fancy options as the page develops and as you increase your skills and confidence. A beginning Web site might be a list of pointers to existing Internet resources which your patrons would find interesting.

2. Keep it short and concise. Do not fill up your introductory page with long verbiage. Point to longer documents or text from the introductory page. The information should be easy to read and uncomplicated. Especially for the introductory page, the information and graphics should be a guide to the site and direct users to the specific information which they need.

3. Language and layout should be clear. Use the terms your audience is familiar with it. Set out the pages in a logical and uncomplicated. Especially for the introductory page, the information and graphics should be a guide to the site and direct users to the specific information which they need.

4. Keep graphics to a reasonable size and limit. Graphics are memory hogs and slow down the loading of Web pages. If your graphics take too long to load, your users may decide not to visit your site. Graphics should also have relevancy to the text of the Web page. Add graphics to enhance your Web page and to make the page attractive or stand out.

In developing your Internet site, look at other Web pages and determine what you like about your favorite Web sites. Examine the source files for tips on how to develop features and where to obtain graphics which you like. In doing so, you will develop a Web page which is attractive and meets the needs of your clients.

This issue features the work of some graduate students at the University of Arizona. Dr. Charley Seavey has integrated Internet technology into his government documents course. The following outlines his experience in developing Web pages.

Building GovInfo Home Pages: One School’s Experience

Dr. Charley Seavey
University of Arizona

Like most schools of library science the School of Library Science (SLS) at the University of Arizona is moving rapidly into the age when resources are no longer just paper, and the U.S. government, in particular, is making more and more information available electronically: the Internet, gopher and FTP sites, and lately the World Wide Web. In 1994 the SLS was hooked up to the Ethernet. Our computer lab of 18 aging IBMs were connected via a new server. Each faculty office has an individual line. The Web rapidly became part of our lives.

As it became time to prepare to teach the government publications course for the Spring of 1995, it seemed to me that it was time to go beyond the usual search exercises involving electronic sources. I decided to have the class create home pages in various subject fields. The requirements were that the pages have government sources as their central focus, but students were free to add non-government sites that seemed relevant to the focus of their pages. The complete directions were:

Homepage project. Each student will be part of a team (numbers to be decided depending on total enrollment) responsible for designing and implementing a WWW home page for a selected subset of electronically available government information. In addition to the home page itself, team members will design and implement an evaluation system for each member of the team. The homepage itself will be 75% of the grade on the project, and the team evaluation will be 25%.

You will need Magpie Pathamovich’s Guide to Government Internet Resources, available on LC Marvel (ftp://ftp.loc.gov), or on the Web at the University of Nevada (http://www.nevada.edu/library/GOVT). You have to do some searching once you get to LC Marvel or UNLV, but that’s part of the course. The syllabus itself, incidentally, was available only as an FTP document.

The resources available to the students were the SLS lab, an HTML editor, whatever HTML documentation they could find at the bookstore, and their own wits. After doing just enough HTML editing on my own to figure out that it was not rocket science, I
decided they could certainly learn it on their own. HTML editing is actually like a lot of early word processors (Applewriter I, anybody?), or, strangely enough, some high end text processors like \TeX, or even Quark, with imbedded formatting commands, think of WordPerfect in the "reveal codes" mode and you have the general idea.

The results, I think, were outstanding. Nobody dropped out, and there are eight subject related govinfo home pages at http://timon.sir.arizona.edu/govdocs/intro.htm. They are: Child Care Resources; Crime; Crime Victims; Access to Federal Grants by Subject Areas; US Western Expansion Page (1600-1900); Intellectual Property Homepage; Sustainable Agriculture Information Sources in the United States; and Women’s Health Resources.

The pages were all up and running in April 1995. At that time I sent one message to the GovDoc-L listserv announcing their availability, and haven’t said a thing since then. According to our transaction logs, on Monday, August 7, 1995, the various pages were hit a total of 271 times from approximately 100 sites. A spot check suggests this is reasonably typical usage.

Given the heavy usage, we’re making an effort to find people who would like to take these pages over, and keep them updated. We’ve found homes for a couple of them, but if anybody is interested in providing a home for the others, please contact me at cas@convxl.ccit.arizona.edu.

The lessons from all this seem fairly clear. Granted I had a fairly computer literate crowd doing these things, but they were pretty typical of most of our recent graduates-- computer literacy is an entrance requirement as of this fall, and it has been an exit requirement for several years prior to this. The odds are that the feds, and state governments, are not going to decrease the amount of information offered in electronic form. The government information community, as a whole, should not depend on GPO or anybody else to build the one true home page for all electronic government information. The experience here suggests that it is easy to build pages that a lot of folks find useful, and we did little or no promotion.

If you are looking for a good govinfo person, think about the students who built these pages. Cutting edge....

Maggie Parhamovich, Internet Specialist, Library Programs Service, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20401; (202) 512-1698 (voice); (202) 512-1432 (fax); mparhamo@gpo.gov

Washington Report

Mary Alice Baish
AALL Assistant Washington Affairs Representative

The mood here in Washington is fairly somber even as the year’s second government furlough, which lasted a long three weeks, is finally over. Particularly unfortunate is that the end of the furlough coincided with the Blizzard of ’96, thus keeping Washington-area government agencies closed an additional week. While Congress and the executive branch continue to battle over FY ’96 budget appropriations and cuts to balance the budget by the year 2002, agencies will soon be back in business at least through January 26th. However, if the budget issues remain at a standstill, another potential roadblock will occur when the debt ceiling is reached in mid-February.

President Clinton did finally sign H.R. 2492, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1996, on Nov. 20, 1995, and therefore the Government Printing Office (GPO) and the Library of Congress (LC) were not affected by the latest government shutdown. Self-supporting agencies, such as the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) and the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), also remained in operation even while, in their case, the FY ’96 appropriations bill for the Department of Commerce remains a political bone of contention. The full impact of the furlough on government information, particularly for agencies which regularly collect and disseminate statistical data, will not be known for several weeks.

1996 will no doubt be a seminal year in terms of government information policy. The 104th Congress is determined to reassess Title 44 all the while continuing efforts initiated during the 1st Session to downsize, shift costs, and move rapidly towards a cybergovernment. We may well see the same strong determination from members of Congress, particularly from those House Republicans who are holding out on the budget issues, to make these changes quickly. Any hopes to educate members of Congress will begin with the GPO Study which was mandated in H.R. 2492. In mid-December, GPO sent Congress its FY 1997 budget request which includes a transition plan to rapidly move the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) towards a fuller electronic environment. Read on and you’ll see why this year will be key to the program’s future.

The Government Printing Office: GPO ACCESS Update...
Two initiatives which center around GPO ACCESS are helping to define GPO’s role in the digital age. Beginning on Dec. 1, 1995, GPO made its ACCESS system available to direct Internet and dial-in users at no charge. It noted in the press release of this announcement that current paid subscribers would receive refunds as appropriate. In describing this policy change, Public Printer DiMario remarked that depository libraries would continue to serve as important intermediaries to those individuals who don’t own computers or who need assistance.

The second important recent GPO initiative was demonstrated at the first meeting of the Government Information Locator Service (GILS) Board which was held at the Department of Commerce on December 6th. Created by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the GILS Board includes representatives from the Departments of Commerce and the Interior, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), the General Services Administration (GSA), GPO and LC. Eliot Christian from the U.S. Geological Survey, who has spearheaded the development of GILS from its inception, gave an update on its implementation. According to OMB Bulletin 95-01, agencies were to have completed by Dec. 31, 1995 an inventory of their: 1) automated information systems, 2) Privacy Act systems of records, and 3) locators covering their information products.

At this well-attended meeting, documents librarians Raeann Dossett and Maggie Parhamovich, who are both serving as consultants this year at GPO, demonstrated how agencies can disseminate their GILS records through GPO ACCESS at minimal cost. Check out the new and impressive GILS Home Page, which will provide hotlinks to other federal agency home pages, at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/gils/gils.html. In addition,
Progress has been made by the GPO Working Group towards completion of the study on how to move the depository program to a more electronic environment. In addition, in mid-December GPO submitted its budget request for FY '97 to Congress, along with the strategic plan mandated by H.R. 2492 to outline how the change to an almost total electronic depository program would be managed. Shortly thereafter, GPO released the strategic plan, entitled "The Electronic Federal Depository Library Program: Transition Plan, FY 1996-FY 1998." This was made widely available electronically on govtoc-e and in paper through a special December 29, 1995 issue of Administrative Notes which was immediately sent to all depository libraries.

GPO's transition plan envisions a 90% electronic depository library program by the end of FY 98. To move through this transitional period, GPO has requested level funding for the next two years, along with some additional monies to award small "technology grants" to the most needy depository libraries. The report includes a list of some twenty-odd titles which GPO recommends should always be available through the FDLP in paper. These include, among others: the bound Congressional Record, the Serial Set (for regionals only as recommended by the 1994 Serial Set Study Group), the United States Code, the Federal Register, the Code of Federal Regulations, the United States Reports, Statutes at Large, the Economic Report of the President and Statistical Abstract of the United States. GPO staff believe that with this appropriations request they are delivering to the Hill a plan to implement what Congress has asked for, that is, an almost all-electronic FDLP. The plan also succeeds in defining a strong role for the Superintendent of Documents and GPO in the digital future.

However, a myriad of complex questions are clearly not yet resolved, and these need to be well examined and understood as the transition begins. Perhaps the greatest stumbling block is the lack of statistical information: for example, what are the true costs of electronic dissemination both to the government and to libraries and end-users? Congress believes that an all-electronic FDLP will save the government significant money, but there are lots of costs associated with an all-electronic program that are not well-documented at this point. As you may recall, GPO last fall asked Congress for special funding for a technology study that would collect and analyze data on the readiness of agencies, libraries and the public for an electronic program. This would have been one of the major tasks of the Working Group. However, members of the Joint Committee on Printing denied funding for this much-needed study which many of us believe would have provided the critical information on which to base plans for change. On the positive side, GPO's transition plan outlines a similar study which will hopefully provide the gap in data on the part of the readiness of depository libraries and the public for a full-electronic access program. That is, if the JCP agrees to fund this latest proposal, and the results don't come too late.

There are no easy answers and the future of the program is unclear. Yet to be determined are exactly what incentives there will be for libraries to remain in the depository program, and what public access responsibilities will be required of depository libraries. Can every one of the approximately 1400 depository libraries provide adequate access to the multitude of electronic government information which we will soon be seeing? Will we need 1400 depository libraries in the future? Scrambling to find some good news among so many complexities, we are now privy to GPO's transition plan and so can respond accordingly. The Depository Library Council (DLC) meeting last October in Memphis provided an open forum and much discussion time on these issues. The DLC's report on the study was published in the December 5, 1995 issue of Administrative Notes, along with the Council's recommendations. These same issues were also discussed at length during ALA's Mid-Winter Conference in San Antonio. Comments on the GPO study from the advisory groups, including the library associations, the Depository Library Council, and federal agencies, will be included in the final report due to Congress in March.

It is apparent that a large burden is on the library community and end-users to fight the battle over issues such as appropriate format, long-term access and preservation. According to what was defined in the Framework document last summer and endorsed by the major library associations, we firmly believe that government information should be provided in THE MOST USABLE FORMAT, regardless of cost. How well we are able to get this message to Congress during this critical period is indeed a formidable challenge.

"Indecency" Language Back in Telecom Bill

December was a busy month for members of the Conference Committee on the telecommunications deregulation bill (S. 652 and H.R. 1555). It was no less busy for the library associations' Washington representatives and member librarians throughout the country who responded to urgent calls to contact their conference committee members. Two House amendments regarding obscenity on the Internet were discussed by House members. The first, introduced by Rep. Henry Hyde (R-ILL), was advocated by many conservative groups and would be more restrictive than the Senate-passed Exxon amendment. A compromise draft amendment by Rep. Rick White (R-WA) was then released. The White proposal allayed some of our concerns in that the very vague "indecency" language was changed to a "harmful to minors" standard. It also included a preemption for libraries and educational institutions from any Exxon-type state laws. On the negative side, it lacked the incentives contained in the House-passed Cox-Wyden amendment to use technologies to empower parents to minimize their children's access to what they might deem to be harmful materials.

On December 6th, after House members approved the compromise White amendment, they proceeded to pass by a vote of 17-16 an amendment by Rep. Goodlatte (R-VA) which reinstated the vague "indecency" standard. This came as a big disappointment. In addition, the latest draft version that we have seen includes criminal liabilities for the "display in a manner available to a person under 18 years of age" any communications that might be offensive according to community standards. If enacted, the liability from this provision on libraries which offer patrons Internet access would most likely be fought out in the courts. Our message to Congress throughout this debate has been that 1) no new criminal penalties are necessary, and 2) the "harmful to minors" language is preferable to the vague "indecency" standard. In addition to the liabilities of the indecency amendment, if enacted, will create within the United States, little has been written about the international implications. How the countries of the world will reach agreement on their different laws and definitions remains to be determined.
If there is any bright side at all to this bill, it may be in the universal access and anti-redlining provisions agreed to by the Conference Committee. A Federal-State Joint Board and a Commission on Universal Service will be created to carry out the universal service principles defined in the legislation. These principles include the availability of quality services at reasonable and affordable rates. Advanced telecommunications services are to be equitable to all regions of the nation, including rural and high-cost areas. Discounted rates are to be available for schools, libraries and health care facilities. In terms of timing, Sen. Larry Pressler (R-SD) who has led the charge to deregulate the telecommunications industry had hoped to have a final conference committee report ready for floor action before the Christmas recess. The tough budget negotiations interfered and the report has yet to be released. Congress returned briefly at the beginning of January to open its 2nd Session before adjourning until President Clinton’s January 23rd State of the Union Address, thus again delaying further action on this bill. Regardless of the final outcome of the telecommunications reform bill, Congressional sentiment remains strong regarding the obscurity issue and an Exxon-like provision may well resurface as a rider or a new bill.

LC Hearing on Security Issues
A full-day joint hearing was held on November 29, 1995 on security and financial management issues relating to the Library of Congress. According to Rep. Bill Thomas (R-CA), this was only the first of many hearings to be held on LC’s management and financial situation. As a quick aside, Rep. Thomas chairs both the Joint Committee on Printing and the House Oversight Committee, and last summer also promised that we would have a series of hearings on GPO this spring as well. Thomas made no bones about his intent to have Congress play a strong and visible role in assessing the operations and long-term policy strategies for both Legislative Branch agencies.

Much of this hearing was spent discussing the 1991 financial audit report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and how LC has met those recommendations. No financial audit has been done in the interim to assess the effectiveness of the GAO’s recommendations, and clearly all agreed that this is needed. Regarding the recent security problems, LC has contracted to have a full security analysis done by March 1996. While Rep. Thomas added 20 years duration of copyright.

Copyright Hearings
There are two current pieces of federal legislation on copyright issues of interest to GODORT members. The first is H.R. 989, the Copyright Term Extension Act, which would give copyright owners an additional 20 years’ protection. Register of Copyrights Marybeth Peters has drafted an amendment which would provide libraries and educational institutions with an exemption to the added 20 years duration of copyright.

Also, I attended a November 15, 1995 joint hearing on S. 1284/H.R. 2441, the NII Copyright Protection Act of 1995. This is the legislation proposed in the White Paper Report. Testimony at the first hearing was limited to government officials and was presented by Bruce Lehman (PTO), Marybeth Peters and Dr. Mihaly Ficsor (World Intellectual Property Organization). Lehman differentiated between the content of communications, BBSs, and public domain information and that which is produced and sold on a commercial basis. In briefly summarizing the White Paper Report, Lehman then observed that existing copyright law can support commerce in cyberspace. Marybeth Peters stressed the need to balance the exclusive rights of creators and the needs of users, including libraries. She stated that fair use should be strongly reaffirmed. The Copyright Office is preparing an analysis of the content of the Report which did not get addressed in the legislation. This report will be completed early this year. Ficsor stated that if adopted, this legislation would provide efficient protection for copyright and would facilitate the growth of the Global Information Infrastructure.

EDGAR and PTO Internet Access Threatened
Early last fall, the Securities and Exchange Commission announced its decision to provide no-fee Internet access to the EDGAR database of corporate filings. In a joint September 29, 1995 letter, the major library associations applauded this decision, noting in particular that it would serve as a good model for other agencies to follow as the National Information Infrastructure (NII) takes shape. In early October, very shortly after this decision was announced, the SEC issued a Request for Information in which they posed twelve questions about the future of the EDGAR database. Three of these questions directly related to the possible privatization of EDGAR, and to whether no-fee access through the Internet should continue.

This is a very critical issue for us. Apparently the SEC is under strong pressure by the private sector to retreat from their decision to make this database available on the Internet. A follow-up letter from the library groups to the SEC on October 30, 1995 strongly urged the continuation of no-fee Internet access to EDGAR. The letter opposed the suggestion that EDGAR be privatized and that its legal ownership be given to any one company. It also pointed out that the current dissemination methods, at low-cost through the Internet and through private sector, value-added services, was entirely appropriate and consistent with Federal information policy.

In November, the Patent and Trademark Office announced that it would provide no-fee Internet access to the past twenty years of searchable patent bibliographic text data. Responding to swift reaction from the private sector and also to the requirement in the Paperwork Reduction Act that agencies hold public hearings when they initiate new information services, PTO's Office of Electronic Information Products held a public meeting on December 15th. In the broader context, they were also seeking comment as they prepare to draft a comprehensive dissemination plan.

In a December 28th letter to PTO, the American Library Association, the American Association of Law Libraries and the Association of Research Libraries all applauded this decision. Part of PTO's mission is the requirement to disseminate information to the public on the patents it grants and the trademarks it registers. Public access is available at PTO's Virginia location and at the 78 Patent and Trademark Depository Libraries (PTDLs) throughout the country. In our letter, we stated our belief that PTO's decision to offer Internet access was well-founded and timely, and a logical step in fulfilling their dissemination mission. Further, it would provide access even to those individuals, often the small, independent inventor, who might be geographically far removed from a PTDL.

New Noteworthy Reports
The Commerce Department recently issued two new reports by the NII Task Force of interest to GODORT members. The Survey of Rural Information Infrastructure Technologies sets out to examine the availability of various telecommunications technologies that are cost-effective in rural areas. Privacy and the NII: Safeguarding
Telecommunications-Related Personal Information is a comprehensive look at privacy issues associated with an individual's use of telecommunications services. It recommends a self-regulated, voluntary approach on the part of companies to make consumers aware of the use and dissemination of their personal information. Both reports are available at the National Telecommunications and Information Administration home page at http://www.ntia.doc.gov. Another new release is the draft report on preservation by the joint Task Force on Digital Archiving created a year ago by the Commission on Preservation and Access and the Research Libraries Group (RLG). This report, well-worth reading, is available electronically from the RLG home page at: http://www-rlg.stanford.edu. Due to its length, you may want to order the print copy for $20 from the RAND Distribution Services, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA. 90407-2138.

NCLIS Celebrates Its 25th Anniversary
It was an auspicious evening on December 14, 1995 when the Library of Congress hosted a celebration of the 25th anniversary of the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS). Librarians and friends of libraries from the Washington area and around the joined the lovely festivities. Present were most members of the commission, including current chairperson Jeanne Hurley Simon and her distinguished husband, Sen. Paul Simon, and ALA President Betty Turock. Congratulations to NCLIS and its executive director, Peter Young!

Mary Alice Baish, Assistant Washington Affairs Representative, American Association of Law Libraries, Georgetown University Law Library, 111 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001; (202) 662-9200 (voice); (202) 662-9202 (fax); baish@law.georgetown.edu

Correction
The references for the article, "Finding Aids for Research on Proposed Amendments to the U.S. Constitution." Documents to the People 23 (December 1995): 282-283, were numbered incorrectly. They should have appeared as follows:

References
1. Jan Oberla, Sterling C. Evans Library, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-5000; joberla@tamvm1.tamu.edu


Also, Table 2 had to be modified to fit the format of DatP. The table provides citations to sources that include listings of proposed amendments to the Constitution and the various publications, editions, and reprints [in brackets] that contain this information. The editor apologizes for any confusion these omissions/changes may have caused.

GODORT Hotel -- ALA New York City
The GODORT Hotel for the 1996 ALA Annual Conference is the Hotel Edison (228 West 47th St., New York, NY 10036). It is located near 4 other ALA conference hotels (Manhattan Crowne Plaza, Doubletree Guest Suites, New York Marriott Marquis, and New York Renaissance Hotel).

The hotel has reserved accommodations for approximately 180 conference participants. Arrival and departure date will be somewhat flexible, that is, the Hotel Edison will allow early arrivals and/or later departures at the same rates.

The room rates, per night, are as follows:

- Single $78.00
- Double or Twin $88.00
- 3 persons (2 double or 2 queen beds) $98.00
- If 3 beds are required, suites or combos (2 bedrooms/1 bath) $135.00

Taxes must be added to the above rates. Barring any new increases or reductions, taxes in New York will be 13.25%, plus $2.00 occupancy, per night.

Reservations can be made by calling the Hotel Edison at: (800) 637-7070 or (212) 840-5000. In order to assure the above rates it will be necessary to mention "GODORT."
Shotgun Weddings and Amicable Divorces: Integration vs. Separation of Government Documents and Reference Services

ALA/GODORT Annual Conference Program
Miami Beach, FL
June 27, 1994

Introduction

Ben Amata
California State University

The library world is changing - rapidly. Since the mid-1980s librarians have found themselves in the confluence of several trends which are dramatically changing the world as they know it.

Financially, over all funding has decreased for libraries at the same time prices for material continue to spiral upward. Heretofore, the online catalog was the most significant automation project that libraries typically undertook. However, publishers who are offering electronic cataloging copy with the purchase of material may eliminate the need for some staff as it becomes cheaper to contract out work rather than paying in-house staff to perform cataloging functions.

Furthermore, vendors and governmental agencies offering full-text databases are dramatically changing the direction of how libraries acquire material as their focus changes to leasing access to material rather than owning, therefore further reducing the need for technical processing staff. Electronic publishing offers a whole range of new products and challenges as publishers adopt new technologies which require libraries to purchase hardware to utilize information. Reference service may no longer be dependent upon the user physically being present in the library as more access and information itself becomes available off-site 24 hours a day. Libraries are reorganizing: some to accommodate reductions in staffing; some to develop new models of providing service in a rapidly changing world.

GODORT and ACRL's Law and Political Science Section have assembled several librarians to make presentations on integration of reference services. Gary Peete, U.C. Berkeley’s Business and Economics Librarian, provides the results from a survey of Association of Research Libraries to determine the number of reference service changes over the last decade and their causes. Randy Olsen, Deputy University Librarian, Brigham Young University, relates his experience with merging the government documents and social science reference departments while Beverly Norton, Government Information Reference Specialist, also from Brigham Young University, reports on her experience with documents training and the electronic environment. Duke University's Jerry Campbell, University Librarian (now University Librarian and Dean of University Libraries, University of Southern California), offers a non-government documents librarian’s view of the major trends affecting librarianship and some of the non-traditional approaches they have taken at her institution to meet the current challenges.

Combining Reference Services: A Survey

Gary Peete
University of California at Berkeley

Over the last several years, the author has encountered various discussions at conferences or on email about a perceived trend among academic research libraries to reduce reference points by combining government publication reference service desks with other types of services. This study was devised to determine if there has been such a trend among large academic research libraries in the United States, what circumstances might be influencing such changes, and the factors that might have led to successfully joining of reference operations.

Methodology

To verify if these changes were occurring, and to determine what factors may have influenced the reorganization process, a questionnaire was developed based on consultation with colleagues and some limited pretesting. A search of Library Literature located no recent articles on a similar topic that could help in the design and evaluation of this survey. Since the focus of this study was academic research institutions, the survey instrument was sent out to 94 members of the Association of Research Libraries in the United States. The questionnaire was addressed to the person who would hopefully be most likely to know how to respond: "the Head Government Documents Librarian."

The questionnaire design sought to achieve various goals. First of all, it sought to identify institutional characteristics such as the size of collections, types of documents collected, open or closed stack arrangements, and how the government publications were arranged in the stacks. Next, it was intended to determine the existence, the number, and the timing of documents reference service changes that had taken place during the last decade. And finally, it attempted to gather opinions on the causes and consequences of such changes.

The design of the survey instrument and process also reflects certain considerations: The form was kept as short as possible to encourage as high a return rate as possible. To promote honest responses, all participants were assured confidentiality. The questionnaire was configured to facilitate the coding and recording of responses for ease of entering into spreadsheets or databases for statistical analysis. The time period chosen for the study, 1984-1994, was selected as an era long enough to track organizational changes at a time when other modifications, such as cataloging of documents, enhanced indexing, and introduction of electronic materials, were occurring. The survey included as many standardized responses as possible for potential statistical analysis, but it also permitted unrestricted answers where the respondents could write in their own answers.
Questionnaires were sent out to the 94 ARL institutions in the beginning of March 1994. By April 15, 60% of the surveys had been returned. A follow up letter was sent to those institutions which had not answered by that date. The overall return rate on June 1 was up to 85% with 80 out of 94 forms completed and returned.

A student employee entered the responses into a Lotus spreadsheet. Various statistical computations were run on the data to create tables and charts showing survey results and to perform regression analysis on the data. The goal of this analysis was to determine causal relationships between various dependent and independent variables. Unfortunately, the size of the sample was not large enough to show any statistically significant relationships. While the outcome of this more sophisticated data evaluation was limited, the results of the surveys themselves presented an interesting profile of what has been taking place in academic libraries.

Profile of the Libraries in the Survey

The institutions responding to the survey had profiles that revealed collection activity characteristics that were in the mid-ranges. Most of the libraries had total collection sizes of between 1 and 5 million volumes (66), with few below 1 million (3) and some (11) over 5 million.

Documents collection sizes also were in the mid-size range with 41 in the 500,000 to 1 million range, 10 in the under 500,000 category, and 29 with over 1 million volumes.

The responses to the types of documents collected question revealed that 80 institutions collected U.S., 70 state, 49 local, 64 foreign, and 73 international publications.

Of the responding libraries, 80.7% had open stacks. The most predominant method of arranging documents on the shelves was by Superintendent of Documents number (71.1%), followed by Library of Congress call numbers (16%), with the "other" category at 11.60%, and, finally, 2.29% using Dewey.

Changes in Services

One of the surprising results of this survey was the finding that research libraries have been actually moving in both directions and that these modifications have been accelerating in recent years. At first glance the graph showing the net changes for the period under study would lead one to believe that there has been very little change. Of the 80 libraries in the study, there was only a total of three more combined services in 1994. However, what these numbers failed to show was the fact that a number libraries combined while others were separating their operations. Overall there were 19 total modifications in configurations, but the resulting net change was only three additional combined sites at the end of the decade.

Also, most of the changes occurred during the last four years as indicated in the graph below. Of the eleven libraries that combined services during the last ten years, seven reported combining since 1990 and six made changes in 1993 and 1994. While some of the surveyed institutions were joining services, eight libraries created separate services and, again, most of the activity took place within the last four years.

In addition to asking respondents to indicate what changes had actually occurred, a question was included on the survey that addressed current planning and the possibility of combining or separating services within the next five years. The table above combines data on actual changes with planned modifications to show potential changes in the next five years and compares those figures with the statistics for the actual configurations in 1984 and 1994.

If these plans are carried out, there will be a net gain of 15 libraries that have combined services or a 79% increase. So while the actual migration to combined services has not been very dramatic, it would appear that the potential for such change will be dependent upon the results of planning processes that are currently underway across the country.

In answering the question on why the decision was made to separate or combined services, the responses also showed some interesting results. The survey asked that a rating be given, with 0 having the lowest value and 5 the highest, to evaluate how various forces impacted the decision making process. The number one reason given for combining operations was an overall reorganization, followed very closely by financial considerations. The primary reason given for choosing to separate operations was an enhancement of services, followed by reorganization. It is worth noting that financial considerations were inversely related, with the libraries unifying services giving it a high score and the ones creating separate operations giving it low marks.

The survey also tried to address situations where a firm decision was made not to change operations. The highest rating for those who decided to maintain separate services was enhanced services with financial considerations showing the lowest rating. For those who decided to maintain combined services, finances was the major consideration, far outdistancing the other factors.

If one looks at the combined results of the decision making question sections, several items seem to stand out. In both cases where a change was actually made or a decision to maintain separate services, enhanced services was the most important factor reported. On the other hand for those who chose combined operations, financial considerations was the primary consideration.

Reasons for Successful Transitions

For those libraries that decided to combine services, the questionnaire provided a section where respondents could evaluate whether the change over was a success or failure. Six institutions indicated that the overall change was successful. The factors that received the highest ratings were training and communication. Five surveys evaluated the unifying of service operations as a failure, and they tended to base this evaluation on a lack of communication and planning. It probably is not a coincidence that communication or lack of it was a major factor in both the successes and failures. The importance of communication was reinforced in the written comments where is was frequently mentioned.

Written Comments

The comments made by participants in the survey also offer insights into the advantages and disadvantages of change as well as some of the potential pitfalls to avoid. Below is a representative collection of those observations from various institutions, some who concluded that change was desirable, but most respondents were less enthusiastic.

One library that had considered combining services, but rejected the idea commented and provided the following reasoning:

We find there is still a need, and perhaps a greater one than in the past, for specialized reference service. Assistance is needed to locate specific types of
information (such as treaties) and data, especially in electronic formats. Reference work with documents is definitely more complex than in the past. We also find that with available online indexes, we provide more general and social sciences reference assistance, providing access to a broader range of resources beyond government information.

Another library that also rejected the idea of an integrated reference service noted:

It’s the patrons who will be disadvantaged... It’s the librarians who will not have the sufficient expertise in accessing the stature and size of the government documents collection... The library will trade quality of service and efficiency of operation in the name of progress and being on the “cutting edge.” Unfortunately, the progress is retreat and the cutting edge dull.

In assessing a recent reorganization that led to a single reference desk, a librarian provided a list of pros and cons for the change in operations:

Problems with this integrated arrangement:
1. Requires great deal of training for non-documents staff.
2. Other librarians (non-document librarians) feel uncomfortable using government documents sources.
3. Large numbers of staff deal with documents—fragmented responsibility.
4. Collection development activities divided up among too many subject selectors.
5. No specialists in this arrangement—mostly generalists.

Support for this integrated arrangement:
1. Automation—more CD-ROMS stations are available to access government CDS and products.
2. The service point is open longer hours at night and weekends.
3. More visibility.
4. More staff are trained to provide services to documents.

A documents librarian from another recently integrated service, who felt that the reorganization had gone badly, lamented:

Questions are clearly not answered with both GP & non-GP sources, so many questions that used to be referred on to GP for further assistance aren’t getting any GP attention...In sum, we’re all at one desk, we all have many fewer hours on the desk (average 5-6 per week), which is an advantage for doing other things, but clearly lowers reference capabilities. The common denominator for service levels has dropped a lot. Service is serendipity for patrons so far depending on expertise. We have tried to put GP & another person on as much as possible, but that’s slipping already. There is a proposal to always have a soc sci & humanities person on together to cover the bases. Social science people are all willing to learn G.F."

In explaining support for maintaining separate service, one librarian observed:

I spend time (weekend slots) on the general reference desk 4 times a semester. I simply cannot remember all the resources in every discipline plus the document sources. So I believe we give better service by separating the two reference points.

A documents librarian in an old, established combined reference service organization found:

The problem with a combined Ref/Docs is the librarians’ “prejudice” against docs questions. I have had librarians refer users to me, off desk, and I will walk them back to the Ref. Desk, pull Stat Abst from Ready Ref, and answer the question. They are better now then 5 years ago in that most will attempt docs questions & then refer. You still get the “I could spend time looking for this, but I’ll ask you since you can pull it right off of the shelf.”

An institution where the decision was made about 10 years ago to keep reference services separated stated:

Documents are alien to most librarians. Hence, they don’t won’t to deal with them. Keeping them in a separate department allows other areas to opt out of dealing with them.

A librarian from a separated reference service, who also spends time in a general reference setting, whimsically observed:

Documents does have its own service, always has in our University. The very MENTION of combining services seems to send chills through most of the Reference Dept. staff... Personally, I feel the nature of reference service in a general reference situation is quite different from that in a documents area, and to combine would produce confusion for patrons and staff.

At a library where the respondent felt that combined services worked, the success of a single reference service was attributed to the proximity of backup assistance as follows:

Combined reference service evolved around 1981. It is basically successful because our reference desk has always been located on the same floor as and within close proximity to the entire collection of gov’t. pubs. There are only two librarians responsible for gov’t. pubs. and our offices have always been readily accessible to the other public services librarians so that consultation is facilitated.

Another librarian who had tried to make a combined service work but reverted back to two desks noted:

Before combining Business Reference with Documents Reference we tried to cross train all librarians so they could work at either desk. That experiment was a failure. We decided patrons would be better served by a dedicated group of librarians who like documents, like statistical sources, can cope with CD-ROM and machine questions, don’t freak out over an endless stream of students needing information on obscure local companies before their job interviews...

Summary

This survey suggests a number of different findings, some expected and others not anticipated. In terms of the amount of change that has been taking place, the amount of actual reorganization was lesser than expected but the potential for future combining service points appears high among academic research libraries. For those libraries that have chosen combined services,
the primary reason was financial. The libraries who have selected separate reference points for their organizations cite enhanced services as their primary concern.

When looking at the responses from the libraries that have combined services, success or failure came down to several factors. The ones who felt that combined services resulted in a positive experience listed communication and training as keys. In addition, the libraries who successfully merged services tended to be the ones that combined a social science reference with documents because of the common terminology and familiarity with similar concepts. On the reverse side, lack of communication, planning, and personalities were believed to be the primary reasons for an unsuccessful transition.

From the written comments came some suggestions on what assumptions to avoid when deciding to reorganize:

- Assuming that anyone can give good documents service without a great deal of training and experience
- Assuming that casual contact with documents will maintain one’s skills
- Assuming that advances in cataloging and indexing have made documents reference easier
- Assuming that separating reference staff from their collections is a good idea

Hopefully, these factors will provide some food for thought for those institutions considering a merger of reference services.

**Merging Documents Reference with Social Sciences at BYU**

**Randy Olsen**

**Brigham Young University**

**Introduction**

One of my favorite Gary Larson cartoons shows an Indian chief standing by his tepee studying a book titled 101 rain dances. Puzzled the chief says: "Oh! Four steps to the left and then three to the right ... what kind of dance was I doing?" Other members of the chief’s tribe look up in amazement as egg beaters begin to fall from the sky.

In 1978, as a new documents librarian interested in improving service at Brigham Young University (BYU), I ran a survey to determine the various models for organizing documents reference in college and university libraries. As you could probably guess, I found that there must have been at least 101 ways of structuring reference services for government information. So, like the Indian chief in Larson’s cartoon, I was left to puzzle over exactly what steps to take - not to bring rain - but to ensure that BYU had the optimum organization for promoting government information. I’m going to describe today the dance we did at BYU and what fell out of the sky - it wasn’t egg beaters but neither was it praises from heaven for discovering the perfect arrangement for documents reference.

**Merger with Social Sciences Reference**

In terms of the title for today's program - shotgun marriages and amicable divorces back in 1978 I was the anxious suitor and the Social Sciences Department was the object of my attention. When I first assumed my position as Documents Librarian at BYU, I noted three facts; first, government documents were a rich resource of information on a wide variety of subjects; second, documents were difficult to use; and third, very few students or faculty ever used government publications. I can still remember plainly working the reference desk in the evenings and spending hours without answering a single substantive question. By contrast, I noted with some jealousy that the Social Sciences desk enjoyed a brisk demand for service. I also discovered that most referrals to government information came from the Social Sciences desk because of the apparent overlap in subject coverage between the two service points.

Grasping for ways to increase exposure to government documents, I expanded my library use instruction lectures, identified government serials not fully cataloged and had them processed, prevailed on Technical Services to fully catalog up to 5% of all government monographs received, and played over 4,000 author and subject cards in the card catalog referring patrons to the Documents Department for further assistance. I was rewarded with a 10% jump in reference questions and a 7% increase in re-shelving statistics. In retrospect, this growth in usage was actually fairly typical of what was going on in all areas of the library during that period and it may not have had anything to do with my actions at all.

Seeking additional ways to promote government information, it occurred to me one day that if the Documents and Social Sciences were merged, then librarians at the new consolidated desk could direct patrons to government information sources in conjunction with Social Sciences tools. I began discussions with the Assistant Director for Public Services about the possibility of merging the two departments.

Attracted by the suggestion that a merger might reduce personnel costs, the Assistant Director instructed me to survey other academic libraries to determine how many had combined their documents operations with other library departments and what advantages and disadvantages had been realized. I found that about 50% of the libraries that responded to my survey had merged documents with another area. Among the advantages listed by librarians who had consolidated services were improved efficiency of operations and better utilization of staff. Disadvantages noted revolved primarily around the large number of reference tools librarians needed to master.

Encouraged by the results of my survey I presented the proposal for merger again to the Assistant Director and the Social Sciences Department. Both parties ultimately agreed to the plan although the Social Sciences Department was very much a reluctant bride. It was only because of their commitment to reference work and their belief that a consolidated desk could truly improve service that the social science librarians agreed to the plan. They must definitely were not motivated by any love for documents.

Three major objectives were articulated for the merger. First, it was anticipated that it would be possible to establish a more effective and efficient staffing pattern at a combined reference desk. Prior to the merger, professional librarians staffed their respective desks less than 50% of the hours those desks were open. After the merger professional coverage was expected to increase to 75%.

By contrast, it was projected, that para-professional staff and student employees would drop the percentage of time they staffed...
the desk from 63% to 13%. This shift in desk coverage from non-professionals to professionals enabled staff to dedicate more time to clerical functions and student employees to provide increased collection development and professional development support for librarians. Further, it was estimated that a merger could save $6,000 to $12,000 in student wages that could then be transferred to another area of the library.

The second objective of the consolidation was to improve the quality of reference service. It was noted that prior to the merger, most patrons received reference assistance from para-professional or student employees - many of whom had worked for the library less than a year. These employees lacked the training, experience, and dedication of librarians. It was therefore believed that the quality of reference service would improve as a natural consequence of increasing the number of hours professionals staffed the desk. It was also anticipated that some reference questions could best be answered by directing patrons to both social science and documents sources and that this cross referral could best be accomplished at a combined reference desk.

A third and less promising objective was to reduce expenditures on reference sources by canceling titles duplicated between the Social Science and Documents reference desks. The amount of savings to be realized was very small.

It must be noted here that while Social Sciences personnel looked forward to the anticipated improvements in reference service, they were skeptical about combining the two departments administratively, dubious about transferring student wage funding, and concerned about the prospects of training employees in all of the social science and documents sources. Nevertheless, the consolidation went forward in the summer of 1979.

Impact of Merger

The first consequence of the merger was the need to cross train all reference employees in documents and social sciences sources. The enormity of this task had probably been underestimated. Describing the training period in her annual report, the head of the new merged department noted "... it wasn't a matter of providing good service, it was purely a matter of survival."

The department head also noted that the staffing pattern had not turned out to be as ideal as hoped. While professionals were covering the desk more hours than previously, there were also times of the day when the number of patrons dealt with had more than doubled. To cope with this increased service load it became necessary to double staff with one professional and one non-professional. The move to increase professional coverage began to fail from the very first.

By the following year, demands for double staffing forced the department to transfer back to the desk some of the student hours that had been released for collection development and professional development support at the time of the merger. The very next year, the departments were separated again administratively. This action was taken to provide Documents with a more direct communication link with the library administration in recognition of the unique character of the documents department and the depository program. The consolidated reference desk was retained, however, and was still viewed as successful. Although the marriage had been dissolved, relations between the now separated departments remained cordial and communication ties strong.

Over the next few years, however, the strain of operating the combined desk became increasingly apparent. Reports from the Social Sciences department continually noted that their greatest ongoing challenges were training for the consolidated desk and managing the reference workload. The training problems were amplified by the explosion of automated research tools during the 80's. The following statement is actually the cover of an annual report from the Social Sciences Department during those years: Whisper in a Librarian's Ear (she'll tell you where to go). If you knew the conservative temperament of the librarian who submitted the report you would understand what a statement of frustration this cover represented.

During that same period of time when Social Sciences struggled with training and workload, document's personnel continued to be concerned that government information was under utilized. To increase the visibility of documents, the library contracted with Marcive for machine readable records for the OPAC and the documents staff began a massive retrospective cataloging project to place more documents in the library's online catalog. The merged desk had apparently not increased documents usage to the desired level or these other actions would not have been pursued as aggressively as they were.

By the early 1990's, both the social sciences and documents departments frequently expressed concern about workload and training challenges at the consolidated desk. An informal patron satisfaction study run in 1992 substantiated their views. Positive feedback from the study suggested that there continued to be a strong commitment to service in the departments and that employees were dedicated to their assignments. Library workers were almost always described as being extremely helpful. A sampling of these responses follow:

Responses to 1992 Patron Survey: Positive Feedback

Very helpful. Don’t just answer question, go with you to find book, or sit down and help you with computers.

The employees that have helped me have been AWESOME! Very knowledgeable and friendly.

They always did everything they could to help.

They have often helped me well into my research -past what I asked for.

Especially on the first and second floors the Reference Desk workers have bent over backwards to help me find what I needed! They were very helpful.

Negative comments from the survey, however, supported librarian assertions that the combined desk was frequently too busy and that employees sometimes had been unable to master all of their reference sources. Students complained that they had to stand in lines for service and that desk personnel sometimes failed to answer questions adequately. This last observation was particularly discouraging since the both departments ran intensive, and very sophisticated training programs for all of their full- and part-time reference employees. A sampling of these responses follow:

Responses to 1992 Patron Survey: Negative Feedback

They frequently take the time to completely resolve a concern, which is nice, but I’m often there for a very
quick question and hate to wait for the person in front of me.

They always waste extra time by going over things I already have done or checked.

They do the best they can with the materials they have.

In generalities they were great. In specifics not as helpful.

I know very little about the research in the Library, yet I knew more than the desk clerks.

Other comments from students indicated that they recognized the workload problem at the desk. For example, one student noted that: "... reference employees seem overworked but they do a fine job." Another said: "I hate the comatose look they have - its scary." A sampling of these responses follow:

Responses to 1992 Patron Survey: Feedback on Employee Workload

First floor desk people are well informed and helpful! Most of the time there are not enough desk workers available.

Sometimes it’s just a matter of tracking down who knows what I need to know.

They were very helpful. The only problem was the amount of time I always have to wait until one of them is available to help me.

They seem overworked but do a fine job.

I hate the comatose look they have -- its scary.

The survey also reflected the impact of automated tools on reference services. Students noted that while CD Rom sources were indispensable to their research, librarians were sometimes too busy to assist with computer searching or were unable to help because they didn’t understand how to use the databases either. The survey suggested that the exponential growth of electronic sources mounted on the library’s mainframe, offered across the library LAN, or accessible through the internet had seriously eroded the quality of reference service. A sampling of these responses follow:

Responses to 1992 Patron Survey: Feedback on Automated Research Tools

The LAN has been an indispensable source of information.

I don’t like Byline (BYU’s OPAC)

It seems like they can’t leave the desk easily and when I need help on a computer, it’s not easy to find.

Everyone at a different desk tells me something different. No one knows how to use the computers to help me find material I need.

No one seems to know other floors. If I want a Wall Street Journal Index, the 1st floor (employees) just say to use the computer.

In 1993, the heads of the Social Sciences and Documents Departments jointly recommended to the library’s Administrative Council that the reference desks be separated again. They cited the workload and training challenges of the consolidated desk and suggested that dividing the areas would enable employees to offer better service by mastering the reference tools in their respective areas. The recommendation was adopted - the divorce was final and complete.

The departments had squabbled a bit during the divorce proceedings only in two areas. First, the Social Sciences department complained that the reference philosophy in documents was quite different than their own. While social science librarians staffed the desk religiously - documents personnel preferred to work in their offices and offer service on demand. True enough responded the documents staff - with the processing workload in a depository library that is the only practical model of reference service. This argument seemed to reinforce the logic for dividing the desks.

The only other area of discord was that point of contention in any divorce - how to divide up the property. Social Sciences was reluctant to surrender any of its personnel budget to staff a new documents desk but the documents department obviously needed additional funding to operate even its on demand reference service. Ultimately, almost the same amount of funding was reallocated to the Documents Department as was transferred out at the time of the merger - some coming from Social Science some from elsewhere.

Reshelving Statistics as an Indicator of Usage

Understanding the history of the merger and dissolution doesn’t necessarily tell us whether consolidating the reference desks ever did stimulate usage of government information. Statistics on reshelving and reference load can answer this question, however. I would like to briefly review those statistics now.

Looking first at reshelving statistics - which would of course reflect both increased circulation of documents and in-building use - we see a somewhat confusing pattern. Beginning with 1978/79, the year of the consolidation, just under 34,000 items were reshelved. This statistic grew until it peaked in 1985/86 at just over 61,350 items for an 80% increase in seven years. The growth experienced during those years probably resulted - at least partially - from the greater exposure given documents through the combined reference desk. After 1986, however, documents reshelving declined steadily until by 1989/90 it had fallen to 36,500 - nearly the level it was at over a decade previously. Beginning in 1990, reshelving began to climb again - reaching 52,700 items last year. As I said, this record of growth and decline is puzzling and I would be curious to know whether anyone in the audience has seen a similar pattern in their library.

I can hazard two guesses as to the underlying causes of the period of decline. First, the Documents Department closed its shelflist in 1986/87 after contracting with MARCIVE to provide machine readable records for the OPAC. It’s possible that some documents users were slow to adapt to the OPAC as the primary means of accessing government information. A second possible explanation is that during the late 80’s more government documents were published in microforms - and at BYU we know from long experience that students and faculty dislike microforms intensely.
The only new factor I am aware of that could have stimulated usage in the early 90's was the appearance of CD Rom's. By 1992, the department had over 200 CD Rom products and had installed its own local area network for mounting the most heavily used of these electronic research tools. Whether CD Rom's alone, however, could have caused the dramatic jump in usage, I have no idea. For the purposes of this paper, it is important only to note that while there is some evidence from reshelving statistics at BYU that a consolidated reference desk stimulated usage, there is also evidence that other factors play a much larger role in determining use patterns.

Reference Statistics as Indicators of Usage

Comparing statistics on reference load for separate and merged desks also fails to verify that a consolidated desk stimulates usage. The reference statistics for the period just prior to the consolidation of Documents with Social Sciences (April - August 1978) are: Microforms Reference (22%); General Reference (23%); History Reference (12%); Social Sciences Reference (12%); Humanities Reference (11%); Science Reference (10%); and Government Information Reference (5%). The Government Information Reference figure represents 3,983 reference questions and referrals - approximately 5% of the total reference load for the library during that five month period. Unfortunately, our library discontinued keeping regular reference statistics from 1978 through 1992 - so we don't have a record of the immediate impact of the desk consolidation.

We do have statistics, however, for the period immediately before and after the separation of the Documents and Social Sciences desks in 1993. They show the record for the period just prior to the division (January - April, 1993). They are: Microforms Reference (25%); General Reference (23%); History Reference (10%); Social Sciences Reference (10%); Humanities Reference (12%); Science Reference (10%); and Business Reference (8%). These statistics indicate that for this period the consolidated desk responded to just under 15,300 reference and referral questions or approximately 12% of the total load for the library.

Of the questions responded to at the Social Sciences desk, about 3,200 or 21% related to government publications. Government documents then represented about 2% of the total reference/referral load of the library for the period of time just prior to splitting the documents and social sciences desks. This was both a lower percentage and absolute figure than in 1978 before consolidation - although the semesters for which the statistics were kept are different. The breakdown of the statistics for categories of questions asked at the Social Sciences desk for the same period (January - April, 1993) is: Government Information (21%); Behavioral Sciences (19%); Political Science (15%); Education (14%); Other (14%); Maps (10%); Business (5%); and Recreation (2%).

The last set of figures shows the documents' reference/referral load for the period just after the desks were split (September - December 1993). They are: Government Information (3%); Humanities Reference (21%); Science Reference (16%); History Reference (16%); General Reference (17%); Maps (1%); Business (13%); Microforms Reference (7%); and Social Sciences Reference (6%). For this four month period, the documents desk fielded 4,809 questions, which was approximately 3% of the total load for the library. Note that there was an increase of over 1,500 questions responded to between the period before and after the separation of the desks. This amounted to approximately 47% growth in reference load. By comparison, for that same period there was a total increase of only about 9,500 questions for the entire library or about a 5% growth in reference load.

It would be tempting to conclude from these statistics that merging the documents and social sciences reference desks had a negative impact on the number of reference/referral questions asked and possibly, therefore, on usage of government information. However, I believe that this conclusion is unwarranted given that the first set of statistics are separated from the second and third by over a decade, that we do not have consistent sampling of reference statistics over the entire period of the merged desks, and that all three sets of data were taken during different periods of the year. I do believe the statistics suggest, however, that merging the desks apparently never stimulated documents reference service to the degree anticipated.

Conclusion

In retrospect, I believe the marriage of documents with social sciences at BYU was a mistake. There is little data indicating that it increased usage of government information and ample evidence that it decreased the quality of reference service. This leaves us then back where we started - wondering what steps to take next.

From my perspective I can tell you where my library will go next. First, at BYU we retain a high commitment to quality reference service as one of our core values. We agree with research that suggests that electronic research tools increase the workload at reference desks in terms of the amount of assistance patrons need if not in terms of the number of questions asked. In the future, we intend to further decentralize rather than consolidate our reference services. We are currently planning a 200,000 sq. ft. addition to our library and with this new facility we will add three new reference points bringing the total to 11 in our central library. In addition, we will construct four computer equipped classrooms and a multi-media auditorium. We will increasingly devote our personnel resources to teaching students and faculty how to access and use electronic information. There will necessarily then be a long term shift in personnel from technical services to public services to support increased library use instruction and increase reference service.

Are these the right steps to take? I hope so. Otherwise, the long term weather forecast in Utah may be for egg beaters. Thank you.

Documents Training and the Electronic Environment

Beverly Norton
Brigham Young University

In recent years the advent of electronic media has changed all areas of reference services almost beyond recognition. The day of the stereotype librarian looking in a card catalog for a book that might have been published three years ago are long gone. The patron now sits at a computer work station in the afternoon and accesses material that was published in the morning over the electronic super highway. Reference for government information is no different, with the exception that we seem to be bombarded with even more CD-ROMs, bulletin boards and gophers than other areas. More and more of our basic reference tools are now available only in electronic format. Once the government realized that it was a lot cheaper to stamp out those little round disks than
it was to print and bind books the depositories have received
everything from Congressional Record to orthophotoquadros to
statistical abstracts on CD-ROMs. Electronic bulletin boards are
even better. When its typed into the computer GPO is finished.
No longer do they have to keep track of processing contracts,
lightheaded bins, or claims. Once a document is available on the
internet, the ball is then in the court of the depositories as to how
they will access the material.

We have on-line full text access to such things as the 1300
page Clinton health plan. We can watch congress in action on C-
SPAN. I actually considered requesting a television so that we
could have C-SPAN available during important committee hearings
but decided that my administration would think that was going
to far even for a documents librarian. Finding the money to purchase
the hardware, so to say nothing of the necessary software, needed to
access this material is extremely difficult even for the large
academic library. Monies that once might have been available for
this type of purchase are now rapidly being siphoned off to support
the ever increasing cost of serial subscriptions. Public libraries are
frequently forced to send their patrons to the nearest large academic
institutions because the funding needed for 486XL computer systems
and modem, 200 meg hard drives and GIS software systems is totally
out of the question. However, even if you have the equipment, do
you have the staff expertise to act as an interface between the
electronic super highway and the patron? Susan Ryan in her
article, "CD-ROMS in U.S. Depository Libraries" (Government
Publications Review. September/November 1993), found that in the
ten southeastern states surveyed libraries responding indicated that
53.4% offered reference service for CD-ROMs equal to that of
items in other formats. 27% indicated that their reference for CD-
ROMs was less than that offered for other formats and 19%
indicated that they had no reference help for depository CD-ROMs
at all. This lack of assistance is directly related to a lack of time,
staff, and training available to those who are responsible for
documents.

There are those of you out there who thrive on the electronic
products. As I read GOVDOC-L each day, it never ceases to
amaze me that so many of you have not only found a problem with
one of the electronic products, but have usually found the solution
long before I even realize there is a problem. In my own defense,
we do live way out west and therefore get deposited materials
much later than those of you in the east. But in all honesty, I’m
just not very electronics literate. For those of you who fall into the
category of problem solver, I give continual thanks. You save the
rest of us a lot of hard work and frustration. The majority of us
however need help! We need help for ourselves and for training
our staff. It doesn’t matter whether you have a separate reference
desk or a centralized one training for reference in an electronic
environment is a challenge we all face.

It is vital that you, in cooperation with your administration, set
some type of policies about the kind of reference service you are
going to provide. A couple of years ago Duncan Aldrich came out
with a revolutionary theory. We couldn’t all do everything for
every patron. We might just have to actually circulate CD-ROMs
to selected patrons, or write selective housing agreements with
other departments on campus. I have to admit that I was very
much against it. I wanted to cling to the old theory that as a
library, we should and could provide access to everything for
everyone. I didn’t want to send the patron across the campus to
the geography department and I certainly wasn’t about to let
someone out the door with the CD-ROMs. Good heavens they
might loose them or scratch them all up. Those things were
expensive to replace, what was Duncan thinking of? However, as
time has gone by and we are now faced with a seven drawer CD
cabinet which is completely full, electronic bulletin boards, and full
text documents via the internet, I am much more inclined to agree
with Duncan’s policy. Most of us do not have the staff expertise
nor the time and money to develop it, that is required to supply
reference assistance for every CD, electronic bulletin board or
internet connection. Each library is going to have to establish a
reasonable level of reference with which they can feel comfortable
and that they can afford to maintain. Once these levels have been
established then you can begin to worry about how to train your
staff. Occasionally you, as the documents librarian, have some
influence in this decision. More often you are forced to operate
under an already on-going policy which in most cases does not take
into consideration the uniqueness of governmental materials. Is it
necessary to give full patron assistance on every CD, on-line
database, and electronic bulletin board or is it acceptable to create
a selective housing agreement with the geography department and
send them all the CD-ROMs, to say nothing of the patrons that
have anything to do with maps? Do you need to provide dBase
programs for microdata or is the library willing to circulate the
CD-ROMs that have this type of information? Will
you allow a patron to sit for an hour and print material free, will
you charge a fee or are you going to insist that they download the
information to disk? If downloading is required, does your staff
have the expertise to assist the patron and are disk available for
sale in the area or must the patron bring one with him? Is
government information reference furnished by all reference
librarians and assistants or is it handled by the documents staff at
their own reference desk? As you have heard from Randy Olsen
at BYU we have tried reference both ways.

For a little over a year now, we have operated our own
reference desk in the government information area. Everything is
not always great and we have many of the same problems that a
 centralized reference desk has. Someone, in our case our full-time
office manager, has to do the scheduling for the desk. Trying to
work around the time preferences of two professionals, one full
time para-professional, two half-time para-professionals, and four
student assistants, who also do processing, is no easy task. It is a
time consuming, frustrating, project which she does each semester.

Training the non-professional documents staff is one of our
more challenging tasks. I will say however, that non-professionals
are easier to train than a professional that has worked for many
years in a subject specialty. It is difficult for the professional to
give up the theory that all areas are subject, not agency, related and
that you should, therefore be able to browse the stacks and find the
information you want. It seems to be particularly hard for the
professional librarian trained for years in a given subject area to
relate the Defense Department with a substantial book on skin care.
The professional somehow still feels that if they are looking in
Monthly Catalog for the subject "air bags", that it should come up
under "air bags" and not under automobile - detachable inflatable
safety devices. The non-professional is much more willing to
accept the fact that the government indexes in strange and
mysterious ways. Because they do not have an image to keep up the
non-professional will more readily ask for assistance when they are
in over their heads and are therefore, frequently of greater
assistance to the patron than the non-documents professional. One
of the professionals who used to work at the combined social
science and documents reference desk came to me by office a while
back and said, "Boy, it sure is great not having you in our
department." I must have look at her rather strangely
because she threw her hands over her mouth, blushed a bright pink
and gasp out "Gee, that didn't come out the way I meant it." She then went on at great length to explain how much less stress she felt in not having to deal with documents along with the rest of her subject areas. I assured her that the feeling was mutual as the documents staff all felt that we had more than enough to learn with just our own materials.

As we looked toward opening our own desk I began to read everything I could get my hands on concerning the training of reference staff, and let me tell you, not all that much is available. There is one great source out there however, and several of you are responsible for it. Management of Government Information Resources in Libraries, edited by Diane H. Smith, with various chapters written by our colleagues such as Jack Sultzer and Ridley Kessler, is a wonderful aid in establishing a training program as well as simply managing your collection. Many of my ideas and methods are directly attributable to this book.

So, how do we actually train the non-professional person to provide a reasonable level of reference service. It begins with looking at the employment applications and interviewing the prospective employee. We have found that those who have good technical processing are often not the best reference assistants. If I have two applicants for the same position where one of them has great office skills and the other has worked for two years on the counter at McDonalds, everything else being equal, I will hire the McDonalds person. You want someone who is accustomed to working with the public. When BYU's Library school was still viable we used to hire MLS students as reference assistants. Many of them had worked in school or public libraries as volunteers. When the school first closed we tried to find people with majors in political science, or history feeling that they would have more interest and experience in using the collection. We discovered however that we could teach subject skills. What we couldn't teach were people skills. Our best reference assistants have been English and Microbiology majors.

The first thing we explain to all new employees, regardless of their status, is that they will be the first and last thing that the patron sees and remembers about the department. If the patron has the perception that you care about his problem, no matter how busy you are, he will be happy. If you can't answer his question find someone who can. If we don't have the necessary materials send him to inter-library loan. Smile, listen, be approachable.

We have found that there are various levels of reference service that are offered at our desk. There are the certain basics that everyone has to know such as, what to do if the power goes out or water starts pouring through the ceiling, emergency phone numbers, and the general layout of the building. Other necessary general information includes such things as, what subject areas are located on which levels of the library, where the rest rooms are, telephone courtesy, and circulation restrictions. An orientation session, which includes an audio taped tour of the library as well as actually taking the new person and introducing them to the people in other areas that they will come in contact with works quite well. We back this up with a notebook at the desk which explains, in detail, everything we have told them. This orientation session is done by our office manager. She is also responsible for seeing that the notebook is kept up to date.

We try to teach the basics of question negotiation. Query the patron as to why he needs the information. Is it for a paper, how long does the paper need to be? The answer for a two page short essay is a lot different than the information necessary for a masters thesis.

Another thing that it is necessary for all staff to be familiar with are the ready reference materials that we keep behind the desk. Since we supply reference for maps, collect fairly heavily in the United Nations statistical area, and are a Canadian and Utah state depository as well as an 82% selective for federal materials this adds up to quite a number of books. We have tried several ways to teach this, such as show and tell where either one of the professionals or para-professionals tells them what type of material each book covers, or having them read Easy Access to Federal Documents or Tapping the Government Grapevine. The one most of our assistants feel works the best is to make up a list of questions, I have about forty, give them a few days and actually have them find the answers. This generally forces them to look in several books for each answer and thus familiarizes the reference assistant with the material. I'm not overly concerned that they get the correct answer on the first or second try. I want to know why they looked in that particular book and if it was not there what their search strategy was for looking in the next one. We also try, when time and funds permit, to schedule them so that they work with someone who has been around for quite a while. This allows them to observe without feeling in any way threatened. What may seem like a perfectly logical approach for the person who has worked on the desk for a couple of years, can be completely beyond the brand new reference assistant.

Once the new person is fairly comfortable with ready reference we move them on to the rest of the indexes -- CIS Annual, ASI, Serial Set Index, as well as the Monthly Catalog in paper to name but a few. Here we also have them read Julia Schwartz's Easy Access to Information in United States Government Documents. This little book published by ALA in 1986 is great. It not only tells you what type information is contained in, and how to use the major reference sets, but it also tells you what you won't find in each one.

The most difficult challenge is to train a new employee to deal with all of the electronic products. If there was just some sort of standard protocol for accessing the material, life would be a lot easier. If there were inexpensive workshops given in our area it would be wonderful. As it is we are forced to write short cheat sheets on what type of material is on each disc and what keys to push to view, print and/or download the materials. I am daily grateful to all of you who are good enough to share your guides with the rest of us.

Quite frankly, we do not expect our student assistants, who are also responsible for doing technical processing during slow times, to be as competent as we do our para-professionals. We know that they will not be with us as long and we, therefore, cannot expend as much of our time and funds in consistent ongoing training. If they know the basic materials they can handle 85% of the questions they are asked, and they can refer the remainder on to someone else. The para-professionals may well be without professional support at night, on the weekends, or during conferences, when we are all out traveling around the country. It is therefore, important that they be able to handle all but the most difficult research problems without relying on someone to help them out. Training for this level of staff is an ongoing task that each professional must deal with. In our department my colleague Terry Dahlin is the type of person who likes to mentor the new para-professional along. I, on the other hand, tend to set tasks and projects for them to work on which I then go over, feeling that they learn more by actually doing the work. In our case this has been a good combination.
We also try to send this level of staff to workshops and training sessions whenever we can. This not only allows them a break from the office and some hands-on training, but it also affords them the opportunity to associate with people outside our library who have the same problems they do. Making the para-professionals responsible, under Terry's and my direction, for training the reference students also allows them the opportunity to further their own knowledge.

In our library we are extremely lucky in that we don't have to install all the CD-ROMs, write the batch files, and create the menus that give the patrons easy access. Neither are we responsible for fixing the system if something goes wrong. We are however, responsible to give reference assistance, and bibliographic instruction both in a classroom setting, for undergraduates, as well as one on one for faculty and graduate students. Sometimes this is done by one of the professionals sometimes by a para-professional.

In order to provide this type of reference service the staff has to be adequately trained themselves.

Staff training absolutely has to be an ongoing program. If one of the professionals goes to a workshop he or she comes back and trains the rest of us at our weekly training meeting. If a new reference source or a new CD-ROM comes in someone is assigned to become familiar with it and share the information with the staff. Terry calls it the adopt a CD-ROM theory, everyone becomes an expert on something and all of us use that person as a resource if we need help. While the burden of learning all this new material is shared it is still very time consuming and therefore very costly. Even with a reasonably well trained staff the cost of doing reference for electronic products is significantly higher than doing the same reference for paper or microfiche products. What we used to do in three or four minutes now often takes fifteen or twenty. We find however, that students well stand in line to use a reference source or a new CD-ROM comes in someone is assigned of the professionals goes to a workshop he or she comes back and adequately trained themselves.

If we are lucky we can have a student assistant or part-time para-professional up to a reasonable level of competency in a couple of months. By the end of the semester they are pretty good, and by the time they graduate in a year or two, you want to keep them forever and not have to start all over. I don't want to discourage you, but let me remind you that these wonderful students who you have worked so hard to train, always go on to bigger and better things and you are left struggling on with ever changing governmental scene and a new staff.

So, I recommend that you take some time, set some reference policies, review the professional literature, look at the training manuals you will find on the Education Committee's disc exchange, and then sit down and write or update a training module for your department. It will make life and your ongoing training easier on both you and your staff while providing better reference service for your patrons.

Rethinking Boundaries: Government Documents in an Integrated Information Environment

Jerry Campbell
University of Southern California
(formerly at Duke University)

Image of the Documents Librarian

"Are you crazy," she asked. "You're speaking to which group at ALA?" Calmly, I reiterated that I had agreed to address members of GODORT. "Do you know which group that is," she continued, "They are the zealots of our profession; intensely passionate about their work and fierce in the defense of their mission. What exactly have you been asked to speak about?" That was a good question. I asked her if she remembered the "Changing the Thirty-Forty Split" article that got the technical service people so stirred up—and the "Shaking the Conceptual Foundations of Reference" article that got the public service folks so mad. She remembered. Well, I told her, I have been asked specifically to instigate a similar debate among the document librarians. She looked at me in perfect horror for a long moment. "You are crazy," she concluded.

So, it is with some anxiety that I get up before this assembly of document librarians to complete my end of this bargain, to serve, as it were as a stalking-horse for you as you pursue an illusive glimpse of the future. The reference librarians only burned me in electronic effigy on their list serves. But, if you really are the zealots among us, I've wondered if I am opening myself this morning to a virtual electronic jihad?

I've recounted the preceding conversation both to begin with some humor and to raise a substantive point concerning the image of document librarians. While those remarks of a colleague were rendered tongue-in-cheek, they none-the-less capture, as do most caricatures, something of the image you project to others. I have not attempted to discover through research when such an image originated within your group or to what degree it is an accurate depiction. I do believe that this could be ascertained, that it would be a worthy (and interesting) project, and that its findings could be generally helpful as you contemplate the future. After reading John Shuler's excellent article, "Historical Perspective on Restructuring the Government Printing Office and the Depository Library Program," I presume this image might have originated during the late 1960's when the language in congressional testimony became more focused on issues of public access and increasingly sloganized (from the electronic document). The late '60's was, after all, a time of widespread suspicion of government action and secrecy and, as well, a powerfully formative time for my generation.

I bring up the matter of your collective image because the image you project can be helpful or harmful to your efforts to forge a preferred future. The more peculiar and dogmatic you appear as a group, for instance, the easier it becomes to ignore you, to write you off as radicals. The more reasonable and collegial you appear, the more likely it is that others will welcome your efforts to join ranks and collaborate in achieving solutions to problems that are broader than any single library department or team. My informal assessment is that collectively you are viewed somewhat more on the negative side of the scale.

It is my opinion that you as individuals and as a group ought to give some thought to the matter of how you present yourself to others and how you are perceived by others. It may be time to leave behind some of the characteristics born in the late 1960's and to construct purposefully a fresh and different image among those with whom you work, both librarians and government officials.

Time of Transition; Time for Vision

One of the things I did to prepare for this morning was to read the full text of the Report of the Conference on the Future of Federal Government Information which originated from a meeting in Chicago in October of 1993. I also read the report of the Dupont Circle Group and various responses from regional and state
depository groups. Each of you have also read that material and will be aware of the recommendations and assessment of trends represented there as well as the record of some differences of opinion among you on key issues recorded there.

One striking aspect of those documents is that they so clearly reflect a genuine sense of urgency over the current state of affairs in the depository community. This sense of urgency not only appears occasionally in concrete statements but also pervades the general character of the reports. At its roots, lie such issues as inadequate financial support with all the ramifications it has for staffing, collections, and access and the challenge of technology with its implications for everything. There is no doubt in my mind that this sense of urgency is appropriate, and I share it with you.

I want to observe, however, that this sense of urgency and the feeling of anxiety that underlies it is not unique to the depository community. More so now than at any other time in modern history, this is a time of change in the wider library and information world. It is clearly a time during which all aspects of libraries as we have known and loved them are in transition. I have personally spent a great deal of time this past decade urging my profession if they are to be solved.

So your problems are for the most part not unusual. Yes, you have government agencies with which to deal, but outside agencies of one kind or another exacerbate the problems of other units as well. And the good news for you is that you do not have the considerable impediment of intellectual property rights looming over the materials of your primary concern. You are free to experiment with new forms and methods of access without fear of legal reprisals. Indeed, because of this circumstance, you have the unique opportunity to play a leadership role within our profession in developing and testing new models of access while the intellectual property rights debate on other fronts has time to mature. My point is that you share most of the problems of this time of transition with your colleagues and that these problems are large enough to require teamwork and collaboration throughout our profession if they are to be solved.

Any time of transition and challenge is also a time for vision and bold new undertakings. And yet, you have been slow as a documentary community in articulating such a vision and uniting behind it. Instead, you manifest fundamental disagreement on one of the most basic factors of the transition. Perhaps the most troubling aspect of the documents I mentioned above was that while several attempted to look forward to a new environment, others objected that certain technological conversions should not and must not be allowed to take place. I refer to statements that "All government information is not suitable for electronic or microformats." And that "Heavily used materials, such as the Federal Register and Congressional Record will continue to be available in paper for the foreseeable future, with electronic access as an adjunct, not a replacement." Though I hope you will believe that I do truly understand why some are clinging desperately to paper, I am compelled to emphasize the futility and detriment to your mission that stems from it, no matter how well intentioned it may be.

It is futile because the dye is cast. The migration of government information to electronic form is underway; it is now out of our control; and it will not stop. Documentary librarians received a letter dated June 1, 1994, from Wayne P. Kelley, Superintendent of Documents, advising us of this in so many words. Let me quote from that letter.

The Government Printing Office (GPO) is ready to introduce its new on-line database services. GPO's Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services (EIDS) and Library Programs Service (LPS) will be providing access to a WAIS server, offering on-line access to the Federal Register (FR), Congressional Record (CR) and other databases on June 8, 1994. The purpose of this letter is to give you the information you need to register for access to these databases through the WAIS server.

Depository libraries registering for databases on the WAIS server will not be required to forego the delivery of the equivalent paper or microfiche products. Thus, for now, the WAIS server is an additional, not an alternative, selection for this information. Please recognize, however, that we are now clearly in a period of transition from paper to electronic format and libraries must begin preparing for the day when the electronic version will be the sole format provided.

Whether or not the argument to maintain paper is correct (and I am not conceding that it is), it is irrelevant. The change is underway, and it will not stop. Those of you who have delayed must begin at once to accommodate yourselves and your libraries to the emerging electronic depository environment. You waste valuable energy and time to fight a battle that is lost.

You also delay achieving a united front in new battles that may be ours to win. Even those of you who are excited about the WAIS server referred to in Mr. Kelley’s letter can’t be happy about the restriction to a single workstation. This is ready evidence that we have work to do and a crucial role to play in helping to assure that this new, emerging information environment is truly serviceable to information seekers. And I reiterate that our influence will be more readily acceptable and persuasive if we are united and positive—as opposed to divided and somewhat reluctant.

While it exposed your differences to the library profession, the Chicago Conference and the regional discussions that followed were, in general, exceedingly valuable and positive. They were valuable and positive because they articulated the issues, because they began to explore new directions, and because by revealing your differences they provided you with the opportunity to seek common ground if you have the will. My concern is that, to my knowledge, there is no formal, continuing effort growing out of the Chicago Conference to pursue the future of the depository community. I hope I am mis-informed about this. If not I recommend and urge that such an effort be organized. This time for vision requires it.

Merging Public Documents and Reference

In addition to carrying out the readings I mentioned above, I also sought the help of my Duke colleagues in preparing for this talk. I met with the head of our documents team, Lauren Sapp, and with her help arranged to discuss the matter of the relationship of documents and reference with any staff who were interested. We had a full room and an excellent discussion. I want publicly
to thank each of my colleagues who participated in that discussion and acknowledge their role in shaping my conclusions.

For the most part it is the financial pressures and the onslaught of technology that bring about programs entitled "Shotgun Marriages and Amicable Divorces: Integration vs. Separation of Government Documents and Information Services." In what we might call a typical library organization, we sometimes made fundamental changes just because it was the right thing to do, but not often. We have not viewed our libraries as malleable organizations. Most often change has been the result of necessity— as it is for libraries today.

In addressing the matter of merger, I want first to say that while it has its own complications, the action to merge or to separate the two units will not automatically solve the problems that both units currently face. Either action, merging or separating, is far too simple and the problems far too complex. Yet it is human to grasp for simple solutions and hope for quick relief, and so we find immediate and concrete ways to focus our efforts. On the other hand, even hasty decisions to merge or separate may have some salutary effect. It may be like rearranging the furniture; it wakes us up, makes us think about where we are walking. Anything that forces us to think in new ways about our work can be helpful. But neither merger or separation can be ends in themselves in our present circumstances.

Recall that our existing library organizational structure was built around the parameters of the paper environment. Also consider that as information becomes increasingly electronic, it does not conform to the same parameters. The information itself, then, begins to cross the boundaries which it once, in another format, helped create. The information itself now begins to demand, and our task now is to create, new boundaries. That's the job that really lies before us.

So I am not here to advocate merging documents and information services, but I am here to tell you without the slightest doubt, that unless document and information service librarians work together to solve the problems they have in common, we will not succeed. I can also assure you, that if document and reference librarians truly work together, they will themselves change the old boundaries.

Indeed, unless we find ways to talk together across all our existing historical boundaries we will fail to reach our potential in this time of transition. Ha! Now the rumors will say that Campbell is in favor of merging the whole library with itself!

With this in mind, let me tell you something of what we have done at Duke. We have recently instituted an organizational design intended to diminish the distinctions among the old departments. At the basic level we have converted our departments into teams. We did this because a library in transition must find a way to escape the rigidity and inflexibility of the divisions within the existing library model. We concluded that the best way to accomplish this was to redesign the library on the basis of a team approach. There are several reasons that the team approach seemed to us a preferable alternative for libraries. First, it offered the most gentle means of initiating organizational change. If desirable, an initial configuration of teams may be fashioned from existing units, departments, and branches. For libraries that are more advanced in organizational skills, less traditional and more forward looking teams may be established. In any case, evolving a library into a team based operation can be tailored to the style and organizational prowess of each individual library, thus reducing staff resistance and organizational shock. More than any other organizational principle, teams provide for stability without rigidity.

The second reason that we gave preference to a team based arrangement was that it diminishes the perception of boundaries and divisions and allows the library to adjust more rapidly to new challenges. It achieves this, in part, by reducing the management layers of the organization. This often eliminates entire layers of managers who, for career reasons, must be concerned about protecting their "territories." As a result, it becomes easier to establish new teams that reach across old boundaries. Such teams are often called cross functional teams. The easy ability to form and reform teams is a distinct organizational advantage in a time when a host of new problems and opportunities arise that do not fit existing organizational units.

There were other reasons to prefer teams, but suffice it say, that this was the fundamental change with which we began to provide opportunity for our staff to come together in different ways.

At the second level we brought particular teams together in what we have called quality circles. For instance, we placed reference, public documents, access services, and our core of bibliographers together in an information services quality circle. As a quality circle, these four teams work together regularly on matters of common concern and, once a year, produce jointly an annual operating plan. The purpose of the quality circle and the plan is not to focus on the individual teams or to squash them together unthoughtfully. Rather, the purpose is to provide them with a forum to explore together their common challenges and new ways of organizing to meet them. We have not, therefore, merged documents and information services, but we have created an environment in which it is possible for them to combine or merge services in any way or ways they themselves may determine.

What are some of the new and emerging challenges that they face together? One challenge concerns how we keep our users informed about the constantly changing information world. There are many fundamental changes that from the user's viewpoint seem to take place over night. Paper is replaced by CD-ROM stations. CD-ROM stations give way to ubiquitous, networked access. In a recent survey of our users, they confess the significant need for assistance with research in the new environment. Perhaps we need something like a new public awareness team to focus on what will surely be an ongoing feature of our immediate future. But from which existing groups will it be drawn and how will we decide?

Another emerging challenge is the considerable need to help networked users who are not on-site when their questions arise. Should we create what might be called virtual information teams that, like commercial vendors, offer help remotely twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week? In such an increasingly on-line, networked environment with users who are not on-site, does it make any sense to keep a distinction between reference and public documents. Will the user have to determine within whose domain the matter falls and contact the correct department to receive help? And if we do create virtual information teams, always we ask which existing resources, human and financial will we reallocate to do so.

Yet another challenge on the public services side of our split corporate personality lies in the matter of public education. The much debated matter of bibliographic instruction may be obviated by the need to develop major training initiatives related to
accessing information through the internet and the soon-to-be tested information highways. How will we convert your users and others to the WAIS server environment? For some time, such electronic information sources will continue to be chaotic and marked by change. Will (and how will) we furnish driving instructors for the information highways? Can we afford to do it in our present, different groupings, or should we develop a generic approach to training for the internet? And there are other questions as well, such as what information will we make available on this highway and who makes it available. In a recent survey, our users told us that they wanted almost every variety of library resource, from print to manuscript, to be made available in electronic form. Is the reformating of materials public services work or technical services work? Is it library work at all? The new tasks violate the old organizational structures.

As you would suppose, we have also taken this soft approach in providing new ways to face the challenges and choices for the technical services of the house. To this end, we've set up what we call an internal operations quality circle. We have avoided the technical services label in order to shed the historically value laden connotations, opting rather to identify it generally as those teams that serve internal customers. Again, our intention is not to force a particular outcome (which would suppose that we had some clairvoyant knowledge of the future) but to provide a setting in which the boundaries between the former departments are softened and in which the teams can mutually explore new options.

Who Decides

In discussing this morning's program, Atifa Rawan asked me a series of key questions. "What kind of planning should precede merger or separation," she asked. "Who should be involved? Who are the decision-makers? How does this fit into other planning efforts?" These are, you might say, the bottom line questions, and who are the decision-makers? One way or another we librarians, suppliers, and our users. Too often we leave our users out. And who are the decision-makers? One way or another we all, you and I, must decide. As document librarians and information services professionals, you have the option to decide, not the right, but the option. But if you do not step up to the challenge, as time runs out others will decide for you. As for how this fits into other planning efforts within the library, the answer is it must be fully integrated. These are not just documents and reference librarian problems. These are just two valuable parts of a larger whole that must be rearranged in ways yet to be articulated. You must decide.

As a final note, I hope that you will seriously reconsider the names that history has provided to our profession. Names, you know, are powerful things. They affect us and influence the nature of reality and the course of events. I remember long ago cataloging a MLS thesis that found a large correlation between an individual's name and profession. I read a book in 1975 that argued for care and wisdom in the naming of children because a name bestows an immense and life-long impact. So reconsider the effect of the name document librarian. What does it signify, and what does it help hold you to an increasingly antiquated environment? We might especially wonder what it means to a younger generation that brings a new vocabulary and understanding to our institutions. The purpose in thinking about the name is not necessarily to get a flashy new moniker (though that would be a nice fringe benefit), but rather it is to describe as succinctly as possible what you do or who you are professionally.

You will be pleased to know that I, who invented the universally disliked name Access Librarian for reference librarians, decided not to reveal my new name for document librarians.

Endnote


USDA Statistics Available through WWW, Via Cornell's Mann Library

Back in the old days—say 1993—Cornell University agriculture students surfed the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Economics and Statistics System gopher site at the university's Albert R. Mann Library for the latest crop and farm information. That was then!

Now, the USDA site has jumped onto the World Wide Web (WWW). It can be found at: http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/usda.html

Mann Library began providing Internet access to USDA statistical data from the Economic Research Service (ERS) and the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) about two years ago. These files included crop, livestock, and agricultural economic statistics from the U.S. and other countries. Last year the system was expanded to include reports from the ERS, NASS, and the World Agricultural Outlook Board (WAOB). These include weekly, monthly, and quarterly forecasts and estimates on crop production, dairy outlooks, wheat forecasts, and many others.

"In the early 1990s, when the library was creating this system, Gopher technology was the leading Internet access method," said Oya Rieger, Cornell Public Services Librarian. "During the last two years, the World Wide Web became the preferred Internet protocol. This upgrade enables the library to improve the user interface substantially, making it much easier to locate related information."

Beginning in October 1995, a group headed by Rieger performed the technical upgrades necessary to convert ERS, NASS, and WAOB data and reports into the WWW environment. Although this new and improved delivery mechanism is now available, the gopher remains to continue to service sites where WWW access is difficult. Much of the WWW upgrade project was funded by the USDA's Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service.

Mann Library will continue Gopher, Telnet, and FTP sites. For Gopher access, connect to: usda.mannlib.cornell.edu. For Telnet access, connect to: usda.mannlib.cornell.edu and log in as usda. No password is needed for Telnet access. To use the anonymous FTP protocol, connect to: usda.mannlib.cornell.edu and log in as anonymous with your ID name or e-mail address as your password. Then, change the directory with cd usda. Internet users with access to the WWW may connect to: gopher://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu.

For questions about accessing this information through the Internet, contact the Mann Library Reference Desk at (607) 255-5406; or send e-mail to: help@usda.mannlib.cornell.edu.
A Congressional District Level Documents Group: Empowerment at the Grassroots

Irene Herold, Monmouth College
Robert Conklin, Galesburg Public Library
Charlet Key, Black Hawk College Library
Tiina Kurman, Western Illinois University Library
Sheila Nollen, Western Illinois University Library

Introduction

What do a public library, a community college, a private four-year liberal arts college and a mid-sized public university have in common? They are all members of the 17th Congressional District in the state of Illinois, and they are all federal depository libraries. These widely different libraries have found through group meetings common ground, been able to help each other through recent inspections, teach each other about emerging technologies and resources in the depository program, assist patrons better through understanding the individual institutions' collections and services, and garner the attention of our local representative and his staff.

This article is the group's attempt to demonstrate that despite our diversity meeting together is useful. The following includes a brief history of our activities, a description of the individual depository collections, and concludes with a statement about the impact of the meetings by the librarians of the institutions. Our goal is that this group will serve as a model, inspiring others to try this kind of grassroots organizing. The aim of such a group is to strengthen individual depository programs, and give a more powerful voice by creating a district level. This power can then be utilized to capture the attention of your local representative and their staff, demonstrating the wealth of the depository program to their constituents, their own information needs, and the access that is available and should be maintained.

Brief History of the group

In the Fall of 1993, Irene Herold, a second year public services librarian in charge of documents at Monmouth College in Illinois, contacted Sheila Nollen, head of government publications at Western Illinois University in Macomb, Illinois, about doing a site visit. Ms. Nollen suggested including the documents librarian from Galesburg Public Library in Galesburg, Illinois, Robert Conklin. This first gathering proved very informative and useful for the attendees. They toured the government publications floor, discussed common concerns, especially an upcoming, but yet-to-be-scheduled federal-inspection, and what that would mean in terms of preparation, and decided to create a Union List of documents for the three depositories. They discussed having a meeting every quarter with the site rotating among the libraries, and inviting Charlet Key from Black Hawk College, in Moline, Illinois, to the next meeting, so all of the federal depository libraries from the 17th Illinois Congressional District would be present. Thus started the 17th Congressional District Federal Depository Librarians group, or the group for short.

During the next two and a half years the group started preparing for federal inspections and then had them, co-wrote brochures about depository materials on the topics of history, education, business, tax, statistics, travel, nutrition and consumer information, besides one on what is a depository in general, saw demonstrations of electronic products, Internet and Web access, and decided to inform and invite the 17th Congressional District representative and his staff to the meetings. When Irene Herold went on an unexpectedly early maternity leave two months before Monmouth's federal inspection, her temporary replacement and the interim library director attended the group. Because of the cooperation and collaboration of the previous year and a half, the other group members were able to assist them in completing the draft self-study in preparation for the inspection. After a year of inviting, two members of the District's representative's staff attended a meeting. The librarians discussed with the staffers what depository libraries are and can provide in the way of printed and electronic materials. The staffers were impressed with the Internet access. Besides the staffers, others who have attended the group's meetings included the documents coordinator from the Illinois State Library. The group has decided that it has been very useful to meet and that they would continue the quarterly meetings, even though the next inspections will be far in the future.

Description of the 17th Congressional District Depository Libraries' Collections

Black Hawk College: It is one of 49 community colleges in Illinois. It was established in 1946, and it serves all or part of nine counties in northwestern Illinois, with a population of more than 300,000 residents. There are more than 40 transfer programs and 45 career programs offered at the College. A wide range of special purpose and community service programs are also offered. The College is a member of WIEC, Western Illinois Education Consortium, which delivers courses to 7 community colleges, Western Illinois University, the Quad-Cities Regional Undergraduate Center and the Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center.

The College operates at two campuses: Quad-Cities campus in Moline and East Campus south of Kewanee. Each Campus has its own library and organizational structure. The Quad-Cities campus library has a professional full-time staff of 3, 2 full-time support staff, and 3 part-time staff (1 professional and 2 support staff). The East campus library has one full-time professional and one full-time support staff.

The Federal Depository Library collection is housed at the Quad-Cities campus. The total library collection is $8,000 items identified in an online circulation system that is shared with 30+ other libraries. There are 300+ current periodical subscriptions and retrospective holdings of microfilm/fiche for most of them. The Library is developing a "virtual reference desk" of major titles and has a local area network of Information Access Company products [Academic Index ASAP and Magazine Index ASAP] as well as QuadLINC on compact disk with Bibliofile.

The depository collection is small and heavily integrated with the main library collection. Black Hawk current selects 8% of depository materials. Books are cataloged and shelved according to Library of Congress Classification, periodicals are checked-in...
and shelved with the regular subscriptions. There are 3 unique selective housing agreements: all geological survey materials are routed to Augustana College in Rock Island; all Small Business Administration and Commerce Business Dailies are routed to the Procurement Assistance Center at Black Hawk College; and all agriculture related materials are routed to East Campus in Kewanee.

Galesburg Public Library: Galesburg has a population of 33,500. Two colleges, Knox College and Carl Sandburg College, a four year and two year college respectively, are located in the city. There are three main industries and many small businesses in the Galesburg, plus agriculture in the surrounding region.

The depository was established in 1896. The entire collection was destroyed in a fire in 1958. Today the Library selects about 10% of depository items in the areas of agriculture, commerce, health, taxes, small business and laws. Most depository publications are shelved separately; however, some are integrated into the reference and general collections. There is a separate online database of all depository materials accessible to the public with staff assistance, consisting of about 15,000 items. CD-ROMs and public machines for use are available for census, NTDB, and other depository products. One librarian does all processing, selecting, and reference for the depository.

Monmouth College: This is a four-year, private, liberal arts college, founded in 1853 and having its first graduating class of four in 1857. Today the enrollment of the College is over 925 and climbing. The town has a population of 9,000, and is composed of light manufacturing, service industries, and farming.

Monmouth houses the oldest continuing depository collection in the state of Illinois. It was designated in 1860 and contains a wealth of historical materials since very little weeding was done until the 1990s. The Hewes Library has selected from 25% in the 1980s to its current 14% of available government items. Holding some 100,000 print volumes in SuDoc order on the upper level of the library and almost as much microfiche in SuDoc order on the main level, the Hewes Library also is up-to-date in technology. When the library automated in 1993, 9,000 document monograph titles were retrospectively added to the online catalog. Since September of 1994, all current documents are in the online catalog. America's Horizon, through use of MARCIVE's shipping list and full MARC record services. Over 500 CD-ROMS and diskettes, including U.S. Code on the College LAN, plus OPAC access to the Federal Bulletin Board via Telnet, are available to the public. Within the 1995-96 academic year fiber optic cables will be laid, and Web access will also be made available through the OPAC to GPO Access. About 80 document periodicals are received and held in current and bound periodicals for one year on the main level, and then moved to the upper level due to space considerations after binding. Used mostly by the community, a large topographical map collection in geographical order is housed on the upper level of the library. As described below, Monmouth and Western Illinois University have a selective housing agreement for DOQ CD-ROMS and Monmouth sends Western its superseded CFR microfiche.

Access is open for all to all documents. Documents are allowed to circulate, with the exception of the periodicals on the main level, where they are treated like the other periodicals in the library's holdings and do not circulate, and CD-ROMs mounted on the LAN, but available for all to use on the OPAC. Because of the historical nature of the documents collection, many requests since automating have been filled through Interlibrary Loan.

There is one librarian assigned to manage the depository, although it is just one fourth of her job responsibilities. Therefore, thirty hours per week of student help are assigned to the depository materials for technical processing, plus one part-time night supervisor assists with identifying shelving problems and tackling cataloging problems too complex for the student workers. The librarian attends state and national meetings, teaches speech classes how to find the legal status quo on current topics, and does community outreach, such as giving an informal talk to third graders about topographical maps, which fit into their social studies unit.

Western Illinois University: The federal depository library at Western Illinois University (WIU) presents some unique attributes to residents of the 17th Congressional District of Illinois. A medium-sized university with enrollment of 12,000, WIU offers educational opportunities at the bachelor's and master's levels in a small town in a rural setting. Designated a federal depository in 1962 and housed in a 17-year-old architecturally striking building, the WIU Library has selected a substantial portion of available government items (55%-78%). As a research institution, it retains most of these materials indefinitely. The collection of nearly 1,000,000 items fills much of the 4th floor, a portion of the storage area on the 1st floor, and the Map Library in another building.

The Library arranges its federal documents in SuDoc order, the smaller depository collection of Illinois state government publications in Dewey order, and the extensive collection of maps in geographical order. All of the Illinois documents and approximately 10% of the federal documents can be located by using ILLINET Online -- the computerized, state-wide database of catalog records, which is connected to the Internet. Also on the Internet is the Library's World Wide Web home page. The Government Publications Library's home page provides links to government information such as Supreme Court reports, census and other statistics, legislative and executive agency information. This is in a constant state of flux as we find more useful databases with which to link.

The Library opens its doors to all people and allows most of its government publications to circulate. It also fills requests for specific materials via Interlibrary Loan. The WIU Government Publications/Legal Reference Library boasts a mutually advantageous relationship with the local McDonough County Bar Association. As a branch of the McDonough County Law Library since 1981, it houses their Regional Reporters with its own set of legal books so that lawyers, students, judges, faculty, administrators, and area residents may all consult these shared materials. Legal tomes received on depository enhance this collection; it enjoys heavy use from miles around.

The WIU Library has supported the Government Publications Library in its entry into the technological era by providing staff and public workstations from which users can access some of the many government CD-ROMs received on depository. In addition, Internet capabilities allow us to offer Stat-USA and GPO Access to patrons as well as connection to the Web.

Two professionals, four paraprofessionals, and twenty part-time student workers staff the WIU Government Publications Library. They divide the responsibility for the technical processing and reference service among themselves, thereby developing expertise but also retaining overall general knowledge to share with each other and users. Staff regularly attend state and national depository meetings and share the information gleaned there with the others.
Impact of the group

Black Hawk College: Participation in the Congressional District Libraries has allowed me the opportunity to share information and suggestions for better handling and maintaining of the depository materials, and to prepare for the recent inspection with very little panic. We have created a composite list of item selections that has been very useful for collection building purposes and for handling patron requests. Of particular benefit has been the opportunity to meet and share information with the Congressman’s office staff – we hope to have them tour all of the libraries in the District.

Galesburg Public Library: The group has enabled me to view new technologies not available at my library. Seeing the World Wide Web is incredible. Later on this year we hope to provide public Internet access through a state grant to public libraries, and then we can use some of the Internet resources we have seen demonstrated at the other depositories in our Congressional District. Along with seeing electronic media, I have learned how to use various printed publications, such as the Federal Register. Discussions of problems that arise with the management of depository materials has also been helpful. The group has really opened up the lines of communication between the depositories of the 17th Congressional District, something we feel is unique and worthwhile.

Monmouth College: Starting out as a “green” documents librarian with only one course in graduate school, I felt overwhelmed by the task facing me. The previous documents librarian had not cataloged any microfiche in five years. No weeding had been done. The items selected list had not been reviewed in over twenty years. I needed help and support. The group was my solution.

From the first meeting, the group has provided instruction and assistance. At the first meeting we went over the areas inspected during an inspection. Through the group I learned why Web access is far superior to telnetting to GPO Access. Seeing how others arrange their collections and processed materials also gave me confidence that what I was doing was correct.

The group has not been all take and no give. After attending the two meetings in 1994, Federal Depository Library Conference and the Interagency Seminar, I was able to share what I learned about contacting members of congress and teach a lesson to the group on the Federal Register (which I suspect they all knew, but they assured me they did learn something).

Using the brochures that we co-wrote, I contacted local schools and offered to speak to the faculty about the depository collection. The local junior high school accepted my offer and I distributed brochures during my talk. I know of at least five depository users such decisions with the material in hand than on the basis of a brief description, or only a title. We discover new ways to arrange or process materials or to present CD-ROMs. We learn how to use particular government publications more effectively. We occasionally even e-mail government materials from GPO Access or the Web to each other or for a patron.

Western Illinois University: The group has increased the effectiveness of the WIU depository in a variety of ways. It provided the incentive for us to develop promotional brochures about the depository libraries in general and on some specific topics such as education and business. We have distributed these one-page, folded, brightly-colored brochures to the local public library, to the WIU public relations office, to classes, to new faculty, and to local organizations such as Business & Professional Women and the League of Women Voters. A newspaper article promoting GPO Access also used information from these brochures.
State and Local Documents News

James Igoe
University of North Carolina -- Asheville

Local Government Information on the World Wide Web

Two recent experiences I had with helping students find local government information resulted in entirely different outcomes. One student wanted to know the number of automobile accidents at major intersections for two small midwestern cities. With little hesitation I referred the person to the local public library’s excellent local documents collection and I gave him some phone numbers to city departments. Another student wanted to find current information about a particular city agency in Chicago in preparation for a job interview. One possibility was the Index to Current Urban Documents microfiche set, I told her we did not receive publications directly from the City of Chicago. I recalled reading that the City of Chicago had recently created a World Wide Web site on the Internet and suggested we try it out (http://www.ci.chi.il.us/). Having had mixed results in the past with Internet searches, and since I was visiting this site for the first time, I was not expecting to find much information. The “Chicago Mosaic” home page contained a list of city departments, the one we were looking for was included. Once in the department file, I was pleased to find exactly what she was looking for: mission statement, a description of responsibilities and services, and information on current programs. Feeling confident and well-prepared, the student walked away with a five-page printout.

The first example illustrates just how notoriously difficult it is to find local government information. Public libraries, and some academic libraries with sufficient resources and user demand, have attempted to maintain local government documents collections with various levels of success. Since many local governments do not have effective document depository programs, finding and collecting publications often requires an intense effort on the part of librarians. Informal arrangements, like building a rapport with the clerk’s office or public information office and placing a box for documents earmarked for the library or developing a spy network of patrons who know of local documents through their occupations or community involvement, are some proactive strategies that can be employed. Maintaining a well-organized and current vertical file of local newspaper clippings is a very labor intensive project. Despite the obstacles, some libraries have built very good collections for local government information.

The second example illustrates the potential usefulness of the Internet for both users and providers of local government information. Many counties, cities, and towns are developing World Wide Web Sites for providing information and services to the local community. Some local governments now have the capability to develop Internet resources themselves while others are relying on the services of a commercial web site publishers. The cost of developing and maintaining a local government web site can range anywhere from $2,000 to over $100,000, depending on the size and sophistication of the site. Whether or not the investment may be cost effective for local governments, libraries, and users, is unclear. Agency staff time for answering, reproducing, and mailing responses to repetitive inquiries would be reduced. Libraries would be replacing the cost of traditional paper collections with technology costs associated with network access. Users would not have to travel to offices to obtain and submit information, as long as they have Internet access from their homes.

Electronic Mailing Lists

Despite the uncertainties, government officials at all levels are enthusiastic about the potential uses of the Internet and the World Wide Web. Two electronic mailing lists devoted to the discussion of issues related to state and local government information on the Internet are GOVPUB (GOVPUB@VM1.NoDak.EDU) and the Local Government Technology mailing list (lgtech-admin@mail.institute.virginia.edu).

World Wide Web Indexes

Given the recent attention to local governments and the Internet, I decided to take a look at some Web sites to see what kind of information is available. With about 85,000 local governments in the United States, meta-indexes are a good place to start when looking for sites of interest.

Public Technology Inc. (http://pti.mw.dcs.us/AllAbout.htm), a non-profit technology organization for local government, maintains a list of web sites that are endorsed by the respective local governments. The list is organized by state and indicates when new sites are added.

The University of Buffalo’s School of Architecture & Planning (http://arch.buffalo.edu/pair/local_government.html) has developed an index of web links which are sponsored or maintained by local governments throughout the world. The emphasis of the index is on planning and zoning information, sites containing only chamber of commerce, tourism, or self-promotion information are not included. The sites on the list are organized alphabetically by locality name. Alexandria and Williamsburg, two cities in Virginia are situated far apart in the index.

Victoria, British Columbia Freenet (David Mattison) (http://freenet.victoria.bc.ca/freenets.html) provides links to community freenets around the world. In addition to local government information, freenets are a good source for regional information.

CityNet (http://www.city.net/), edited by Kevin Altis and Nancy Tindle, boasts having online connections to 1,375 cities from around the world. The emphasis is on travel, entertainment, and business, so not every site offers local government information. The index is organized by state and includes keyword searching.

California Electronic Government Information Directory (http://ecprs.org/dos/eeg.html), a project maintained by Chris Mays with the support from the California Library Association Government Publications Round Table and Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility, includes a directory of links to municipal, county, and regional governments in California. More than just a list of web links, each entry includes an abstract and a contact person’s email address. Also included is a page of proposed sites, databases that “netizens” feel should be available on the Internet.

The City of Seattle’s home page (http://www.pan.ci.seattle.wa.us/), offers an extensive collection of local government information, including links to other local government sites in the state of Washington.

Some Examples of Local Government Web Sites:

After viewing most of the web sites listed on the indexes, I offer some general observations. Since most web sites are works in progress, the quantity and depth of information varies considerably from site to site, although the type of information is fairly consistent. A typical local government web site includes several
types of information. First, a directory of all the elective offices and departments with a brief description of responsibilities/services and a name/address/phone number for contacting the department. Second, the agendas and minutes of current and previous council/board meetings. Third, the county, city, or town charter. And finally, the summary/highlights of the budget for the current fiscal year.

The following are examples of web sites that provide services or information that go above and beyond the basic information found at most local government sites. Other local governments may be interested in these examples as a guide for further development of their web sites.

**Full-text of Substantive Publications**

The City of San Diego's web site (http://www.saninet.gov/city-council/council-activities/municipal-zoning-code/index.html) offers the full-text of the municipal code. Several options are available for viewing the document. You can retrieve sections by using a word search or go directly to a section by inputting a section number. Also, you can browse the entire directory structure in chapter, article, division, and section format.

The City of Seattle's Public Access Network (http://www.pan.ci.seattle.wa.us/seattle/budget/home.htm) includes the online proposed budget for 1995-96. This section is chock full of budget information; including the mayor's budget message, budget priorities, city revenue sources, expenditure summaries, expenditure categories, department budgets, and the capital improvement program.

In Virginia, the City of Alexandria's home page (http://ci.alexandria.va.us/city-gov/annual_report/00/contents.html) offers the text of the City Manager's Annual Report. The online document includes links to official messages, priority issues, and accomplishments and events in various service areas. Also included is a Statistical Snapshot of the city and its residents.

**Regain the Trust of Citizens by Providing Access to Information**

After its recent bankruptcy disaster, the Orange County government in California (http://www.oc.ca.gov/) has made it a number one priority to make available the complete text of all policy documents regarding current money market investments and broker/dealer questionnaires. Additional documents, such as a chronology of events, a who's who of people involved, and frequently asked questions, are also included. Perhaps if other local governments provide this kind of extensive financial information to the public, fiscal disasters like Orange County would be avoided.

**Providing Interactive Services**

The San Francisco Bay Area Transit Information Project (http://server.berkeley.edu/transit/) is a volunteer effort by a group of UC-Berkeley students who believe it is important to improve the availability of information about the Bay Area over the web. The map based schedule and fare finder allows you to choose an origin and a destination from an area-sensitive map of all BART routes and stations. After your trip is entered, a page is returned that includes the complete schedule for trips/return trips and the exact fares.

**Electronic Mail for Submitting City Forms & Online Access to City Database**

The City of Santa Monica's Public Electronic Network (http://pen.ci.santa-monica.ca.us/pen/) enables its citizens to fill out and submit forms through electronic mail. Online forms are available in 12 areas, including business license, consumer complaints, AIDS/sexual discrimination, library cards, and petty theft reports. Santa Monica's Public Electronic Network is one of the few local government sites to provide online access to a database. Searching the Maximum Allowable Rents Database will allow the user to retrieve rent levels for a particular site address under the city's rent control program.

**Encouraging Citizen Involvement**

In Nevada, the City of Reno government (http://www.reno.gov) offers its citizens a chance to serve on one of its many boards, commissions, or committees by completing an online application. For each organization listed there is a general overview, membership duties, time commitment, and an electronic mail application.

**Easy-to-Use Format & Balanced Presentation of Information**

In Oregon, the City of Salem government (http://www.open.org/salem/) has fashioned its web site to serve the information needs of the average user. Each city department is represented by a graphical link to information on services, programs, and projects. This site offers a good variety of legislative, geographic, and directory information.

**The Important Role of Libraries**

Local government web sites that offer wide array of information that is useful to residents are frequently developed and maintained by their libraries. In North Carolina, the Public Library of Charlotte & Mecklenberg is the lead partner for Charlotte's Web (http://www.charweb.org/) This site offers police and fire information, including local crime statistics; local health statistics which are often difficult to find; and extensive information on environmental programs. The site also posts permit applications filed for commercial and residential building.

The Multnomah County Library in Oregon maintains the Multnomah County government home page (http://www.multnomah.lib.or.us/). It includes the full text of official speeches and department reports. Also included is information on neighborhood associations.

When libraries and other concerned groups are absent from the Internet resource planning process, local governments frequently focus initial efforts on using the Internet to attract business investment, tourism, and other methods of generating revenue. NYCLink, the City of New York's official government home page (http://www.ci.nyc.ny.us/) is a case in point. The site is maintained by the NYC Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications and development of the site is conducted internally among other city agencies without any input from the public, including the New York Public Library. Noticeably absent are the core publications that are found on many of the other local government sites. Instead of providing free access to this basic information, NYCLink offers a list of official publications for sale from the CITYBOOKS Store located at the City Publishing Center. The Green Book, the official NYC directory, will cost you $15. The NYC Charter and the Budget for FY 95 are both available for $25. Various sections of the Code and miscellaneous laws range from $5 to $45.

Local governments that are planning web sites may benefit from the input of focus groups. These groups should consist of individuals who are aware of the needs of local government
information users; like citizens, librarians, local businesses owners, and government employees who handle requests for information. Based on my recent browsing of local government web sites, it is evident that many sites are continuously adding useful information and deserve return visits.

1 Presentation by Professor Joe Morehead, University at Albany, SUNY School of Information Science & Policy, Spring 1993.


Meetings, Conferences, Workshops
Alabama
The Alabama Library Association GODORT hosted a workshop on December 1, 1995 called "How to Furnish Your World Wide Web Home Page." The workshop was held at the Sterne Library at the University of Alabama in Birmingham. Presenters included Janet Frederick of the Auburn University Library, Bret Heim of the Spring Hill College Library, and Joe Moudry of the University of Alabama at Birmingham Library. Speakers covered the fundamental processes of creating government documents world wide web site. Emphasis was places on making clear outlines and hierarchical arrangements. Another important feature discussed was the process, the director of each Louisiana state documents depository library signed a form agreeing to participate in the Plan. The Plan was arranged and customized to fit local user needs. Simplicity and clarity were also emphasized. (Source: Tim Dodge, Moderator of Alabama Library Association GODORT for 1995-96)

Louisiana
The State Library of Louisiana held a celebration on January 10th in order to commemorate the inauguration of the Louisiana State Documents Depository Program Plan. The goals of the Plan include ensuring all citizens of Louisiana be within a one hour drive from a state depository library and developing minimum technical standards for state depository libraries. The Plan was proposed by a committee of the Louisiana Advisory Council for the State Documents Depository Program. After being approved by the Council and the State Librarian, Tom Jaques, the Plan was distributed to the depositories for comments. For the final stage in the process, the director of each Louisiana state documents depository library signed a form agreeing to participate in the Plan. The program at the celebration included speeches by Louisiana State Librarian Tom Jaques, former Recorder of Documents Margaret Lane, current Recorder of Documents Grace Moore, Collin Hamer of the New Orleans Public Library, and Virginia Smith of the Louisiana Section of the State Library. Lori Smith, the current chair of the Advisory Council, acted as mistress of ceremonies. (Source: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University)

James Igoe, Government Documents Coordinator/Public Services Librarian, Ramsey Library, University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, NC 28804-3299; 704-251-6621, 704-251-6012 (fax), jigoec@uncsa.edu

Report from COPAFS

Susan Tulis
University of Virginia Law Library

The third quarterly meeting of the Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics (COPAFS) was held September 15, 1995. Everett Ehrlich, Undersecretary for Economic Affairs in the Department of Commerce, began the meeting, talking about "The Statistical System: Plans and Challenges." Statistical agencies now face some very real challenges in the appropriations process. The past few years have shown many improvements in the statistical systems and plans for continuing these improvements are in danger of being crippled by the political process. The Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) is dealing with tightening budgets by emphasizing the qualitative nature of its outputs and reducing the quantity where possible. The Census Bureau is refocusing on the production of high quality statistical data and is re-engineering its programs because its internal skills need not cover all aspects of the data distribution processes. For the 2000 Census, plans emphasize partnerships with the private sector and with state and local governments, and the use of new technology to reduce costs and increase accuracy. Census is also looking toward more customized data products and reductions in the number of predefined data products.

Changes in data collection methods in both statistical agencies aim to reduce the burden on society while improving accuracy. Such changes include more attractive questionnaires, better administrative cooperation, and improved sampling techniques.

Ehrlich emphasized that users of the statistical system need to speak out about what they want and how they think the system should work. Most users and statistical agencies seem to favor some kind of data-sharing legislation.

Katherine Abraham, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), pointed out the improvements made in recent years in BLS data - the redesigned Current Populations Survey (CPS), innovations in employer data, and converting to electronic data collection which is a time saver for large employers. Electronic data dissemination is expanding at BLS, with special efforts to coordinate with academic and private sector data users. Abraham is concerned about the mismatch between resources and needs. There is a perception that statistical agencies are producing more data than is needed, or that they could do things more efficiently, but these perceptions do not reflect the reality of scaled-back programs.

Paula Schneider, Census Bureau, spoke about existing Internet access and the Data Access and Delivery System (DADS). Internet access to data of the Census Bureau was established in 1994 - prompted by customer interest and the National Performance Review. Efforts are on-going in the areas of decentralizing activities and linking with various data delivery systems. Establishment of the Internet site has resulted in an entirely new customer base. An important priority for the Bureau is to balance the needs of these new customers with the needs of its traditional customers. Goals that are currently being implemented include promoting of products and services, market research, communications enhancements, online ordering, and custom product generation.

As development continues, several policy issues must be resolved. Data integrity is key in Internet dissemination - data must be confidential and accurate. Standards must be developed and refined for documentation and metadata. Access to all segments of the population must be considered. Relationships with other federal statistical agencies and Federal Depository Libraries must be established and the Government Information Locator System needs to be incorporated. Costs of development and maintenance need to be determined and policies for cost recovery must be established.
The Census Bureau’s plans for future data delivery are being developed as the Data Access and Delivery System (DADS) - a concept that is based on a coordinated and systematic approach to dissemination. The objective is to provide a single electronic systems for access to all Census Bureau data that is fast, flexible, and cost-efficient. Its focus will be on the 2000 decennial census and continuous measurement.

Questions and concerns were expressed following Schneider’s presentation. The reduction in the number of printed reports was discussed and key concerns were those users who do not have electronic access and the issue of archiving. There was disagreement on the equity issue -- just how much electronic access will people have by the time the 2000 Census data are released? Many feel that Internet dissemination will effectively increase access rather than decrease it, while others see it as depriving a particular constituency. Cost factors were discussed - isn’t this federally produced data a public good that should be accessed at no charge? Concern was also expressed that the broader access envisioned in the next decade will foster an increase in analysis by individuals who are not qualified.

Ed Hunter, National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), spoke about efforts within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to consolidate surveys from the various agencies within HHS. An effort is underway to reinvent the health data system. The HHS Data Council was established to guide planning within the Department. An outside Advisory Group was established to provide advice on issues such as data standards and electronic interchange, and to make recommendations to the Data Council. Organizationally, the role and functions of NCHS are being strengthened to define it as a central statistical entity. Major steps are being taken to establish linkages and integration that will permit consolidation of the more than 300 surveys conducted within HHS. Key issues that need to be worked out include minimizing the burden on respondents and establishing confidentiality standards.

Constance Citro and Robert Michael, editors of the National Research Council’s Measuring Poverty: A New Approach gave an overview of their new report. Initiated by the family Support Act of 1988, the National Academy of Science’s Panel on Poverty and Family Assistance studied concepts, information needs, and measurement methods.

The current poverty threshold was developed by the Social Security Administration in 1963. Problems with the existing threshold were categorized as flawed, obsolete, or arguable. The Panel recommended that a basic threshold needs to be established to measure the fundamental concept of economic deprivation. This level should provide for food, clothing, shelter, and "a little more" without defining what that "little more" should be. The threshold should include adjustments for household size, geographic differences, and changes over time.

The definition of family resources, or income, should be changed to include the value of in-kind government subsidies such as food stamps, public housing and school lunches. Subtracted from the available resources should be federal, state, and local income and payroll taxes, child support payments, specified work-related expenses including child care, and medical out of-pocket expenses, including premiums for health insurance.

Empirical tests used CPS data to measure differences between the current measure and recommended measure. A poverty populations identified with the recommended threshold would include more families with the head working a full year, more two-parent families with children, more families without health insurance, and fewer families receiving assistance from the government.

Some changes in the poverty population as well as the impact of many government programs simply cannot be measured by the current poverty threshold, but could with the recommended threshold. Examples include Food Stamps, FICA taxes, the Earned Income Tax Credit, income tax rates, health insurance coverage, child care subsidies, and child support awards. The ability to measure such policy changes would provide a valuable tool. For example, the Earned Income tax Credit is based on before-tax income so it is impossible to know how many people it lifted out of poverty under the current system.

The December 8, 1995 meeting began with the usual update from Ed Spar, Executive Director on where funding stands for the major federal statistical agencies. As one might imagine, none of agencies who have received their FY 1996 appropriations got what they requested, some being harder hit than others. Spar also reported that the Supreme Court has agreed to hear the case which contends that the Secretary of Commerce was arbitrary and capricious in deciding not to adjust the 1990 Census figures for undercount. The hearing was scheduled for January 10, 1996.

Alan Tupek, National Science Foundation, spoke about federal statistical agency coordination of the dissemination of statistical information. The Subcommittee on Electronic Dissemination of Statistical Data of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology released its report "Electronic Dissemination of Statistical Data" (Statistical Policy Working Paper 24) in November 1995. The report is intended as an aid to statistical agency managers in decision-making about electronic dissemination of publicly-available statistical data. It was organized and written to transcend the types of media used in the rapidly changing environment for electronic dissemination. Topics found in the report include: Options and Best Uses for Different Media, Operation of Electronic Dissemination Service, Customer Service Programs, Cost and Financing of Electronic Dissemination Service, Latest Interagency Initiatives, and an Appendix which gives a summary of current federal agency practices. (This report can be found at http://www.bts.gov or in PDF format at http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/stats/htm).

Other activities Tupek has been involved in include working with David Lytel, Office of Science and Technology Policy, on a White House initiative to establish economic and social indicators briefing rooms. These briefing rooms would provide key federal statistics with links to the issuing agencies’ home pages. Tupek is chairing the One-Stop Shopping Task Force of the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy whose purpose is to provide easy access to all federal statistics on the World Wide Web. This one-stop site is likely to include a list and description of the federal statistical agencies; categories and classification of federal statistical information; direct links to data series; and a series of pointers to various agency sites.

Council Nedd, House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, reviewed H.R. 2521 - the bill introduced by Rep. Stephen Horn designed to consolidate the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Federal Statistical Service (FSS). The FSS would be established as an independent agency in the executive branch and headed by an administrator who is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In addition, there would be a statutory
deputy administrator, general counsel and inspector general appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate as well as a Federal Council on Statistical Policy established to advise the Administrator and the President. The House Committee planned to hold hearings on this bill the week of February 12, 1996.

Judith Waldrop and Carolyn Hay, Bureau of the Census, provided an update on the questionnaire design and testing plans for the 2000 Census. It is important to keep in mind that this is questionnaire design NOT content. The postcard approach which has been discussed in the past has been abandoned. The questionnaire is being redesigned so that it is in a simpler, more user-friendly format. It must also stand out from the stacks of commercial mailings that many Americans receive every day (probably yellow). Three new designs will be tested during the 2000 Census Test (March 2, 1996) - two were designed by a commercial art design firm, the third designed within the Census Bureau.

Jack Triplett, Bureau of Economic Analysis, gave an update on the development of the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) which is being proposed to replace the current Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system effective January 1, 1997. NAICS is being developed in cooperation with Statistics Canada and Mexico’s Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (INEGI). The principles under which the three countries are operating in the development of NAICS are:

1) NAICS will be erected on a production-oriented, or supply-based conceptual framework. This means that producing units that use identical or similar production processes will be grouped together in NAICS.

2) The system will give special attention to developing production-oriented classification for (a) new and emerging industries, (b) service industries in general, and (c) industries engaged in the production of advanced technologies.

3) Time series continuity will be maintained to the extent possible. Adjustments will be required for sectors where the United States, Canada, and Mexico presently have incompatible industry classification definitions in order to produce a common industry system for all three North American countries.

4) The system will strive for compatibility with the 2-digit level of the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC, Rev. 3) of the United Nations.

Susan E. Tulis, University of Virginia Law Library, 580 Massie Road, Charlottesville, VA 22903-1789; (804) 924-3504; (804) 982-2232 (fax); set7c@virginia.edu

A Report Worth Reading!!

This report was released in November 1995, and is highly recommended reading by both COPAFS and APDU. It includes useful appendices summarizing electronic access and media from federal statistical agencies and giving many ftp, gopher and www addresses. It has not yet been distributed to depository libraries (Item 126-D-7, MF), but is available on at least two web sites: the Bureau of Transportation Statistics Home Page (http://www.bts.gov) and in pdf format from the National Science Foundation’s Division of Science Resources Studies (http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/stats.htm). The report is also available from NTIS as PB96-121629. The report citation is:


Report from APDU

Julie Wallace
University of Minnesota

GODORT is a member of APDU, the Association of Public Data Users, which is an association of professionals in data use from agencies, academia, and the non-profit and private sectors. As GODORT’s representative this year, I attended the Annual Conference in Washington October 30 to November 1. The conference included a mix of policy discussion and practical statistical information, and for the first time included an Agency Showcase with demonstrations of electronic dissemination products from over a dozen federal statistical agencies. The conference was preceded by workshops on international data sources and economic data from the Census Bureau. A summary of the materials from the international workshop are available on the World Wide Web at http://dpls.dacc.wisc.edu/apdu.

A major theme for several of the prominent speakers was that we are in danger of losing much of our nation’s statistical base. The potential loss of statistics comes from two concurrent movements in Washington. First is the pressure to downsize, consolidate and eliminate agencies and reorganize statistical units. Second and possibly more troublesome is the devolution of programs to the state and local level. Unless the shift of major programs such as welfare and Medicare includes some standards and guidelines for statistical reporting, we are in danger of losing a great deal of comparable information with which to evaluate program effectiveness and track these issues over time. So far, attention to the statistical implications of this devolution has been sparse in Congress. One point made over and over was the importance of political contacts and advocacy by those who manage and use statistical data. Those who know how data is used by the public need to inform Congress about its importance.

The conference opened with a keynote address by Janet L. Norwood, Senior Fellow at the Urban Institute and former Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, speaking on "The Current Crisis in Federal Statistics: Opportunity for Change or Politics as Usual?" Suggesting that criticism of statistics goes in cycles, she identified several reasons. People don’t like the results; the system seems disjointed, with multiple agencies and databases, and it seems to be lagging and slow to change. But an objective system of information is critical to a democratic society. Major shifts are being driven by technological and political change. Technological advances are forcing a complete rethinking of information collection, packaging and dissemination. At the same time, the world of public policy is being turned on its head, with policy-makers knowing what they want to do without the benefits of data. Norwood warned that the pressures for devolution, which will move programs to the state and local level, can have drastic consequences for the collection and comparability of data, and presents problems for historic record keeping and data maintenance. She recommends that any devolution legislation must include requirements for collection of basic data, with defined variables, as well as for archiving. She also suggests that more cooperation among levels of government will be required, and that
Norwood described a variety of efforts going on in Congress to statistical efforts, and mentioned in particular Representative Horn's bill (HR 2521), which she called "a sincere attempt" to improve the statistical system. Her book Organizing to Count: Change in the Federal Statistical System, is available from the Urban Institute Press.

A panel on "Improving Government Dissemination of Statistical Information" was introduced by Alan Tukep of the National Science Foundation, who was a member of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology's Subcommittee on Electronic Dissemination of Statistical Data. The subcommittee's report "is intended as an aid to statistical agency managers in decision-making about electronic dissemination of publicly-available statistical data." Tukep provided an overview of the report, which had not been officially released at the time of the conference. It includes chapters on options for various media, customer service, and cost and financing for electronic dissemination. The report was released in November 1995, and is highly recommended reading; it includes useful appendices summarizing electronic access and media from federal statistical agencies. The title is Electronic Dissemination of Statistical Data, and the complete reference and availability information of this report are on page 74 of this issue.

Forrest Williams of STAT-USA and John Kavallianas of the Census Bureau were also on the subcommittee which produced the report. They spoke of changes in federal agencies' dissemination, driven by technologies and by budget constraints. Williams spoke of a "tidal wave of changes" including such things as groupware. He said that agencies find electronic dissemination cheaper than paper, and that they consider electronic releases to be "publications". He anticipates more partnerships with the private sector to produce and disseminate data. There is an increasing public demand for faster access to data. He is concerned that some agencies think they can deemphasize documentation and customer support. Kavallianas spoke of tightening budgets, saying that the Census Bureau can no longer afford to print, especially as they are being asked to recover costs. He cited four problem areas: assure that electronic sources are user-friendly; provide for a variety of media, assure archiving of data; and create adequate documentation.

Richard Rockwell, Executive Director of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), expressed major concerns about effective documentation and metadata. He also pointed out that archiving means more than just storage, but that they consider electronic releases to be "publications". He anticipates more partnerships with the private sector to produce and disseminate data. There is an increasing public demand for faster access to data. He is concerned that some agencies think they can deemphasize documentation and customer support. Kavallianas spoke of tightening budgets, saying that the Census Bureau can no longer afford to print, especially as they are being asked to recover costs. He cited four problem areas: assure that electronic sources are user-friendly; provide for a variety of media, assure archiving of data; and create adequate documentation.

Katherine K. Wallman, Chief of OMB's Statistical Policy Office, titled her talk "Building Bridges Over Troubled Waters." The troubled waters include the organizational framework of legislative and administrative initiatives, devolution and its possible relationship to deregulation and a corresponding loss of data, budget constraints and problems with planning budgets in the current Congressional climate, and the credibility crisis. She proposed several bridges which are needed; starting with bridges among agencies; current discussions of classification of race and ethnicity and of poverty are examples. Other bridges are needed with state and local governments, international agencies, and users.

Barbara Everitt Bryant, Research Scientist at the University of Michigan Business School and former Director of the Bureau of the Census, spoke on "The Impact of the Privacy Act on Statistics." Because marketers are able to piece together data and geography in more sophisticated ways, the public feels that privacy is being eroded, and resistance to government statistical efforts is increasing. Data users need to communicate with the public and with Congress about the benefits of good data and its role in strengthening the economy. Bryant predicts more involvement of the private sector in surveys, using the government's census as the "gold standard" by which to calibrate other data. Bryant's new book, Moving Power and Money: The Politics of Census Taking is available from the New Strategist.

Martha Farnsworth Riche, Director of the Bureau of the Census, spoke about plans for the year 2000 census. Strategies being used to meet the goals of accuracy and cost effectiveness include building many partnerships, simplicity in forms and collection, and intelligent use of technology. The bureau plans a bare minimum of printed summary reports, and is developing an electronic system where users will create their own reports. Calling it the "democratization of data," Riche said people will no longer "have to go to the library and plow through the data." She did acknowledge concerns about archiving and metadata. She cited two major and difficult trends. First is the downsizing of government, with the corresponding need to focus on what is the appropriate role for the federal government. Second is the increasing reluctance of the public to cooperate. Two later panels provided detailed information about the National Content Test and the 1995 Test Census.

A program designed as a wake-up call for APDU members was entitled "Making Ourselves Heard: The Role of Users in Policy Making." TerriAnn Lowenthal was the first speaker. She was the staff director of the former House Subcommittee on Census and Population, and now is with the Rothschild-Lowenthal group where she maintains a strong interest in statistical issues. She illustrated the major shift in political winds which accompanied the last election, with monumental policy implications. Many initiatives are swirling in Congress, from eliminating agencies and statistical programs to specific issues like changes in labor market information and the Debt Collection Improvement Act, which permits data sharing using Social Security numbers. As programs are turned over to states, how can we as a society monitor success? Congress may dismantle a network of social services without any idea of how to measure the consequences. Members and staff are not necessarily well-informed. It is a responsibility of APDU and other associations to educate and advise Congress. Lowenthal encourages us to ask the right questions, and help shape the answers.

David McMillan, minority staff member on the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, verified that a lot is going on but with no coordination. He provided an update on the Family Privacy Protection Act, which would have major implications for the collection of data from persons under 18. He discussed the Horn bill, which would consolidate all of the major statistical agencies. Who would decide priorities and allocate resources? How are specific subject-matter interests maintained? Anthony Black of the Census Bureau's Congressional Affairs Office said that they try to inform Congress of all of the Bureau's activities, but it is hard to get attention except when there are problems. Each of the panelists encouraged the audience to maintain contact with Congress; contact offices frequently, help local offices with statistics about the district, and build coalitions with other associations and state and local groups.
A panel of staff members from the Energy Information Administration described the process they are using to improve dissemination of energy data, involving customers as they work towards improved services. Additional panels covered issues, problems and examples of privacy and security issues and geographic information systems. Specialized concurrent sessions provided in-depth looks at international data and health and disability data. Final speaker William H. Frey of the Population Studies Center at the University of Michigan described the Social Science Data Analysis Network at the Center. It involves 12 colleges and enables social scientists to share data and create classroom projects in data analysis.

APDU has a new committee structure, which provides an opportunity for GODORT to contribute to APDU as well as to benefit from our membership. A Public Policy Committee has as its objectives "to monitor and communicate developments on policy issues pertaining to public data and to interact with key stakeholders in the statistical policy arena." The chair of the committee is Stephen J. Dienstfrey of the Office of Veterans Affairs. APDU will be one of several associations with an interest in statistical policy which will participate in the Federal Depository Library Conference in April.

Julia F. Wallace, Government Publications Library, 409 Wilson Library, University of Minnesota, 309 19th Ave. South, Minneapolis, MN 55455; 612-626-7520 (voice), 612-626-9353 (fax); j-wall@tc.umn.edu

**IFLA: Government Information and Official Publications Section**

**1995 Annual Report**

**Al Kagan**

University of Illinois

**Introduction**

The Government Information and Official Publications Section had another stimulating year. During the 1994/95 year, we had a very successful program on the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, showed a special UN video, participated in our first IFLA divisional program, held an exciting seminar for Anglophone African librarians, planned two more Third World seminars, began planning for the 1996 Beijing and Copenhagen meetings, and elected two new promising officers. I would again like to thank Nina Leneman, who not only did a wonderful job as our Secretary and newsletter editor, but also ably organized and chaired our UN program in Istanbul. It was indeed unfortunate that our Treasurer, Celine Walker, had to leave her UN position after her agency (ACCIS) was reorganized out of existence. We were sad to receive her resignation from her IFLA position.

**Programs and Seminars**

Our Istanbul program was titled, "UN-50: Fifty Years of United Nations Publishing Activities." It was attended by about 60 people. The speakers and paper titles were: Patrice Piguet, "Fifty Years of United Nations Publishing Activities;" Nina Leneman, "A Chronological Perspective of the United Nations at Geneva Library;" Eleanor Frierson, "Information Services of the International Labour Office: a 75-Year History;" and Jane Wu presenting for Keith Richmond, "Fifty Years of Publishing in FAO." It is likely that the papers will be published by a library journal in the United States. About 100 people attended a special showing of the video "Once Upon a Time: the United Nations." Stephen Zink presented "Government Information in a World of Change" at the joint program of the Division of Collections and Services. The 1996 Beijing program will be on Human Rights Documentation.

The first Anglophone Africa Seminar on Government Information and Official Publications was successfully held at the University of Zimbabwe in Harare, December 15-18, 1994. It was a joint project of the IFLA Section on Government Information and Official Publications and the IFLA Regional Section on Africa, and co-sponsored by Unesco and the U. S. National Commission on Library and Information Science. 33 participants came from 13 countries, including 4 U. N. system institutions and 1 NGO. 27 speakers took part in 8 panels over the four days. The keynote overview speech was given by Dean J. B. Ojiambo, of the Faculty of Information Sciences at Moi University in Kenya. The participants stayed together in the dormitories, ate in the dining hall, enjoyed a barbecue and a special dinner, and generally got to know each other. Those who arrived a bit early were treated to a city tour arranged by our local organizer, Stan Made, University Librarian at the University of Zimbabwe. Participants were intensely interested in the topics addressed, and there was a high level of vigorous discussion. 14 resolutions were passed and published in *IFLA Journal*, the newsletter of the two sponsoring IFLA Sections and elsewhere. A small working group was established to work on implementing the resolutions. The papers are being edited for publication. I would like to give my warmest thanks to Kay Raseroka (Chair, Africa Section) and Stan Made (Host and Secretary, Africa Section) for their crucial help in organizing such a stimulating and enjoyable seminar.

Plans are well underway for a similar seminar in Moscow for the countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, however the proposed date is now April 1997. We are also planning a seminar for Arabic-speaking countries to be held in 1998.

**Election of New Officers**

The Section was pleased to elect Francis Kirkwood (Library of Parliament, Canada) as the new Chair/Treasurer, and Helen Sheehy (Pennsylvania State University, USA) as the new Secretary. I wish both of them much success in continuing the work of the Section.

Al Kagan, Africana, 328 Library, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801; 217-333-6519 (voice); 217-244-0398 (fax); kagan@vmd.eso.uiuc.edu

**1996 GODORT Award Winners**

**Susan Tulis**

University of Virginia Law Library

**Johannes de Thulstrup**

**James Bennett Childs Award**

The 1996 recipient of the James Bennett Childs Award is Julia Wallace, Head of the Government Publications Library at the University of Minnesota. This award is a tribute to an individual who has made a lifetime and significant contribution to the field of documents librarianship. This award is being presented to Julia in recognition of her leadership in the library community and her role as an advocate for public access to government information. She has also been a successful scholar as demonstrated in her work as author, editor, and spokesperson.
Julia's most profound contribution to the profession was her leadership role in a series of meetings and conferences that culminated in the "Framework" document jointly issued by ALA, ARL, SLA, and others in August 1995. Julie, as Chair of GODORT, spearheaded with Gary Cornwell, Chair of Depository Library Council, the Dupont Circle meeting which met in April, 1993. The focus of the Dupont Circle meeting was re-invention of the Federal Depository Library Program in light of change in the government information environment. The object was to develop a discussion document that would evoke dialogue in the documents community. This was followed by the Chicago Conference on the Future of Federal Government Information in October, 1993, which Julia co-chaired. Coordination of an ad-hoc conference with more than 150 attendees was a monumental feat. In April, 1995, Julia played an active role in the Coalition of Many Associations (COMA) which was held to press the Dupont Circle/Chicago Conference efforts onward. Julia was one of four original Dupont Circle Group members that was invited to attend the ALA Forum on Government Information Policy that convened in July 1995. As a final step in the re-structuring process, Ms. Wallace was asked by the GPO to be a member of the team named to a Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a Successful Transition to a More Electronic Federal Depository Library Program.

In addition to Julia's long string of activities within GODORT including serving as GODORT Chair 1992-93, she has been involved in countless other professional activities at the national, state, and local levels. Several major activities include: facilitator, chair, and speaker at the GPO's annual Federal Depository Conference in 1990, 1992, 1993, and 1994; official delegate from the Minnesota Association of Law Libraries to the National Conference on Legal Information Issues, July, 1995; in 1990-1991 served on the Depository Library Council's subcommittee studying implications of users fees on depository library services; served as chair of the Government Documents Round Table of the Minnesota Library Association in 1985; and been a member of the Minnesota Government Information Access Committee's Executive Committee since 1994. Add to this Julia's thirty plus public presentations and you have a remarkably active participant in the federal information dialog over the past decade.

Equally important, as stated in her nomination letter, Julia "has contributed all of this service with a high level of selflessness, compassion, and conviction." And she has done it all with grace and good humor under fire. She is precisely the sort of documents librarian who deserves the recognition the Childs award bestows.

CIS/GODORT/ALA "Documents to the People" Award

The 1996 recipient of the CIS/GODORT/ALA "Documents to the People Award is Jack Sulzer, Head of Reference, Pennsylvania State University. This award is presented to the individual, library, institution, or other non-commercial group that has most effectively encouraged the use of government documents in support of library service.

This award is being given in recognition of Jack's tireless efforts to improve access to government information. Jack has spent the majority of his professional career working to improve documents services and accessibility. Jack has been involved in all of the major focus groups of the last few years dealing with the future of the Depository Library Program and access to government information. He has published many articles and presented a number of papers and speeches dealing with government information, electronic access to information resources, and the use of computer networks. Jack's contributions as a researcher, writer, and active spokesperson have provided the library community with a vision for the future of government information and more importantly, it has caused the profession to think. Jack possesses an uncanny ability to identify new approaches to old problems. While the rest of us are still trying to apply existing principles to current issues, Jack will develop an entirely new model for resolving the problem.

In addition, Jack has been very active in professional organizations. He chaired the Government Documents Round Table in 1990-91, has chaired numerous GODORT committees, and served on the Depository Library Council during 1992-1994 where he was the Chairperson in 1994/95. Lastly, Jack has served as an inspiration to his colleagues and has always been willing to share his expertise and time to improve documents librarianship. He has been particularly effective as a mentor to younger Documents Librarians and always makes time to advise and/or council where needed or asked.

Clearly, Jack's career demonstrates the purpose of this award. This was best stated by one of his colleagues in his nomination letter, "Jack is the epitome of the phrase 'Documents to the People'." We are all in his debt for his many contributions to our profession and for his unstinting efforts in our behalf.

Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds Award

The 1996 recipients of the Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds Award are Susan M. Ryan and George D. Barnum. This award is named in honor of Catharine J. Reynolds, former Head of Publications at the University of Colorado, Boulder Libraries until her retirement in 1984. This award is designed to perpetuate Ms. Reynolds' encouragement to promising librarians by assisting and encouraging documents librarians who are relatively new to the field of research, travel or study in the field of documents librarianship or in an area of study that would directly benefit their performance as documents librarians. The award is supported by a $2,000 contribution from the Readex Corporation.

Susan M. Ryan, Government Documents Department Head at Stetson University, was awarded $1,500.00 to cover research expenses at the National Archives and Records Administration for a book on "The Treatment and Portrayal of Women in U.S. Government Publications." At present, there is very little written that analyzes the treatment of women in official government publications. This book would fill that void by identifying government publications sources that portray women (in both positive and negative manners) throughout the history of the United States and to analyze the information within its historical context.

George D. Barnum, Government Documents Department Head at Case Western Reserve University, was awarded $500.00 to assist in his final research for the paper "Finding Common Ground: Creating the Library of the Future Without Diminishing the Library of the Past." This paper was presented at the March 30-31, 1996 conference sponsored by the Harvard College Libraries. The paper examined the place of government information in academic libraries and suggested models by which value can be ascertained and assigned beyond the customary models of cost/benefit analysis. In addition, George plans to do further presentations on the valuing of government information collections.

Bernadine Abbott Hoduski Founders Award

No award was presented for 1996.
David Rozkusza Scholarship

The 1996 recipient of the David Rozkusza Scholarship is Linda Chia, who is currently working as a Government Documents Associate at Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois. Linda has spent the past 20 years working in documents and dealing with the full range of library duties. She is in charge of processing the federal and Illinois government publications, answers reference questions, supervises student workers, provides bibliographic instruction, and works with installing and operating government CD-ROMs. In addition, she supervised the construction of the Government Documents Web page for Loyola University.

Linda's goal after graduation is to be a devoted Government Documents Librarian. The formal training acquired through obtaining a MLIS degree will complement her already-acquired practical knowledge. Linda will, thanks to the scholarship, be able to finish her MLIS at Rosary College in the summer of 1996. Linda was quite happy when she got the news and wanted to extend her personal thanks to all those who have contributed to the scholarship fund.

Susan E. Tulis, University of Virginia Law Library, 580 Massie Road, Charlottesville, VA 22903-1789; (804) 924-3504; (804) 982-2232 (fax); set7e@virginia.edu

IASSIST'96

Jean Stratford
University of California, Davis

The International Association for Social Science Information Service and Technology (IASSIST) will hold its 1996 meeting in Minneapolis, May 15-18. The conference will be held at the Radisson Hotel Metrodome. Its theme will be "Weaving the Web of Social Science Research, Data and Support."

The conference will bring together researchers, data producers, data archivists, data librarians and support staff to explore the changing roles and relationships among those who work with social science data. New technologies for creating, storing, accessing and analyzing data have opened up new opportunities, new solutions, and new problems in working with data. Changes in the economic and political climate around the world have raised new expectations, new concerns, and new possibilities in terms of what data is collected and how its used. Researchers are exploring data using new tools and techniques and are searching for means of effectively using these methods in an instructional setting.

IASSIST'96 provides a forum for the exploration of the needs, aspirations and constraints facing the data community and is an opportunity to determine how we can collaborate to strengthen that community. To facilitate this discussion the conference will also provide a one day overlap with Computing in the Social Sciences 1996 during which joint sessions will be held.

For further information, contact Conference Co-Chair Wendy Treadwell, Machine Readable Data Center, University of Minnesota, 2 Wilson Library, Minneapolis, MN USA 55455, e-mail: wendy@mr4dc.lib.umn.edu, or consult the conference home page at http://www.ssc.upenn.edu/iassist96.

Jean Slemmons Stratford, Director of Research Services, Institute of Governmental Affairs, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95616-8617; 916-752-5141 (voice); 916-752-2835 (fax); jsstratford@ucdavis.edu
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