



Administrative Notes

Newsletter of the Federal Depository Library Program

Vol. 21, no. 15

GP 3.16/3-2:21/15

November 15, 2000

Spring 2001 Council Meeting To Be Held in San Antonio

The spring 2001 Depository Library Council meeting will be held April 1-4, in San Antonio, Texas, at the Four Points Hotel (Riverwalk North, 110 Lexington Avenue, San Antonio, TX 78205). The preliminary agenda for the meeting will be published in January.

A limited number of rooms at the Four Points Hotel are available at \$91 (plus tax) per night single and \$111 (plus tax) per night double. This rate will be honored through March 1, 2001. For reservations, call toll free to (800) 28-TEXAS or call the hotel directly at (210) 223-9461 and mention the U.S. Government Printing Office or the Depository Library Council meeting.



Shipping Lists in PDF Format Available on GPO Access

Shipping lists are now available on GPO Access in Portable Document Format (PDF), beginning with lists for the new fiscal year. PDF files for paper, electronic and separates shipments are available from the FDLP Desktop at <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/tools/sl/slister.html>. PDF files can be viewed on-screen and printed from a computer in the same format as the original shipping lists that accompany depository shipments.

LPS will provide PDF files for microfiche shipping lists in the near future. Until then, the FY 2001 microfiche shipping lists will continue to be available on U.S. Fax Watch.

The paper, separates, and electronic shipping lists will no longer be available from U.S. Fax Watch. Only the new FY 2001 shipping lists are being converted to PDF—no retrospective conversions are planned.

Paper shipping lists will continue to be sent to libraries in shipment boxes. The information on the shipping lists will continue to be available in dBase format from the Federal Bulletin Board located at <<http://fedbbs.access.gpo.gov/fdlp01.htm>>. The Enhanced Shipping List Label Service, a partnership project between the State University of New York at Buffalo and the Federal Depository Library Program will also continue to be available from <<http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/cts/acq/gpo/>>.



FY 2001 Appropriations Cuts for the FDLP

**Remarks by
Andrew M. Sherman
Director, Congressional, Legislative and Public Affairs**

**Before the Federal Depository Conference and
Fall 2000 Meeting of the Depository Library Council
Arlington, VA
October 23, 2000**

The good news is that GPO has appropriations for fiscal year 2001. Our bill was approved by the House on September 14 and by the Senate on October 12, and the measure has gone to the President. (He has until October 30 to sign it, but in a statement on Thursday the White House said they are withholding signing because of the Treasury-Postal bill, to which our bill—the Legislative Branch appropriations bill—is linked. **(Postscript: the President vetoed the Legislative Branch bill along with the Treasury-Postal bill late on October 30, in the midst of the ongoing confrontation between the White House and Congress over year-end tax, spending, and other legislative measures.)**

The bad news is that our total appropriations this year are about 4% less than last year's. The Salaries and Expenses Appropriation of the Superintendent of Documents—the appropriation that covers the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP)—is 6% less than last year's, down by nearly \$2 million.

Fran Buckley and his staff have been making plans to ensure that the library community will continue to have access to as much Federal information as possible in the coming year, and they will talk more about that throughout this conference. As background, I'm going to tell you how our appropriations got cut. Specifically, I want to make it clear to you that the funding cuts and increased electronic formats are coming at you at the explicit direction of Congress.

When I'm finished you might still have questions about *how* GPO will carry out this direction, but you shouldn't have any questions as to *why*. I also urge you to read Tim Coggins' article in the October 2000 issue of Virginia Lawyer, "Print No More: U.S. Code, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Federal Register," which provides an excellent summary of how the FDLP has come to this point.

Electronic FDLP Transition

Let's start by going back 5 years to the 104th Congress. For the 1996 Salaries and Expenses appropriation, there was an initial proposal in the House for a funding cut of nearly 51% by requiring GPO to bill agencies for their depository copies rather than paying for them out of the appropriation. There was an outcry from the library community, and as a result it didn't pass. But the conferees on that year's appropriations bill ordered GPO to develop a plan to transition

the FDLP to an increasingly electronic basis. The idea was to reduce FDLP costs by encouraging the expanded use of less expensive electronic formats.

What resulted was the Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a Successful Transition to a More Electronic Federal Depository Library Program (June 1996) that has been guiding the FDLP's electronic transition. Despite initial congressional insistence on a 2-year transition, the study projected a longer term of 5-7 years, keying the final transition to the successful resolution of a variety of issues, including permanent access, authenticity, and locator systems.

Since then, there's been a lot of progress on the transition. 53% of the new titles made available to the public through the FDLP this year were online, for example. But we have avoided a breakneck conversion to electronic formats that would compromise the public's right to Government information, and there are outstanding issues still to be dealt with. While we've developed partnerships to assure permanent public access for a variety of information, a governmentwide solution to permanent access for all government information has yet to be nailed down, as have solutions to other issues such as authenticity and locator systems.

Impact on Appropriations

A key congressional interest in the FDLP's transition to electronics has been the opportunity to cut costs. In spite of our annual requests for modest increases—including library community support for increases affecting the FDLP—through 2000 our total appropriations have been reduced nearly 10% from 5 years ago. Most of the cuts have been in our Congressional Printing and Binding appropriation, but the Salaries and Expenses appropriation has also been cut. It was \$30.8 million 5 years ago and \$29.9 million in 2000, down nearly 3 percent overall.

Two years ago, an independent review of GPO conducted by Booz-Allen & Hamilton concluded that the FDLP needed increased funding for marketing of FDLP services, more staff to identify and obtain electronic documents, and more training. Booz-Allen also suggested that GPO, "if necessary, [should] seek additional funds from Congress to expand" GPO Access.

To continue current services and accelerate the electronic transition, for 2001 we asked for \$34.5 million for the Salaries and Expenses appropriation, an increase of about \$4.6 million or 15%, to fund: the addition of new products and capacity to GPO Access as well as permanent public access to the FDLP electronic collection; the printing and distribution of the 2000 edition of depository copies of the U.S. Code; and several new positions in the GPO Access, cataloging and indexing, and library inspections.

We also requested more money for our Congressional Printing and Binding appropriation to pay for the increased workload that typically comes with a first session year. Included in this request was about \$2.5 million to cover the reprinting of the U.S. Code, done every 6 years.

Altogether, our request totaled \$121.3 million, including money requested for a new air-conditioning (AC) system in our building. Without the AC funds, we were asking for an increase of about 12%, not an extraordinary hike for continued operations in terms of the rest of the Legislative Branch: the Senate Sergeant at Arms asked to go up 35%, for example, and so did

the Capitol Police. Our hearings before both the House and Senate went reasonably well, and we got strong support for our Salaries and Expenses appropriation request from the library community through the testimony by Pat Wand and Ridley Kessler.

Congressional Budget Resolution

To fully understand what happened this past year, you have to know about the impact of this year's concurrent budget resolution on the appropriations process, which directly affected the Legislative Branch. Normally, we don't pay much attention to these resolutions, because they are crafted at the macro level, and GPO and the FDLP are basically very small players in the overall Federal budget process. But the priorities contained in the budget resolution earlier this year made it clear that despite record surpluses, there would be little room for *any* spending increases. Of course, many of the limitations of the budget resolution have since gone out the window, but earlier this year the resolution was the guide for all appropriations bills.

In April, the House and Senate laid out a \$1.8 trillion budget and tax cut plan. It called for substantial tax cuts over the next 5 years, and allocated two-thirds of the budget for entitlements like Social Security and Medicare as well as interest on the national debt. Within the remaining \$600 billion targeted for government programs, defense was targeted to increase by more than 6% while domestic spending overall was held to an increase of just 2.6%, with many programs held to a flat or decreased level.

Using the priorities in the budget resolution, the Appropriations Committees then established spending allocations for each of the 13 annual appropriations bills. In the House, the Legislative Branch bill was one of 5 bills slated for reduced funding compared with 2000. The cut was 3.7%, about \$94 million. Incidentally, the House Legislative Branch allocation was different from the Senate's, which provided \$145 million more to work with than the House.

On May 4, the House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee reported its bill out. The budget allocation was used as the rationale for making the spending cuts contained in the bill. But instead of applying the 3.7% cut to all Legislative Branch activities straight across the board, some programs were cut deeply while others were not.

GPO sustained the largest percentage cut—over 25%—of any entity in the bill. Other agencies were cut, too: the Architect of the Capitol got hit for almost 18%, the Capitol Police by nearly 12%, and cuts were made to the Congressional Research Service, the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and COLAs (cost of living adjustments) for House employees. But GPO's was the largest. Also, GPO's cut was 25% of the entire cut sustained by the Legislative Branch--\$26 million out of \$106 million.

The full House Appropriations Committee ratified the Subcommittee's plan on May 9, providing details on how the reduction in GPO's funds was to be achieved. The \$26 million cut translated into a huge \$18.3 million (61%) cut to the Salaries and Expenses appropriation and a \$7.8 million (11%) cut to Congressional Printing and Binding.

Saying that the FDLP could be run “with more cost-effectiveness by making greater use of electronic information technology,” all “funding, except for closeout costs, for distributing paper and other tangible media-based copies of government publications to the Federal depository libraries and international exchange recipients” was eliminated.

Obviously, this cut would have been devastating. It would have ended the distribution of about 25,000 of the 40,000 tangible titles we distributed last year, since those 25,000 were available in tangible formats only. It would have terminated the distribution of tangible versions of the other 15,000 titles which were available in dual formats. Except for cataloging and indexing electronic titles, virtually all support services provided by GPO to depository libraries would have been terminated, including program administration, designations, product acquisition, classification, inspections, training, consultative services, and permanent public access partnerships. As a result, most of the staff would have been laid off. The cuts would have eliminated the distribution of tangible materials in the International Exchange Program, operated under international treaty, and would have ended the distribution of all by-law copies of the Congressional Record to the Library of Congress and the National Archives.

The Congressional Printing and Binding cuts were also potentially devastating to the FDLP. They eliminated funding for all publications considered “not absolutely essential to the day-to-day operations and legislative activities of the House and Senate,” including the Congressional Record Index and index personnel; the U.S. Code; the congressional Serial Sets; printing for the 2001 Presidential inauguration; all numbered documents including the quarterly Statements of Disbursements of the House and the semiannual Report of the Secretary of the Senate; treaties; the Congressional Directory; hearings over 3 months old, and other publications such as Our Flag, and the Capitol Magazine. Cutting funding for these publications from the appropriation virtually guaranteed that they would not be produced, meaning they would not have been made available for depository distribution.

The House also required a study of the transfer of Superintendent of Documents functions to the Library of Congress (a proposal which had been rejected twice before by the Library within the past 5 years), and a study of the transfer of the Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate (a proposal that also had been rejected earlier).

There were a couple of bright spots: the House authorized the use of unexpended funds from prior years for current year purposes, although it was not clear how much of this money would be available for 2001. In addition, the usual reduction to our overall personnel ceiling was left at the 2000 level. On the other hand, the overall cut to our funding would have forced the layoff of about 435 personnel, including as I said earlier virtually all of the FDLP staff.

Reaction

Reaction to the House cuts was swift. ABC Nightly News covered the Appropriations Committee vote May 9th and that night ran a network story about the cuts featuring Fran Buckley and the FDLP. It also featured the cuts to the Capitol Police, which were said to

undermine their attempts to increase security in the wake of the 1998 shootings. The Capitol Police cuts would prove to be the lead story on the cuts in the weeks that followed.

The cuts in tangible distribution to depositories also drew widespread attention. An especially effective point was raised about the vulnerability of databases to hackers and virus attacks, since the “I love you” virus had only recently happened. On May 11, Public Printer DiMario sent a strongly worded letter to the Appropriations Committee Members, expressing his “profound concern and dismay” with the cuts and requesting reconsideration of these measures “in the strongest possible terms.”

Through its Washington representatives and others, the library community spread the word about the cuts to librarians nationwide, many of whom contacted their Congressmen and Senators. Other librarians contacted their local newspapers, which are closely watched on Capitol Hill. I can't count the number of calls my office received from congressional staffs wanting to learn more about what was going on.

Senate Action

The outcry over the House proposals didn't escape the Senate's attention. On May 23, the Appropriations Committee reported out its version of the Legislative Branch bill. S. 2603 recommended an increase in the Salaries and Expenses appropriation, by .4%. The Committee declined to participate in transferring the congressional printing appropriation to the Senate and said nothing about the transfer of the Superintendent of Documents to the Library of Congress.

Floor Votes

When the House managers for H.R. 4516 brought their bill to the floor on June 21, there was a managers' amendment which increased the funding for several accounts covered by the bill, including GPO's. The Salaries and Expenses appropriation was increased to \$25.7 million. Funding was restored for distribution of the 25,000 titles not otherwise available online, and 90% of the funding for FDLP program administration was put back. But funding remained cut for the tangible distribution of the 15,000 titles available in dual formats.

The Congressional Printing and Binding appropriation was also partially restored, putting back funding for inaugural printing, the Congressional Directory, and treaties, but funding was still cut for other “non-legislative” items. While welcomed, the managers' amendment still represented a cut of 8% from the 2000 level of funding. As soon as the House acted, the Senate passed its bill, moving the bill to conference.

Conference Agreement

On June 30, following the appointment of conferees on the two bills, the Public Printer sent a letter urging them to agree to the higher funding levels for GPO contained in the Senate bill, and to put language in the conference report addressing the other problematic provisions of the House report, specifically the issue of dual formats. He argued that the House requirement to cut off all funding for the tangible distribution of the 15,000 titles available in dual formats was

premature, that while we are gradually transitioning these titles to an online-only availability, dual format distribution for other publications continues to be required in many cases.

However, the conference agreement simply split the difference on funding for GPO between the Senate and House versions, with the final amounts at \$71.5 million for Congressional Printing and Binding and \$27.954 million for Salaries and Expenses. For the FDLP, the conferees said “emphasis should be on streamlining the distribution of traditional paper copies of publications which may include providing online access and less expensive electronic formats,” but nothing was explicitly said about the continuation of dual formats.

On other matters, the conferees did not agree with closing out the Congressional Record Index (CRI) unilaterally (although there is a move underway by the Joint Committee on Printing to survey users of the CRI about its continued usefulness), and limited participation in the potential transfer of the congressional printing appropriation to the House only. They changed the study of the transfer of Superintendent of Documents operations to the Library to include the FDLP only, and directed that GAO—not the Library’s Congressional Research Service, as originally proposed—perform the study, to be completed by March 30, 2001. The study is already underway.

Passage

The conference agreement was brought to the floor in the House in July, attached to a bill funding the Treasury, Postal Service, and other agencies that had previously passed the House but not the Senate. Following Senate objections, it was withdrawn and brought to the floor again in September, where it passed narrowly. In the Senate, however, the two-part bill, known as a “minibus,” was rejected, for reasons that had more to do with the Treasury bill than with the Legislative Branch bill.

In the meantime, the fiscal year expired. GPO’s funding was continued—at FY 2000 levels—in a series of 4, week-long continuing resolutions that have been passed since the end of September. On October 12, the Senate took up the conference agreement on Legislative Branch/Treasury and passed it. When I last checked, however, the President had yet to sign the bill into law.

Lessons Learned

At the end of his article in *Virginia Lawyer*, Tim Coggins provides his views on what is likely to happen in the future. One is this that year’s congressional action may discourage continued participation by some libraries in the system. This is certainly possible. Already, 20 libraries dropped out of the program in fiscal 2000, the largest dropout rate that we have records for. Let me offer you some additional views, or lessons learned, from the experience of the past several months.

Early on, our fear was that the House strategy was to initially propose a draconian cut for GPO, making any restoration of funds—however partial—seem very welcome. This is exactly what happened, and this strategy may be used again.

In our view, it turned out to be a blessing that the cut in GPO's funding was proposed in tandem with other, more highly visible cuts, especially the reduction in Capitol Police funding. If the two had not been linked—if only the cut in GPO's funding was proposed—there is a real question in our minds as to what the outcome might have been.

Let me tell you why: Despite our efforts and those of the library community, there is a general lack of knowledge on Capitol Hill about what the FDLP is and does. To an extent, that lack of visibility is to be expected: as I said earlier, this is only a \$30 million program in a \$2.5 billion Legislative Branch, itself only a small part of a \$1.8 trillion Government. But that can't stop us from continually trying to raise the program's visibility. Your Washington representatives have been working on this issue, and GPO realizes the need to do more in this regard. For Members of Congress, however, there's nothing like hearing from back home.

There is a strong belief among many congressional appropriators that electronic information really solves the problem of how to cut the budget. They believe electronic information is free, or just about, and that it reaches everyone, or close enough, and that it is generally superior to printed information. GPO and the library community think the issue is more complex than that. This is nevertheless a powerful belief to overcome, especially in today's dot.com culture.

Now is the time for all of us to work together so we can live within the reduced funding for 2001. Hopefully this will be a constructive experience. From 20 years of experience at GPO, I can tell you that the library community has friends at GPO who believe in the FDLP and who are committed to making it work. They do not determine the level of funding the program gets, however.

There was also one very positive lesson: From what we saw over the past several months, your Washington representatives and others did a good job of keeping you informed about the FDLP budget crisis, and the library community's response can be credited with the turnaround—such as it was—in the House and the support you had in the Senate. Members can be educated, and what was started needs to be built upon in the coming months, especially with the upcoming budget round for 2002 and opening of the 107th Congress.



Changing Times in the FDLP

**Remarks by
Francis J. Buckley, Jr.
Superintendent of Documents**

**Before the Federal Depository Conference and
Fall 2000 Meeting of the Depository Library Council
Arlington, VA
October 23, 2000**

Introduction

Good morning! It is quite gratifying to see so many of you here for the first fall Depository Library Council meeting and conference in many years.

There is much to talk about this morning and, indeed, over the next few days at the conference. I want to begin by expressing appreciation for your continuing support for the FDLP and your library's partnership in this program to facilitate the public's access to the information products produced by their Government.

Last February, I had the opportunity to speak to the National Federation of Abstracting and Information Services about the "Role of the Government "Printing" Office in the Digital Millennium" – I mention that because at the time, I said we couldn't freeze technological development or turn back the clock. We want to assure that the American public, through you and your institutions, continues to have ready, long-term no-fee access to electronic government information, as it has for the print/tangible products that have been distributed through the FDLP for more than a century.

As many of you know, in a previous life, I was the government documents specialist at the Detroit Public Library, a regional depository. So from first-hand experience, I am well aware how important it is for citizens of all walks of life with different levels of information literacy, to be able to access the information on all subjects collected, compiled or created by their government.

FY 2001 Funding

Andy Sherman has laid out the details of congressional action on our fiscal year 2001 appropriation. Needless to say, with the reduced funding from Congress, it is clear that for us to operate within the approved appropriation, we must curtail some products and services.

There were a number of issues I laid out in the August 25 letter sent to depository library directors regarding the directions we would be taking as a consequence of the reduced appropriation. The most profound of these changes is the acceleration of the FDLP electronic

transition. This should not come as a great surprise to you, because over the past few years, there has been a steadily increasing amount of Federal Government information disseminated online through the FDLP to libraries and to the American public.

Staff from LPS has spent many hours examining ways in which we can, within our budget constraints, continue to provide necessary services to you in the depository community and to users of government information. Since the FDLP is not funded at a level that permits us to continue to make dual format distribution on a routine basis, staff has been evaluating print products in the program that are also available electronically and changing their dissemination to libraries to the online electronic version only, taking advantage of the general trend in the Federal Government to publish and disseminate information in electronic formats. These are hard decisions for us to make, and we know they are difficult for you as well. But some choices just have to be made in this fiscal year to reduce expenses.

I also said in the library director's letter that we would be presenting a draft Superintendent of Documents policy to the Depository Library Council for their review and recommendations. Gil will be going into more detail about it later. But what I want to make clear is that the focus of the policy is that information content, regardless of the format, remains the primary selection criterion for inclusion of a U.S. Government information product in the FDLP.

I would like to point out that a great deal of staff time was spent on crafting this policy and that none of the decisions we will be examining here this week have been made in haste. We are concerned, as you are, about these changes and I want you to know that we fully appreciate the issues you face in your libraries as the transition escalates.

It is clear that we cannot maintain the FDLP as it has been and indeed, since 1995 we have been directed by the Congress to move to a more electronic FDLP. One issue we are facing is the speed with which we make this transition.

We anticipate shipments of tangible FDLP products to your library will decline sharply over coming years, reducing your long-term requirements for shelving and space, but also anticipate GPO and depository libraries will have one foot in the tangible world and one in the electronic world for an indefinite period. The retrospective hard copy collections in depository libraries will continue to be needed for historical research. Except for selected items on a project basis, I cannot prognosticate when, if ever, they would be digitized for online access. In terms of current Federal Government information products, many are still not being put up on the Web by the issuing agencies, or incomplete versions are being put up. And there are core documents, which need to be published in hardcopy as official publications that are central to our governmental processes or government information dissemination.

I think, however, the electronic transition has already demonstrated it will expand public access to electronic Government information products. But in order to deliver this information effectively to everyone, depository libraries as the basic backbone and safety net for public access to government information must take steps to ensure that the technological infrastructure is in place. Together we must address accelerating training and continuing education needs of

depository library personnel, so that they may keep abreast of this rapidly changing technological environment.

In the new, primarily electronic environment, GPO will continue to provide Federal depository libraries administrative support, collection development, and access services (identification, evaluation, selection, authentication, organization, and cataloging), as well as systems for permanent accessibility.

Other Government Activities

While there are many changes taking place within GPO and LPS that have a direct bearing on the FDLP, it is necessary to note other factors at work within the Federal Government that could have major implications for the way government information is collected, maintained and disseminated.

GPRA

One is the 1998 Government Paperwork Elimination Act which requires Executive Branch agencies to submit plans by the end of this month to the Office of Management and Budget detailing electronic options for information collection which they will have in place in 2003. These are to include paperless submission and maintenance processes for employment records, tax forms, and Federal loan applications.

GAO Study

As Andy mentioned, there is language in our FY 2001 funding bill asking that the General Accounting Office (GAO) conduct a comprehensive study on the impact of providing documents to the public solely in electronic format. The study is supposed to include:

- 1) a current inventory of publications and documents which are provided to the public,
- 2) the frequency with which each type of publication or document is requested for deposit at non-regional depository libraries, and
- 3) an assessment of the feasibility of transfer of the depository library program to the Library of Congress that:
 - Identifies how such a transfer might be accomplished
 - Identifies when such a transfer might optimally occur
 - Examines the functions, services, and programs of the Superintendent of Documents
 - Examines and identifies administrative and infrastructure support that is provided to the Superintendent by the Government Printing Office, with a view to the

implications for such a transfer

- Examines and identifies the costs, for both the Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress, of such a transfer
- Identifies measures that are necessary to ensure the success of such a transfer.

The study is to be submitted to the Committee on House Administration and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration by March 30, 2001.

Over the past few weeks, staff members from LPS have been called upon to provide to GAO materials and related statistics about the FDLP. A member of the GAO staff, Mike Dolak, has also spoken with some of you in the community and in fact, he will be attending the conference to obtain more information and your perspectives on the program.

NCLIS NTIS Study

As you are no doubt aware, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) is currently involved in a study aimed at updating and strengthening the government's public information dissemination laws, policies, and programs, including the mission and programs of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). Judy Russell will be here to talk about the NCLIS initiatives later this morning. In a related development the Computer and Communications Industry Association has produced a white paper on the Role of the Government in a Digital Age.

They encourage a substantial review and rethinking of the role of government in a digital economy. They focus on what services the government should not be providing online. Among the 12 principles they suggest are:

- The government should exercise substantial caution in entering markets in which private-sector firms are active.
- The government (including government corporations) should generally not aim to maximize net revenues or take actions that would reduce competition.
- The government should exercise caution in adding specialized value to public data and information.
- The government should only provide private goods, even if private-sector firms are not providing them, under limited circumstances.
- The government should only provide a service online if private provision with regulations or appropriate taxation would not be more efficient.

One of the authors is Jonathan Orszag who as head of the Commerce Department's Policy Office, proposed the closure of NTIS.

FirstGov

And what impact, if any, will the introduction of the new Federal Government portal, called FirstGov, have on the provision of Federal Government information? This and other questions will be addressed by Tom Freebairn, the Director of FirstGov at the U.S. General Services Administration, when he speaks here tomorrow afternoon.

Conclusion

All this is to say that the Superintendent of Documents programs don't exist in a vacuum. We interact with other Federal agencies and oftentimes must follow their lead in how they produce and disseminate their information. But our objective is always public access.

We know you have questions and comments to share with us and we look forward to hearing from you this morning and over the next three days. Thank you.



Speed It Up: Life In Internet Time

**Remarks by
Gil Baldwin**

Director, Library Programs Service

**Before the Federal Depository Conference and
Fall 2000 Meeting of the Depository Library Council
Arlington, VA
October 23, 2000**

Good morning, everyone. It is my privilege to come before you today as we resume the annual Federal Depository Conference hosted by GPO. This is largest attendance ever for one of our events, and I am pleased that so many of you have been able to come, especially all of you first-time attendees and new Government information librarians here today. We're anticipating a great conference, and we will do everything we can to make this a positive experience.

I'm going to keep my remarks shorter than usual this time (that's not an applause line, by the way) so rather than doing the standard "LPS Update," I just want to highlight a few critical topics and developments. For the operational items, I encourage you check out two handouts: the LPS Update and the Library Programs Service FY 2000 annual report.

Recognition and Thanks

Before I get too far along, though, there are a few people I'd like to give some special recognition to. First off, let me welcome the five new Council members: Charlene Cain, Cathy Hartman, Dena Hutto, Greta Marlatt, and John Stevenson. This is great new "class," and we look forward to working with each of you over the next three years.

Next I'd like to announce two new partnerships that greatly enhance our array of services.

Through the efforts of Ann Marie Sanders at the Library of Michigan, we now have a new set of Web pages specifically for the Regional depositories. These include information on the Regionals' role and the concerns specific to regional librarians. Ann worked very hard to shepherd this project through the approval process at her home institution, the Library of Michigan, and the results are very impressive. You can find a link to the Regionals page off the Partnerships page on the FDLP Desktop.

The other announcement is a further outcome of our cataloging and locator services review of earlier this year. In that review, we recommended that the Browse Topics application be turned over completely to a partner who would manage and improve it, and coordinate the volunteer contributors. Shortly after the Council meeting in Newport we received an inquiry from Adriana Edwards-Johnson, the documents librarian at the University of Central Oklahoma (UCO) in Edmond, OK, about taking on that project. Although we still need to get signatures in place, we have completed an agreement on the terms of the partnership, and we hope to begin the transition over to UCO's management and servers in a few weeks.

We're very grateful to both these librarians, and their administrators, for taking and supporting these initiatives to help move the program forward.

Then there's the Library Programs Service staff. Would you all please stand so everyone can see you. I am very proud of the LPS staff. They really care about this program, and this year they have performed for you and the American public under very adverse and demoralizing conditions. They are doing their best with the resources available, in an environment where change is the only constant. LPS is committed to carrying this program's best traditions on into the next Millenium, and we pledge to continue to work with you to expand public access to Government information, whether that access is through print collections or the Web. You know, we at LPS stick with this program because we believe in the mission. After all, it's not like we don't have other opportunities. Just the other day, we got a message on askLPS that offered to sell us an Australian outback chicken farm; a going concern with birds and all.

I also want to recognize Steve Kerchoff, who just finished a year with us as an electronic transition specialist. Steve, who has recently returned to his post at the Library of Congress, played a big role in developing Ben's Guide, worked on our partnerships and with the OCLC archiving project, and kept us honest about when the Millenium really starts. Thank you, Steve.

Accelerating the Electronic Transition

Let's move into the area now of program highlights. Acting on the clear direction from Congress, we are moving to a primarily electronic FDLP. Both the House and the Senate have told us to emphasize electronic dissemination. This was articulated in the Conference report [House report 106-796], which said "[e]mphasis should be on streamlining the distribution of traditional paper copies of publications which may include providing online access and less expensive electronic formats."

For Fiscal Year 2001, which began on October 1, we were faced with some additional spending requirements, the largest of which is the \$1.6 million for depository copies of the bound U.S. Code. A new compilation of the U.S. Code is issued in its entirety once every six years, and as one of the core titles in the Program, we are committed to keeping it available in paper format. But since we are also looking at the \$2 million dollar funding cut, we must reduce expenses. LPS is therefore moving rapidly to reduce multiple format distribution in the FDLP by trimming the distribution of physical products. So not only have we been directed to go more electronic, but also we must reduce program spending to live within the appropriation.

In the FDLP, two of the biggest expense categories are printing and shipping costs, so we must realize savings in those areas. We are searching for print products that are also available electronically and changing them to online dissemination. The program is simply not being funded at a level that permits us to continue to make dual format distribution on a routine basis.

"Migrating" to Electronic Dissemination

On the operational level, LPS is making daily acquisitions decisions that confirm the transition to a primarily electronic program. But this is not really news. These changes have been under way since 1996 when the transition began. GPO has been making the change to electronic access on a title-by-title basis for several years, but generally we proceeded in tandem with the publishing agencies as they embraced online publishing. Now LPS is actively searching the Web for online versions, and our analysis indicates that some 50% of the products that have been distributed in tangible format may also have an online version available. Several depository librarians conducting their own online searching projects have independently verified this level.

As you can tell from the announcements in WEBTech Notes, many titles have already been migrated to electronic-only, and you will begin to see the results of these decisions in the coming months. By the end of August LPS had already established the requirements for depository copies for many products that will be printed under GPO term contracts beginning this Fiscal Year. LPS undertakes this review each year, and typically the quantity requested for the FDLP rises or falls only slightly. But this year, in order to save printing and shipping expenses, we checked each term contract to see if that title or set of products is available online. If it is, and it does not fall into one of the exception categories, LPS changed the depository dissemination to electronic only.

Policy Statement on Electronic Dissemination

We outlined the decision criteria for the migration and the various exception categories in the letter to the directors. Since then we have formalized this into a draft Superintendent of Documents policy statement. These "SODs," as we call them, are used within GPO to document policy and form the basis for detailed operating procedures. Some of you recall SOD-13, which contains the policies about distribution in microfiche. This is the modern-day equivalent and recognizes the significant changes in the FDLP. Our new draft, called "Dissemination/Distribution Policy for the Federal Depository Library Program" is one of the available handouts, and was also posted to GOVDOC-L last week. Since I posted the draft, there have been a number of comments on it, both on the list, and directly to me. Among the comments are several recurrent themes, and I want to respond to these now.

- 1) Sales: Changes in the depository library distribution format do not affect whether the product is for sale by GPO.
- 2) Permanent access: We are archiving the products that are available only online, either here at GPO, or through a partnership.
- 3) Cataloging: LPS' highest cataloging priority are the electronic products in the FDLP.

We will discuss the draft in the Council working session this afternoon from 3:50-5:00PM, and we look forward to refining this policy statement with your input.

The key statement in the policy statement is that the primary dissemination medium for the FDLP is online electronic. Tangible products, meaning paper, microfiche, or CD-ROM will generally be furnished only when certain criteria or circumstances exist. This direction has already been established by the Congress and put into practice by LPS. Our discussion will focus on how this policy will be implemented to best serve the information needs of the public.

Building the Electronic Collection through New Content Partnerships

Moving toward the primarily electronic program depends upon building the FDLP Electronic Collection. The Electronic Collection must support permanent public access to the titles disseminated in online format. LPS has enjoyed a number of successes in building partnerships with depository libraries and publishing agencies which guarantee permanent access to parts of the Electronic Collection. But the time has come to explore ways for libraries to "collect" FDLP electronic resources that fit their collection development needs based on subject matter or originating agency or possibly other criteria, and then keep these resources available for permanent public access.

In this kind of partnership, the library and GPO become FDLP dissemination partners. Of course permanent public access is a critical element of this distributed responsibility, and the partner library will be expected to agree to keep the online publications available indefinitely. In the event of some unforeseen circumstance that would impede public access to the content, the partner will turn the electronic files over to GPO for continuing access. We encourage any

library that is interested in electronic collection building to contact us with specific ideas about what you might want to collect. Overall, we anticipate that such distributed responsibilities allow us to expand the coverage of the FDLP Electronic Collection.

Cataloging and Locator Services

As we move toward a primarily electronic Program, the operations within LPS are changing as well. LPS' traditional emphasis is shifting from acquiring and shipping physical products to managing an electronic collection for current and future public access. This collection management environment is new territory for LPS, and our toolset to deal with it is based on updated versions of several of our traditional functions: we identify, evaluate, select, organize, and catalog electronic Government information products, and assure that they remain permanently accessible to the public. These services are critical elements of our electronic collection management activities. In fact, the strategy of accessing distributed electronic resources is unworkable without cataloging and locator tools. We know that you expect more cataloging services from GPO, so we are renewing our efforts to bolster the cataloging staff in the coming years. But there's more to improving our cataloging services than expanding the number of staff.

Systems Modernization Needs

Over the past few months there have been numerous inquiries and comments about the various GPO Access cataloging and locator services. Many of these questions involve data integrity across disparate applications and outputs. There is a growing expectation among our users that our cataloging and locator services, as well as our administrative data services, like the List of Classes or WEBTechNotes, have totally consistent and complete data. Changes or additions to the data should ideally appear simultaneously in every output. These are good questions, and reflect reasonable customer expectations. However, I suspect that these expectations and inquiries are based in part on the use of state-of-the-art library systems and software. Unfortunately, LPS does not work in this kind of integrated system environment. Instead, our various representations of data are derived from a patchwork quilt of legacy applications, very few of which exchange data. That means that changes to cataloging records, for example, must be painstakingly entered individually into the various systems. There is simply no capability in these old dis-integrated systems to change a record once and effect a global change on all of the various outputs. These systems, some of which are over 25 years old, have been stretched and band-aided as far as they will go. In order to respond to contemporary service expectations they must be replaced.

Therefore LPS is proposing a systems modernization effort to begin in FY 2002. We have developed a preliminary cost estimate for an up-to-date online FDLP public access catalog; one which would replace most of our legacy applications. This proposal is being built into our FY 2002 appropriations request. In the meantime, we have a lot of requirements analysis work to do, and we must decide how many traditional and possibly unique functions can and should be continued. As you may have experienced, the more unique requirements you have, the more difficult and expensive it becomes to replace your old homegrown systems. In spite of the

challenges, we are convinced that LPS systems modernization is an absolutely necessary step in the evolution of the depository program.

Feedback

I want to close today by thanking you in advance for your comments and feedback. The Library Programs Service exists to serve you, and we depend on your input to know what you need and how to improve our services. So whether it's a beef or a bouquet – let us know.

Thank you all for coming today, and I want you all to know how much we at GPO appreciate your active support for the FDLP.



GPO Access Update

Remarks by

T.C. Evans

**Assistant Director, Office of Electronic Information
Dissemination Services**

**Before the Federal Depository Conference and
Fall 2000 Meeting of the Depository Library Council
Arlington, VA
October 23, 2000**

It is always nice to have the opportunity to update you on the ever-changing state of GPO Access. As always, I want to publicly thank all of the hardworking people at GPO whose efforts to expand and improve our service provide me with this material. The challenges of developing and maintaining our ever-expanding electronic collection keep these hardworking individuals fully occupied and they deserve our thanks.

Those of you who have heard me speak know how much I value user feedback. There will be several good opportunities during this conference to share your insights with us. On Tuesday afternoon at 2:00 there will be an open forum on GPO Access, and on Wednesday morning at 10:30 we will have an open discussion on evaluating our efforts to ensure that the pages of GPO Access are properly indexed by major search engines. In addition, please feel free to discuss your ideas for improving GPO Access with me anytime during the conference.

Current Size

GPO Access continues to grow and now houses almost 113,000 electronic titles and links to more than 80,000 others. This represents an increase of more than 20 percent for the fiscal year-

to-date. There are more than 1,600 databases available on GPO Access, which is also a significant increase over the same time last year.

System Performance

Moving on to system performance, our efforts to provide the fastest possible response times continue. Utilization data indicates that the recent bandwidth increase has achieved the desired effect, with average daily peak usage for inbound and outbound packets running at just over 40 percent of capacity. Efforts are also underway to increase the performance of the server farm and to examine the possibility of establishing a remote mirror site at a GPO facility in the West.

Usage

Usage remains strong as an average of more than 26 million documents were downloaded from GPO Access each month during the last half of FY 2000. March saw an all time high of almost 29 million retrievals. Ben's Guide to U.S. Government for Kids continues to grow quickly. More than 3 million retrievals were recorded for Ben's Guide during its first ten months of operation, with September showing more than 400,000 retrievals as students returned to school. I would like to note at this point that we recently mounted a user survey on Ben's Guide and we hope you will take the opportunity to provide your comments. Over 100 responses were received in the first two days after the survey was posted.

Referral Analysis

Additional traffic from the many portals directing users to the resources of GPO Access is being felt and almost certainly will increase. With the advent of FirstGov, we have begun maintaining and analyzing referrer logs for GPO Access. The first 11 days worth of data revealed some interesting things, including a significant number of referrals from a wide variety of sites. For obvious reasons, the bulk of the referrals came from other pages on GPO Access. These were analyzed separately.

As we suspected, we are getting a significant number of referrals from popular search engines, with some 14,000, or about 10 percent of the non-GPO Access referrals during this period. Google provided the most at almost 3,000, Yahoo approximately 1,500, and a number of others contributed lesser quantities.

Somewhat surprising, however, was the fact that more than 32,000 referrals were received from Government Websites other than GPO. This represents over 23 percent of the non-GPO Access referrals and highlights how agencies are utilizing GPO Access resources to help both their internal and external constituencies.

Another four percent of the non-GPO Access referrals, around 5000, came from Websites registered as educational institutions. While none had high individual totals, a large number of these sites contributed small numbers of referrals to GPO Access resources. The highest total during this period was produced by Ohio State University at 179, followed by the University of

Chicago at 114, GPO Gate from the University of California system at 107, the University of Maryland at 106, and the University of Michigan at 97.

The recently released FirstGov produced a total of 1,749 referrals, or about 1.3 percent of the non-GPO Access referrals. Of interest is that these referrals came from eleven distinct addresses which each take you to the FirstGov home page, indicating that these addresses are not redirections to the main site, but rather are separately available services. While this is encouraging, it should go higher as the FirstGov team refines their site. Based on our analysis of the site regarding its ability to direct users to the resources of GPO Access, there are a number of inconsistencies on FirstGov that will hopefully be fixed as the site matures. Problems exist in both their directory trees and in their search index which would make it difficult for average users to find their way to some of the official resources on GPO Access or that present other options first, some of which are not official Government sites. We will work with them on this in the same manner that we are working with other search engines to help them improve their abilities to link their users to the products and services of GPO Access.

Performance Measures

In conjunction with the Defense Technical Information Center and the Energy Information Administration, GPO helped fund a study to identify performance measures for Federal agency Websites. The study, led by Chuck McClure of Florida State University, was recently completed and is available on GPO Access (the address is included in the handout). While the full results are too lengthy to go into here today, you are welcome to examine it on your own.

A wide range of agency approaches were identified in the study. GPO Access fared well in the review of current practices and the report even suggests that our strategy “could serve as a guideline for other agencies in establishing or amending their website development strategies.” At the same time, there were some things pointed out that will help us in future evaluations of GPO Access.

Of particular importance was a framework for considering performance measurement. This framework included:

- Extensiveness – defined as the “amount or extent to which services are used.”
- Efficiency – defined as the “use of resources in providing services.”
- Effectiveness – defined as “how well the website meets the general governmental objectives and specific agency objectives.”
- Service quality – defined as “how well the website functions.”
- Usefulness – defined as “how well the website meets the needs of users.”

As you have already heard me say, we will be taking the opportunity to learn a great deal from you during this conference that will help answer the questions asked in this framework.

Brown Study and GPO Access

Brown University recently conducted a nationwide content analysis of state and Federal government Websites. Over 1,800 Websites were analyzed in this study, which searched each site for 27 different features. One of the main conclusions resulting from this study was that state and Federal government sites “do not make full, effective use of existing information technology.”

Using the 27 features set forth in the Brown Study as a guide, this report assesses how GPO Access compares to the sites analyzed. Main findings include:

- GPO Access possessed 20 of the 27 features used by the Brown Study to assess government Websites, which gave GPO Access a 74% overall rating.
- Compared to sites in the study, GPO Access was rated higher than many other Websites, including Thomas, which carried a 50% rating.
- GPO Access fared very well against the Legislative sites analyzed in the Brown Study, possessing over 88% of the features used to analyze Legislative sites.

In order to conduct a responsible analysis of GPO Access compared to the Brown Study, it is necessary to point out some areas in which we felt a different methodology would have produced a more useful result.

- A clearer definition of each feature looked for in the study would have provided a better basis for understanding their conclusions.
- Weighting the values of each feature relative to their importance to the overall success of a Government site would have generated a more meaningful end product.
- Not all of the features measured may be essential measurements of a Government Website’s success, depending on what that site exists to accomplish.
- It would have been useful for all of the techniques to have been utilized in a similar manner so that the results could be viewed in a single table.

GPO Access Training Hosts Needed

As a result of the reduced funding for this year, it was necessary to look for ways to reduce our travel expenses for exhibiting at shows and providing GPO Access training classes. This will be accomplished by maximizing the benefits of each trip through offering to hold GPO Access training classes in cities in which we currently plan to exhibit, either immediately preceding or following the show. To accomplish this, we are in need of volunteers to act as the host for these training classes near where the shows are being held. Please take a look at the list of currently planned trips to see if you could serve as the host for these important classes.

I would also like to point out that the new interactive GPO Access CD-ROM is out and we are soliciting comments on how future versions can be improved. One thing is already clear, the way in which the video clip demonstrations are accomplished has created a situation causing unreasonable load time. Newer, more efficient technologies are being explored for future versions. In addition, I would like to state that a new version of the printed training manual is nearing completion and should be available in the near future.

The handout contains information on new items on GPO Access and things on the horizon. Thank you for your time and I look forward to talking with you during the conference.



[Handout]

GPO Access Update

Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services

GPO Access Statistical Measures

- ▶ In recent months, GPO Access has averaged almost 26 million document retrievals per month, with a high in March of close to 29 million document retrievals.
- ▶ GPO Access contains about 113,000 electronic titles and points to more than 80,000 others.
- ▶ GPO Access provides use of over 1,600 databases through more than 80 applications.

What's New on GPO Access

- ▶ The new United States Government Manual (FY2000/2001) is now available via GPO Access at <<http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/nara001.html>>.
- ▶ GPO Access has begun developing and hosting a new website, for the National Mediation Board at <<http://www.nmb.gov>>.
- ▶ Additional final reports from the Office of the Independent Counsel are now available online via GPO Access at <<http://icreport.access.gpo.gov/>>.
- ▶ Two new services from the Department of Energy, the GrayLIT Network and Federal R&D Project Summaries, are now available through the FDL P Electronic Collection: Specialized Collections of Full-Text Information: <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/ec/scfti.html>.

- ▶ Additional volumes have been added to the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: 1995, Volume I; 1998, Volumes I and II. These can be found at: <<http://www.gpo.gov/nara/pubpaps/srchpaps.html>>.
- ▶ Federal Tax Forms for the year 2000 are now available for sale via GPO Access at <<http://bookstore.gpo.gov/irs>>.
- ▶ GPO has been participating in a study of performance measures for Federal agency Websites. The final report is available at <<http://fedbbs.access.gpo.gov/libs/measures.htm>>.

System Performance

The work required to increase the bandwidth for GPO Access has been completed. This has more than doubled the bandwidth capacity for GPO Access. This increase will also allow for further expansion when additional capacity is needed.

Improvements Made to the U.S. Government Online Bookstore

A drop-down list titled "Browse a Topic" is now available on the U.S. Government Online Bookstore main page <<http://bookstore.gpo.gov/>>. This list is based upon the approximately 160 Subject Bibliographies that are available through the Online Bookstore. Additional enhancements, such as sending orders directly to the order processing system, providing customers with a detailed transaction receipt after order submission, an automatic price increase for foreign orders, and only entering a secure environment when customers are ready to enter personal information are expected to be available by December 15, 2000.

New GPO Access Training Materials

EIDS has completed work on a new GPO Access interactive training CD-ROM. The CD-ROM offers an overview of the Web interface, instructions for locating and retrieving information, sample searches in popular applications, and interactive elements (section quizzes, Web links, etc.). In addition, EIDS is in the process of developing a new, updated GPO Access Training Manual, which will be completed in the near future.

Ben's Guide to U.S. Government for Kids Awards and News

Ben's Guide <<http://bensguide.gpo.gov/>> has been featured on HomeworkSpot.com <www.homeworkspot.com/> as a "top-notch tool for students, parents and teachers."

Surveys for Parents and Teachers as well as Students are currently under development that will provide feedback on the current effectiveness of Ben's Guide. These surveys will help to gather suggestions as to how to improve Ben's Guide.

Search Engine Results

EIDS continues to implement methods that strive to give GPO Access better positioning in major Internet search engines. EIDS has ordered and will receive a software package that assists in URL submissions to search engines. EIDS is also in the process of procuring a service that will submit GPO Access URLs to major search engines for a nominal fee.

Coming Soon

- ▶ An examination is being conducted as to how Dublin Core Metadata Elements may be integrated into GPO Access web pages, to help facilitate indexing of GPO Access pages in major search engines.
- ▶ A fifth report evaluating the positioning of resources on GPO Access in major search engines will be completed in December 2000.
- ▶ EIDS staff is in the process of evaluating Helpdesk software for customer support that will further improve customer service available through the GPO Access User Support Team.
- ▶ Improvements to the U.S. Code application are under development. These improvements include adding a browse feature to this application.
- ▶ A Statutes at Large application and a browseable list of all Congressional Hearings are also under development.



[Handout]

Library Programs Service Update

STAT-USA

Effective October 1, 2000, depository libraries have two free subscriptions to the STAT-USA online service. Libraries do not need to register for the increased access to the STAT-USA service. The current passwords in use by libraries registered for this service allow the extra user to access the database. Libraries are reminded they must abide by the agreement signed by each library director upon registering for STAT-USA. The users must be in the library when accessing the database. The library must protect the passwords. Passwords should not be disclosed to faculty, students, or patrons.

The National Trade Data Bank (NTDB) (C 1.88:, Item 0128-L) on CD-ROM is no longer be sent to libraries effective with CD-ROMs published as of October 2000. This is the final step in the agreement to increase online access to STAT-USA. USA Trade CD-ROM (C 1.88/3:, Item 0128-L-01) is no longer distributed to libraries in CD-ROM format. The information in this title is also included in the monthly U.S. Imports of Merchandise (C 3.278/2: Item 0154-D) and U.S. Exports of Merchandise (C 3.278/3: Item 0154-D) on CD-ROM. A new paid portion of the STAT-USA online database, USA Trade Online, with the detail level equivalent to the CD-ROM product is not included under the agreement for free depository access, however, abbreviated 2-digit detail is available under your depository subscription to STAT-USA. Depository libraries wishing to access the detailed USA Trade Online on the STAT-USA website must pay for access under terms set by STAT-USA and the Census Bureau.

Format Changes to Electronic (EL)

LPS is moving forward with numerous changes in the distribution format of FDLP titles. These changes mean that depositories will have current and permanent public access to online versions of content that was previously distributed in paper or microfiche. The notices of the change of format are posted in Administrative Notes Technical Supplement and the online WEBTech Notes, located at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/tools/webtech.html>.

Libraries will continue to see physical distribution of many of these products in the shipment boxes for titles that have been changed to EL format. The contracts under which these products are ordered are in the process of being changed, and it may take the Federal agencies some time to make the changes. The changes will eventually catch up with each title, and the title will then be disseminated only online.

Self-Studies

Staff vacancies contributed to postponing the submission of self-studies to LPS by some libraries last inspected in 1994. Two selections have been made to fill Cynthia Etkin's and Thomas Oertel's positions. Gail Snider resigned in October and her position likely will not be filled.

Once the new inspectors are trained, Depository Services hopes to resume requesting self-studies in spring 2001.

Outreach

The 14th annual Interagency Depository Seminar will be held from May 30 - June 6, 2001 at the U.S. Government Printing Office. The preliminary agenda and registration form appeared in the October 15, 2000 issue of Administrative Notes.

The spring 2001 Depository Library Council meeting will be held from April 1-4. The Four Points Sheraton Riverwalk North in San Antonio, TX has been awarded the contract. The preliminary agenda and registration form will appear in the January 15, 2001 issue of Administrative Notes.

Publications

The August 2000 edition of the Federal Depository Library Directory was recently distributed to all depositories. The Instructions to Depository Libraries, July 2000 edition, was distributed to all depository libraries in September. The Instructions are available for downloading from the FDLP Desktop at <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/instructions> in MS Word, HTML, and PDF formats.

Federal Depository Libraries

As of September 30, 2000, there are 1,328 Federal depository libraries of which 53 are regionals and 1,275 selectives. Nineteen libraries voluntarily relinquished depository status while one joined the program.

PURLs and Access to Online Resources

At present, approximately 11,000 online resources are made available through GPO produced bibliographic records. Most records are accessible via OCLC's Persistent Uniform Resource Locator (PURL) software. As URLs change, the PURL that is input into a record seamlessly re-directs users to the most recent active link. Use of PURLs allows catalogers to spend their time cataloging rather than maintaining links by changing URLs in bibliographic records.

As with many services associated with technology, GPO's use of PURLs software has rapidly evolved during recent years. The Library Programs Service (LPS) began using PURLs in March 1998.

PURLs Assignment

Selected personnel within LPS are authorized to assign PURLs to online resources that are announced in the New Electronic Titles (NET) application. PURLs are also used for providing access to cataloged works that are not listed on NET. Online works that are available via both

NET and the Catalog of United States Government Publications <www.gpo.gov/catalog> should share the same PURLs.

Determining Where PURLs Should Take Users

LPS practices for assigning PURLs to online resources have evolved as experience has been gained and as Internet publishing practices have evolved. The first choice for assigning PURLs in serial records is to take users to a page through which all issues are accessible. The second choice for serials is to take users to the most recent issue. The choice of formats is in accordance with choices for monographs (see below).

The first choice for monographs (non-congressional) is to take users to a page on which they may choose formats (PDF, HTML, text, Word/WordPerfect). If a user-initiated option is not available, the following formats are preferred (in order) PDF, HTML, text, Word/WordPerfect.

Our current practice for assigning PURLs to congressional monographs (GPO Access) is to assign a PURL that takes users directly to the publication in both PDF and text if both are available. If PDF and HTML are available, we assign PURLs to these formats in preference to assigning PURLs to PDF and text formats. In those instances in which we assign a PURL to a resource at a House or Senate site (for recently published documents that are of public interest but not yet on GPO Access) we must choose from the best available options. GPO does not control how non-GPO sites make information available.

Links Checking

Each weekend, PURLs link checking software is run to identify PURLs with broken links. Personnel attempt to restore access and also attempt to discover more direct links to publications than may have been present when the document was cataloged. People who know of broken links and who know of better, more direct access to online works are encouraged to send this information to Theodore Defosse at: <tdefosse@gpo.gov>.

Information Displays and Cataloging Policies and PURLs/URLs

GPO's cataloging policies for providing online access have evolved during recent years. Much of this evolution is in response to evolving national level cataloging standards. Given evolving standards, it is important that libraries display 500, 530, and 538 notes fields and the 856 online access field, with subfields u and z, in their online catalogs. Libraries that display these elements will provide patrons with electronic access to online resources and/or essential information concerning access or dead links even if the exact wording of notes may differ.

Current Practices - Access and Access Related Information

Current practice is to record the URL address of an online work in the 530 (also available) and 538 (online only) fields of records, as appropriate. This address is for information only and refers to the URL and the date on which a PURL was established for the title. This policy was undertaken in response to a recommendation from the Depository Library Council.

Access to online publications is accomplished through assignment of PURLs to the 856 field of records. Subfield u of the 856 field is used to convey access-related information. Such information may include a note indicating a need for an Adobe Acrobat reader and/or may describe how a link to a title may be established from an index or similar page.

Subfield z of the 856 field is used to indicate that a work is no longer accessible via the Internet.

Policies – Information Concerning Dead Links

When personnel are unable to restore a link, GPO's established policy, since 1995, has been to indicate "No longer available via the Internet" in a 500 note. This policy is contained within GPO's Cataloging Guideline for Computer Files, No. 1A, located at: <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/cip/cgcomp01.html>.

This policy has not been uniformly applied in every instance and some exceptions have been discovered. Although most "no longer available" notes are in the 500 field (and the 856 subfield z), some of these notes also appear in the 530 and 538 fields. Some slight variation in the language of some notes also has occurred over time. These variations should not be a problem if catalogs provide record displays for 500/530/538/856 fields.



Depository Library Council to the Public Printer Spring 2000 Meeting

Recommendations and Responses

1) Revision of the Depository Library Public Service Guidelines

Council recommends that GPO reconsider "Proposal 3: Revise the 'Depository Library Public Service Guidelines for Government Information in Electronic Formats' to Establish a Service Requirement for Tangible Electronic Products¹." (April 2000)

Rationale: Council is concerned that the meaning of the phrase "good faith effort" in Proposal 3 is unclear. Council is cognizant of the responsibility of depository libraries to make a "good faith effort" to make electronic products accessible to the public and we realize that the public may at times require assistance rather than simply being given the option of borrowing these products. However, given the eclectic nature of many depository tangible electronic products and their software (or lack thereof), we ask GPO for a more nuanced approach to the problem, and in particular, a clearer exposition of what constitutes a "good faith effort." Further, Council

¹ GPO's three proposals and the Cataloging and Locator Services Report referenced in these Recommendations were published in Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7 (5/1/00), pp. 41-51, and are also available at <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad050100.html>.

will undertake action to clarify the competencies that depository libraries need to have to comply with enhanced service requirements.

RESPONSE: At this time, GPO does not plan to resubmit the proposal modifying the “Depository Library Public Service Guidelines for Government Information in Electronic Products” concerning “good faith” effort by depositories in providing in-house assistance to patrons wishing to use CD’s and DVDs. This proposal was initiated because inspectors discovered that many libraries, while still selecting CD-ROMs or DVDs, lacked the equipment to service these electronic products and also never planned to purchase or replace the equipment to make these information products available in the libraries. In April 2000, Council adopted GPO’s proposal number 2 to “Increase the Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries at Regular Intervals.” These Minimum Technical Requirements (http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/computers/mtr.html) are based on the 1999 Recommended Specifications for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries and they specify a DVD drive and compatibility with a CD-ROM drive. In conducting on-site inspections and evaluating self-studies, the inspectors will rate the depository on equipment capabilities using the new minimum requirements for computer workstations.

2) GPO Access Gateways

Council recommends that GPO capitalize on the experiences and innovative contributions of the GPO Access Gateway libraries by engaging them in discussion to encourage their participation in the evolution from Gateways to potential new partnerships.

Rationale: Council recognizes the valuable role Gateways have played in the growth of GPO Access and the expertise the Gateways have developed in providing tailored instructional, navigational, or interpretive content. Council is aware that some Gateways wish to continue in that capacity. Council is also aware that GPO is committed to continuing operation of the SWAIS interface and to maintaining links useful to Gateway sites. Given GPO’s commitment, Council believes it is reasonable that Gateways as a separate project be ended. However, Council believes that discussion between GPO and the Gateways may lead to new partnerships based on the accomplishments and innovative spirit of Gateway libraries.

RESPONSE: The GPO Access Gateway services provided by numerous depository libraries were an important step in the transition to a primarily electronic Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). GPO encouraged depository libraries to become Gateways in order to expand no-fee public access to GPO Access and other U.S. Government information on the Internet. In 1995, when the Gateway project began, GPO Access was still a subscription service, most users were connecting via modem and using customized client software for search and retrieval, and most FDLP content was still delivered in tangible media. As GPO Access and use of the Web have grown, the original purpose of the Gateway project has been accomplished. However, along with other changes in the information infrastructure, the role of the Gateways also changed, and some have provided tailored instructional, navigational, or interpretive content.

GPO acknowledges and appreciates the accomplishments of the Gateways and the effort of many depository librarians and administrators, systems staff, and others in creating those successes.

Since the Gateways initiative has served its initial purpose, GPO, as announced in the April 2000 meeting of the Depository Library Council, is discontinuing its formal support of the Gateway project as of September 30, 2000. Some institutions may prefer to continue to operate a Gateway as a local value-added service to their constituencies. The decision to continue operating Gateway services should be based upon local needs, and current Gateways will be able to continue to operate if they so choose. In the future such activities will be acknowledged as outreach activities within normal depository operations, rather than as part of the separate Gateway program effort. GPO will continue to observe the remaining Gateways as a source of ideas for the continuing development of GPO Access.

One legacy of the Gateway project is that it serves as a model for cooperative partnerships between depository library institutions and GPO. Today new types of partnerships are needed to advance the cause of no-fee public access to U.S. Government information. GPO will continue to explore new partnership opportunities with depository libraries, Federal agencies, and other institutions.

3) Redefinition of Depository Library Size Categories

Council endorses the "Proposal 1: Redefine Depository Library Size Categories" (April 2000). Council encourages GPO to update the library size categories at more frequent intervals and to begin to articulate definitions of measures for depository libraries in the online environment.

Rationale: Council concurs with GPO that the present definitions, which were articulated in 1987, do not adequately reflect the growth of depository library collections and, therefore, place an undue burden on libraries to select beyond their main mission and scope. More frequent updates of the size categories will avoid this problem in the future. However, Council notes that definition of library size by volume count will not be meaningful in a networked information environment and suggests that GPO begin to consider measures of equipment and public service commitments that might better define depository library "size" in the more electronic environment.

RESPONSE: GPO appreciates Council's endorsement of Proposal 1 to redefine depository size categories effective October 2000 and anticipates recalculating the size categories more frequently. Future revisions will necessarily require additional review of the electronic resources in the FDLDP and of the impact of electronic resource sharing on general library collection size measurements. Information about the adoption of the new measurements is included in the July 2000 revision of the Instructions to Depository Libraries. The new item number/size comparison chart appears at <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/coll-dev/itemchrt.html>.

4) Decennial Census Information

Council recommends that GPO pursue special funding in FY2002 to make 2000 Decennial Census publications and data files available for depository library selection as tangible or Internet products, and that GPO initiate a dialog with the Bureau of the Census regarding preferred options for depository library dissemination of such 2000 Census materials as cartographic line files.

Rationale: Decennial census information, including the cartographic line files that are essential to many Census data applications, comprises a fundamental public information resource and a core collection in depository libraries. This data remains useful for many years, and depository libraries provide the permanent public access which communities and researchers need. Online formats alone do not fill the needs of all users, nor are they exact equivalents in every case. The long-term value of this unique body of information justifies distribution in multiple formats. Special funding was obtained and effectively used during the last census cycle to enable the public to have access to this information in multiple formats through depository libraries, and the data still receives heavy use. Council believes that special funds should again be requested to assure similar levels of multi-format access to the 2000 Decennial Census through depository libraries. The continuation of this flexibility in formats will significantly increase the ability of depository libraries to maximize service for their patrons, now and in the future.

RESPONSE: LPS has provided Decennial Census information to depository libraries in multiple formats when possible because of the high public usage and the need for long-term public access. LPS recognizes the importance of this information. However, in light of the FY 2001 funding constraints, GPO must reduce duplication of FDLP distribution formats and media to reduce Program expenses. Tangible products will be distributed for the Decennial Census material when the information in the print or tangible electronic product differs significantly in arrangement and function from the material posted at the Census Website. In addition, if the product is of a significant reference value to most types of depository libraries, the tangible product will be acquired and distributed to the FDLP.

LPS is committed to making these historical materials available for all users, for current and long-term use. Census and LPS are developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to preserve Census material on the Census Website for permanent public access. Further information about this MOU will be relayed to the Council as it becomes available.

5) Increasing Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations

Council recommends that GPO implement "Proposal 2: Increase The Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries at Regular Intervals" (April 2000).

Rationale: Council recognizes the ongoing need to assure that the technical capabilities of depository libraries are adequate to support access to electronic FDLP publications. Hence, Council supports the proposal that GPO establish a schedule for updating Minimal Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations at regular intervals. Council is concerned about the impact of these standards upon the inspection process and encourages GPO to articulate their expectations to depository libraries.

RESPONSE: GPO appreciates Council's endorsement of Proposal 2 to "Increase the Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries at Regular Intervals." The implementation schedule through FY 2001 has been published already at <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/computers/mtr.html>, in Administrative Notes, v. 21 #7,

May 1, 2000, pp. 48-50, and a link appears in the July 2000 Instructions to Depository Libraries. GPO plans to update the technical requirements and publicize the changes annually.

6) Electronic Transition Report

Council, having accepted in principle the Electronic Transition Committee's Report on GPO's Transition to a More Electronic FDLP, recommends that as GPO staff develop online resources they keep in mind not only FDLP libraries, but also the broad range of constituents who will have direct access to the Collection, including non-depository libraries and the public.

Rationale: Council has studied a number of issues related to GPO's electronic transition and reported on their deliberations in the Electronic Transition Report. While GPO has a mandate to serve GPO depository libraries, the Internet environment enables non-depository libraries and the general public to directly use GPO online resources. Council recommends that GPO keep in mind this broader range of constituents as it develops online tools and resources, marketing, training, and outreach for the FDLP. Ben's Guide is a successful example of an online resource that satisfies the needs of both the FDLP and the general public. It is Council's opinion that this will enable GPO to play a more vital role in the dissemination of government information in the electronic environment.

RESPONSE: As Council has noted, GPO has a legislative mandate to serve the Federal depository libraries. This traditional view of our user community was expanded in the 1998 plan for Managing the FDLP Electronic Collection, which stated that:

The primary user community for the [Electronic] Collection is composed of end users gaining access to the Collection through the facilities and resources of the FDLP, including its geographically dispersed network of depository libraries. ... GPO will strive to accommodate the needs of as broad a range of users as possible within the constraints of time and resources. Collection planning and the effective use of GPO's appropriated funds will focus on depository libraries and depository users as definable, known groups representing the public's need for access to Government information.

GPO recognizes the opportunities of the electronic dissemination environment to reach out to and serve a broader segment of public and other types of libraries. Our Program development and transition activities have been, and are expected to be, guided by an awareness of the needs of all our users, both our mandated user community in depository libraries and the general public. While we will continue to rely on Council as a source for information about those needs, we will also use appropriate input from other sources and communities.

The revised and streamlined "Finding Aids" (http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/tools.html) on GPO Access exemplify a service that has been redesigned to be more user-friendly to non-depository librarians and the general public. In addition, the EIDS User Support Team receives and acts upon numerous comments and suggestions for GPO Access enhancements that originate outside the depository library community.

7) GPO's Cataloging and Locator Services Report

Council recommends that GPO proceed with the six "Proposals for Council Consideration" articulated in the report, "GPO's Cataloging and Locator Services Actions in Progress and Proposals for Change" (April 2000). While Council endorses each of the six proposals, we do further recommend that GPO consider strategies for continuing a simple index in the paper Monthly Catalog.

Rationale: Council believes that this well thought out review of locator services proposes a reasonable strategy for strengthening cataloging and locator tools on GPO Access. These services were initiated approximately four years ago and have reached the point where assessment and retooling are required. Given the low use and high cost of the Monthly Catalog on CD-ROM and the ready availability of a much better product on GPO Access, the Catalog of Government Publications (CGP), resources used to produce the CD-ROM should be reallocated to other GPO Access efforts. Since the online CGP minimizes the need for the paper Monthly Catalog, desktop publication of the paper product will reduce costs and free resources for other projects, and will meet Title 44 requirements for the production of a list of products.

RESPONSE: GPO has either completed or made substantial progress toward completing five of the six proposals outlined in the April 2000 report to Council. A remaining proposal on which work is in progress concerns the use of desktop publishing technology to support the compilation of the abridged paper edition of the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications (MOCAT). GPO is investigating the use of desktop publishing software in the context of requirements to replicate, to the extent possible, the features of the current MOCAT. At present it appears that desktop publishing software may not support indexing to the record. However, an index that identifies the page on which a record is located appears to be within the capabilities of most word processing applications.

Superior access to the electronic and tangible publications in the FDLP is available by searching the more than 152,000 freely accessible records of the Catalog of United States Government Publications (CGP, located at <www.gpo.gov/catalog>). GPO's ability to maintain records at this application provides the public with a continuously improving product that provides electronic access to more than 11,000 online titles and that provides the physical locations of most tangible publications distributed to depository libraries.

8) Cataloging and Locator Tools

Council recommends that GPO revise GPO Access Finding Aids and Cataloging and Locator tools pages to:

- assure that Cataloging and Locator Tools pages conform in look and feel with other pages on the GPO Access site;
- include links (buttons) on Cataloging and Locator tools pages which provide easy navigation within and among these tools; and

- establish a Browse Topics pages metatag requirement to conform with CORC standards that will facilitate search engine retrieval of Browse Topics pages.

Rationale: The Cataloging and Locator Tools pages currently have a different look and feel than other GPO Access pages, as well as a different schema for navigational devices. Council believes that greater conformity within the overall GPO Access site would ease use of these pages, especially to the broader community of users beyond depository libraries. As an example, adding a uniform set of navigational buttons to the Cataloging and Locator tools pages similar to those on the branches of government pages would improve navigation among the tools. Additionally, the establishment of a metatag requirement for Browse Topics would ensure that pages contributed by all volunteers participating in the Browse Topics partnership will be uniform for Web search engines and available for CORC.

RESPONSE: Over the past several months GPO has refined and improved the cataloging and indexing suite of tools to add new navigational aids and make the “look and feel” more consistent. This effort was conducted in parallel with the redesign of the FDLP Administration Website begun in spring 2000. LPS and EIDS staff standardized the graphics and navigational buttons for all of the GPO Access Finding Aids. The FDLP Desktop was successfully launched in late July 2000 and provides visual consistency and easier navigation within and among the tools.

LPS has identified a partner to administer the Browse Topics application, and we are approaching finalization of a partnership agreement. The agreement will require the partner to create and maintain the metadata for all topics in this application. LPS staff has established metadata creation guidelines for use by the partner.

In establishing the Browse Topics service partnership, LPS staff built upon the knowledge gained through recent experience with OCLC's CORC project, as well as from on-going projects with other Federal agencies currently involved in the establishment of metadata standards and the creation of metadata for electronic publications.

9) Microfiche Congressional Bills

Council recommends that GPO continue distribution of the microfiche version of congressional bills until such time as the electronic version can be certified as authentic.

Rationale: Council recognizes that due to fiscal constraints, GPO has to make difficult decisions regarding formats and that Congress is pressuring GPO to eliminate dual distribution of FDLP titles altogether. Nonetheless, Council is aware of concerns within the FDLP community about ending distribution of the microfiche version of congressional bills until the electronic version that is available through GPO Access can be authenticated as official. There are currently no government-wide information policies or procedures to address the important issue of authenticating electronic government information, including core legal titles that are increasingly becoming available in electronic formats. Council believes that GPO should take a proactive role in this arena similar to the leadership they have demonstrated in bringing together key stakeholders to discuss solutions to ensure the permanent public access of electronic government information.

RESPONSE: The August 25, 2000 letter to the directors of depository libraries (http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/coll-dev/sdltr8-25-00.html) described measures that GPO is implementing in anticipation of the expected \$2 million reduction in the Salaries and Expenses Appropriation (S&E) for the Superintendent of Documents for FY 2001. To operate within the reduced appropriation, GPO will be obliged to curtail some traditional products and services. The Program is not funded at a level that permits us to continue to make dual format distribution on a routine basis. Therefore, we are implementing a policy on distribution to Federal depository libraries that will accelerate the transition to a primarily electronic Program.

As previously announced, LPS will discontinue distribution of the Congressional Bills on microfiche effective with the last of the 106th Congress Bills. We estimate that eliminating the bills on microfiche will save over \$200,000 per year. Bills are permanently accessible on GPO Access beginning with the 103rd Congress. The online bills are easier to search and retrieve than the microfiche versions. The microfiche bills require use of a complicated and cumbersome paper finding aid and the physical space to store the microfiche.

GPO has reviewed the official status of the electronic bills on GPO Access. These electronic bills are produced from the same source files as the official printed versions. It is GPO's position that the online bills on GPO Access are equally official and authentic.



Readers Exchange

Future Growth in Federal Documents Depository Collections

**McKinley Sielaff
University of Richmond**

Predicting Growth

Forecasting the growth of any library collection is difficult these days. Planning for new spaces only increases the pressure to accurately predict how large a collection will be, not just a year from now, but five, ten, even twenty years into the future.

No one better understands the complexity and dilemmas faced with forecasting the growth of a collection than do documents librarians. Libraries control their collection development: which books they buy, what periodicals they subscribe to, and what other materials and in which formats they acquire. With Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) collections, however, significant unease results from external control of what a library receives based on a profile. The type, quantity, and quality of a depository collection rests in the hands of people who may well never set foot in our libraries let alone touch our documents. Thus, Federal depository collections present a unique set of challenges to space planners.

Traditional Considerations

Increases of space used to house depository collections in libraries are dependent on how much GPO prints. The number of publications from the GPO has increased over the decades. This has meant planning on increasing space needs year after year.

Growth varies for specific parts of the collection; hence space needs vary dramatically as well. Individual titles have different space needs. Space needed for a title may vary from one year to the next. The Census Bureau shelves are a case in point. Every ten years the Census of Population and Housing demands a great deal of space, while every five years the Census of Economics and the Census of Agriculture quickly fill more space. To add to the confusion, parts of series are housed in different locations within the broader collection as a consequence of changes in issuing agencies and SuDocs classification.

Changes in format also alter space requirements. New technologies store significantly more data in substantially less space than earlier. Consequentially, formulas used to calculate collection growth cannot be easily applied to predict adequate shelf space.

Electronic formats

The document library community was shocked when in 1995 GPO released its plans to migrate to electronic formats. "A key assumption of the plan is that nearly all of the information

provided through the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) will be electronic by the end of fiscal year 1998” (Administrative Notes, v. 16, no.18; December 29, 1995, p. 1).

Librarians questioned their conventional thoughts on space planning. With such a considerable reduction in paper publications, would libraries need any more space for documents? Although document librarians were skeptical about the feasibility of FDLP’s time frame, none made the mistake of doubting that electronic information was the future for access to information via GPO.

Using Current Space

In thinking about future space, it is important to consider current requirements. Shelving items is not easy as workers insert slick pamphlets next to stapled monographs and folded maps next to odd sized kits. Where should one house pamphlets and what should one do with floppy disks and CD-ROMs? This mix results in a mishmash of documents that make shelving difficult. Growth space is dependent on how the present collection is housed as well as how materials will be shelved in the future.

Fortunately, it is possible to change the current space to deal with future space needs. A variety of types of shelving can be used. Compact shelving is one way to house more in less space. The entire collection or parts of the collection can be stored this way. In addition, locks are available to aid in protecting rare and valuable items. Slotted shelves are an option to deal with materials that are not consistent in physical shape and size. Spacers are easy to install, they can be placed at intervals as needed, and, moreover, they keep the collection neat and tidy, making browsing and retrieval more manageable. They also provide support which keeps materials in good condition.

Other alternatives range from weeding to integrating parts of the collection into other library collections. One example would be to shelve government document periodical publications with the general current periodicals. If and when GPO stops distributing a title in paper format, additional space requirements for it will cease. Microform editions of some titles can be purchased. Storing microform in cabinets will save space. Remote storage is becoming a reality for many libraries; perhaps documents can be included.

Tools of the Trade

Coupling conventional tools for growth creates a foundation for planning. Traditionally, one used growth statistics from previous years. One year’s growth or an average of the last few years can be the base calculation. Multiplying the base figure by the desired number of planning years results in a measurement of shelf requirements. This method works well for individual titles. However, it has limitations, especially when applied to an entire collection. Another approach is to consider the trends and changes in information dissemination. Librarians should be knowledgeable about congressional debates and GPO plans. These indicators can help librarians determine space needs and growth estimates in the new millennium.

Traditional formulas are flawed. When applied to the current environment, they lead to unsound consequences. However, there are ways to cut down on the unpredictability of growth issues. Forecasts could be made using two different approaches.

The first forecast is based on the rate of paper growth or decline for the past 5 years. That number is then used to calculate what the actual growth would be, continuing at that rate, for the time period. Forecast #2 is based on "current signals." Analyze and assess all pertinent statements released by GPO. Read Administrative Notes. Peruse documents on the FDLP Desktop at GPO Access such as Managing the FDLP Electronic Collection: A Policy and Planning Document. Take special note of speeches from the LPS director and the Public Printer.

In addition to GPO there are other resources of information to consult. Don't overlook document expertise when gathering clues regarding trends. GOVDOC-L Archives and the GODORT website should be consulted. Check out what other depository librarians are doing. For example, university libraries like the University of Louisville and Washburn University are creating web accessible URL links for many government periodicals. Electronic equivalents for an ever-growing number of periodicals are posted. The University of Denver has a web page for document librarians. One table shows the number of publications shipped per item number for the past few calendar years. Approximately 10% of item numbers and classification numbers seem to cease while another 10% are created each year.

Finally, think thoughtfully about how your collection will grow. Are the needs of your constituents changing? Will you continue to select all you are currently selecting? Will you be trying to complete past holdings such as filling in gaps in serials? Will you start growth in new areas?

Requesting Space

While acknowledging current trends, requesting less than sufficient space causes more problems than planning for an electronic-only future. More documents will migrate to an electronic format. It is also safe to predict the coordination efforts between libraries will increase. Depository library collections will benefit as it becomes increasingly easy to share collection development.

We would all like to know exactly what GPO will be doing five years from now. We would like concrete answers about the future of paper and electronic documents, especially in regards to future building projects. I realize that whatever projections I make now regarding growth space for the documents collection for the next twenty years will last longer than I think.

It appears that we have entered a period of conflict both in publishing and librarianship that will continue for some time. Moreover, we are in the nascent stage of e-government. In the past we have built repository libraries. Now, however, we are designing buildings for technologies that not only change from year to year but also ones that haven't been invented yet.

While it may prove impossible to provide totally reliable predictions about anything relating to the Federal Depository Library Program, there are some avenues we may turn to for guidance. Not the least of whom are other professionals who work for and with the FDLP.

My thanks to Laurie Canepa at the New Mexico State Library; Bill Sudduth the Head of Documents and Microforms at the University of South Carolina; Alan Zoellner, Government Information Librarian at the College of William and Mary; Thomas Lindsey, Government Publications Librarian at the University of Texas at Arlington. And last but not least, GPO/LPS.

McKinley Sielaff
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
804-289-8851
bsielaff@richmond.edu



Table of Contents

Spring 2001 Council Meeting To Be Held in San Antonio	1
Shipping Lists in PDF Format Available on GPO Access	1
FY 2001 Appropriations Cuts for the FDLP: Sherman, Council Meeting, 10/00	2
Changing Times in the FDLP: Buckley, Council Meeting, 10/00.....	9
Speed It Up: Life In Internet Time: Baldwin, Council Meeting, 10/00.....	13
GPO Access Update: Evans, Council Meeting, 10/00.....	18
Handout: GPO Access Update.....	22
Handout: Library Programs Service Update.....	25
Responses to Council Recommendations, 2000, Spring	28
Readers Exchange: Future Growth in Depository Collections / Sielaff	36

Administrative Notes is published in Washington, DC by the Superintendent of Documents, Library Programs Service, Government Printing Office, for the staffs of U.S. Federal Depository Libraries. It is published on the 15th day of each month; some months have additional issues. Postmaster send address changes to:

The Editor, Administrative Notes
U.S. Government Printing Office
Library Programs Service, SLLD
Washington, DC 20401

Internet access at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/index.html

Editor: Marian W. MacGilvray

(202) 512-1119

mmacgilvray@gpo.gov