Biennial Survey Due December 1

The Biennial Survey of Depository Libraries was mailed to all depositories via first-class mail on October 18, 1999. The survey, required by law, is being conducted online, on the Web at <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/dpos/99survey.html>.

The survey is due by December 1, 1999; however, to avoid the rush, depositories are advised to submit their survey responses well ahead of that date.

George D. Barnum Appointed Electronic Collection Manager

The Library Programs Service is pleased to announce that George D. Barnum has been appointed Electronic Collection Manager, effective September 27, 1999. In this newly established position he will assume responsibility for the creation of the Federal Depository Library Program Electronic Collection (FDLP/EC), a comprehensive virtual library of Federal Government information. His duties will include collection development and management, the establishment and management of external partnerships with agencies and FDLP libraries, and advising the Director of LPS on FDLP/EC-related matters.

George came to GPO in July, 1997, as Expert Consultant on a temporary appointment to the Electronic Transition Staff. During his two years he helped to write and edit "Managing the FDLP Electronic Collection" the collection planning document that is guiding the creation of the FDLP/EC, and worked on several projects involving Government agency and FDLP partners.

Before joining GPO, George was Head of Government Documents in the University Library of Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, and was an adjunct faculty member in the School of Library and Information Science at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio, teaching courses in government information and archival administration. He received his M.L.S. from Kent State University and a B.A. in English from Cleveland State University.
Steven Kerchoff Appointed Electronic Transition Specialist

The Library Programs Service is pleased to announce that Mr. Steven Kerchoff has been appointed as Electronic Transition Specialist, effective October 10, 1999. His responsibilities will include outreach and liaison activities, both with Federal publishing agencies and depository libraries, for the purpose of establishing partnerships to bring additional electronic products into the Federal Depository Library Program.

Mr. Kerchoff comes to GPO on a one-year inter-agency detail from the Library of Congress, where he has worked as a FEDLINK Network Program Specialist for nine years. Mr. Kerchoff has also worked as a consultant for the Sri Lanka National Library Services Board under the auspices of the ALA/USIA Library Fellows Program. In the summer of 1993, he worked as reference librarian for the National Performance Review, Vice President Gore’s task force on re-inventing government.

A graduate of Houghton College, Mr. Kerchoff holds the M.S. in Library Science from Catholic University. He has completed course work for the M.A. in Liberal Studies at Georgetown University.

Upcoming FDLP Events 2000

Spring Council Meeting
April 10-12.................................................................Newport, RI

Interagency Depository Seminar
May 31-June 7..........................................................Washington, DC

Regionals Meeting
October 22.................................................................Arlington, VA

Federal Depository Conference / Fall Council Meeting
October 22-25 ..........................................................Arlington, VA
SuDocs Letter: Destroy DOE CD-ROM

September 17, 1999

Dear Depository Librarian:

The Library Programs Service (LPS) was apprised by the Department of Energy, Los Alamos National Laboratory, that the CD-ROM, The Joint DoD/DOE Munitions Technology Development Program, Progress Report for FY98, should not have been distributed to depository libraries. The Department of Energy has advised us that the CD-ROM is for internal use only.

Descriptive information on this publication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>The Joint DoD/DOE Munitions Technology Development Program, Progress Report for FY98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SuDocs #:</td>
<td>E 1.111:M 92/V.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping List #:</td>
<td>99-0062-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping List Date:</td>
<td>08/19/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #:</td>
<td>0429-X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am requesting that you immediately withdraw this publication and destroy it by any means to prevent disclosure of its contents. Both LPS and the Los Alamos National Laboratory regret any inconvenience resulting from the shipment of this publication.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS J. BUCKLEY, JR.
Superintendent of Documents
Good morning everyone. It is a pleasure to be with you to provide an account of recent activities within the Cataloging Branch. This presentation will include information concerning cataloging operations, the new policy concerning availability records, serials cataloging, PURLs and URLs, our interests in OCLC’s CORC project, and the Monthly Catalog products and records.

Cataloging Operations

The transition to a more electronic Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) continues to produce a complex assortment of interrelated works in all media. At the conclusion of Fiscal Year 1999, approximately 29,000 works in various media were received for cataloging. Approximately 33,600 of these works were processed, leaving a balance of approximately 9,400 works to be processed. Most works in the backlog are serials that remain from prior years.

This serials backlog is related to the electronic transition. In recent years two serials catalogers have devoted full time and part time efforts, respectively, towards assisting with electronic transition related activities. Recently, we were advised by contract specialists at the Federal Library and Information Center Committee to set aside, for the present, a recent initiative to seek commercial CONSER cataloging services.

Although this is disappointing, we are attacking this backlog in several ways. First, one serials cataloger is working nearly full time on backlogged materials. Second, we have just recruited a serials cataloger to fill a position that had been vacant for nearly three years. And third, we are about to institute procedural changes in which non-serials catalogers will review incoming serials and will check serial issues against bibliographic records to identify those issues that require a change to serial records. Previously, this work was done by serials catalogers.

This change should be useful in eliminating work from the workflow that does not require the services of serials catalogers. We anticipate that, in many instances, work will be counted out soon after it has been received. We also expect that this change will free serials catalogers to concentrate their efforts on maintaining serials records and in creating new records, as appropriate.

As in the past, most works in paper and CD-ROM and those available via the Internet are cataloged within one or two weeks of receipt. A backlog of approximately 145 Browse Electronic Titles (BET) entries remain to be cataloged. Most works in this backlog are serials.
Production of Availability Records Ceased October 1, 1999

In response to a recommendation from the Depository Library Council during the Spring 1999 meeting, catalogers ceased producing availability records on October 1, 1999. Previously, staff produced records that represented specific annual, semi-annual publications, or multi-part works. Based upon Council’s recommendation, catalogers now maintain, update, and create, as appropriate, records that represent serials irrespective of the frequency of issue. This change should eliminate confusion caused by the production of piece level records for serials issued semi-annually and less frequently but not for those issued three or more times per year.

Application of a uniform standard for bibliographic control of all serials will be most noticeable in the year 2001 when all serials will be represented within the Serials Supplement, the successor to the Periodicals Supplement. The last issue of the Periodicals Supplement, to be published in the year 2000, will include only titles issued three or more times per year.

A uniform practice for bibliographic control of serials has been established in consultation with the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, the Cataloging Distribution Service of the Library of Congress, the Cataloging Committee of the Government Documents Round Table, American Library Association, and commercial tape vendors.

Serials Cataloging

As you know, in addition to cataloging monographs and maps, much of the work performed by Cataloging Branch staff concerns identification, cataloging, and authenticating serial records for the many serials published by Federal agencies for inclusion within the CONSER (Cooperative Online Serials) database. Serials publishing within the U.S. Government continues to increase as does the number of electronic serials available at Federal agency Web sites.

At the present time, approximately 50% of BET entries cataloged by the Branch are serials. Our most recent annual report to CONSER indicates that LPS catalogers produced 613 original CONSER level records, authenticated 427 records, added 1040 records to the CONSER database, and performed 2,073 CONSER database transactions. At present, approximately 1,100 GPO serial records contain PURLs/URLs.

Recruitment of Serials Cataloger

After a lengthy nationwide recruitment effort, I am pleased to announce that Ms. Esther Simpson, of the University of Maryland, McKeldin Library, has recently joined our staff of four other full time serials catalogers. Esther will contribute to efforts to represent and provide access to electronic texts of the increasing number of serials that are available from agency Web sites.

PURLs/URLs

As of late September, approximately 3,400 Persistent Uniform Resource Locators (PURLs) have been assigned to electronic works available via BET and the Web Catalog application. Over the years, an estimated 6,000 URLs have been assigned to various resources. Long term access to most works is maintained via PURLs. Given our policy of transcribing the URL that provided
effective access to the publication when a work is cataloged, many of the recently input URLs may, for a time, also provide access. Although URLs are input for their potential information value, access is maintained via PURLs.

Cataloging Branch personnel now provide centralized access to electronic works made available via LPS. Personnel assign PURLs to electronic works chosen for the collection and maintain access by updating addresses within the LPS PURLs server. At present, we estimate that such efforts require approximately 30 hours per week. Reports from the library community regarding broken and new links are encouraged. Such information may be reported to askLPS or to Theodore Defosse <tdefosse@gpo.gov>.

In addition, people who are interested in searching for links associated with a particular PURL or URL may do so. PURLS or URLs may be input for searching within the LPS PURLs server by using the PURL search form, which is now located between the Monthly Catalog application and List of Classes and Related Files in the tools portion of the FDLP Administration pages.

**Cataloging Branch Personnel and OCLC’s CORC Project**

I am pleased to note that Ms. Shirley Hyatt, Manager, Product Marketing Department, OCLC, Ms. Carolyn Kohler, Head, Government Publications, University of Iowa, and Ms. Cassandra Hartnett, U.S. Documents Librarian, University of Washington, will present information and perspectives concerning OCLC’s CORC, or Cooperative Online Resource Catalog Project, at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow in the Phillips Room. OCLC’s CORC project is of increasing interest to both public services and technical services librarians.

This project has been of interest to us from its inception. We are members of the CORC listserv and are involved, in an advisory capacity, in efforts of the Federal Library and Information Center Committee, or FLICC, to investigate the potential the CORC project may have for providing access to works published via the Internet.

We understand that CORC is an OCLC research project to investigate the feasibility of producing brief bibliographic records to provide access to Internet related titles. We appreciate that OCLC has seeded the CORC database with several loads of thousands of GPO-produced OCLC records with PURLs and related Internet data. We continue to be the leading institution for cataloging Government publications published at Federal Internet sites and are pleased to know that additional access is provided to these works through extracted Monthly Catalog data in the CORC database.

As you know, our efforts are focused on providing cataloging records for as many Federal publications as possible for public access within the centralized online public access catalogs (OPACs) of as many institutions as possible. With current technologies, and the opportunities they present for direct online access to the texts of thousands of U.S. Government publications, tasks associated with this mission become increasingly important.

Given this context, we hope that OCLC will develop CORC applications that will optimize opportunities for providing free permanent public online access to the Federal Depository Library Program’s electronic collections. Applications that would support this objective should
provide several important options. One option would be the ability to archive electronic texts as an intrinsic part of creating CORC records. Another would be to select and assign persistent uniform resource locators, PURLs, or successor technologies to assist with assuring access. Yet another option would be the adoption or development of commonly recognized uniform cataloging standards and authority controls that would assure that CORC records meet the needs of library OPACs. It is clear that OCLC’s CORC project benefits from the insights and interests of librarians from various communities. We look forward to tomorrow’s presentations, are eager to hear about current and future CORC related initiatives, and hope that you will express your interests in how this project may evolve. With a good dialog among conference participants, it is possible that the CORC project may evolve in ways that are supportive of the interests of an increasingly electronic Federal Depository Library Program.

**Monthly Catalog Products, Tapes, and the Catalog Application**

I would like to take this opportunity to provide some explanation as to why various editions of the Monthly Catalog have not yet been distributed. By now, we are all weary of hearing about Y2K related issues. Nonetheless, Y2K has dominated much of data processing related activities within all of our respective institutions. Within GPO, concerns relating to compliance with Y2K requirements understandably assume a high priority. In this regard, I must add that this priority among the technical organizations that support the production of Monthly Catalog products has accounted for many of the delays associated with their distribution. At present, the top priority accorded by technical support elements of GPO to assure Y2K compliance for the Office have contributed to an approximate four month delay in distributing CD-ROM and paper editions of the Monthly Catalog. Distribution of the Congressional Serial Set Catalog also has been delayed.

Fortunately, circumstances that have delayed distribution of products have not affected the timeliness of dissemination of Monthly Catalog records to the Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) of the Library of Congress. Monthly data sets of GPO records compiled by CDS personnel for dissemination to vendors are made available to CDS, via FTP, from the Federal Bulletin Board in accordance with schedules. Similarly, records produced in OCLC are passed to the Web Catalog application within twenty-four hours after production. As of mid-September, we estimate that more than 132,000 records are available at the Catalog. Nearly 10,000 of these records provide hot-linked access to electronic works published at GPO and other Web sites.

**Ins and Outs of LPS Processing**

I would like to conclude this presentation by inviting you to attend a presentation on the Ins and Outs of LPS Processing, to be held at 2:00 p.m. tomorrow, in the Crystal Room. Vicki Barber, Chief, Depository Distribution Division, Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Administration Branch, and I will be available to answer your questions on the internal workings of LPS and how they affect the products and services we provide to our FDLP community. If you have ever wondered how messy life can be, this is your opportunity to hear all about it.

We really do work in a complex Library Programs Service environment that requires much interaction and joint problem solving. In recent years, as we continue to migrate to a more electronic environment, some of the more traditional distinctions that had existed between
organizations within LPS have become increasingly indistinct. We would like to share information and experiences with you and expect that this program will provide good opportunities for an open exchange of information and ideas.

---

**GPO Access Update**  
**Remarks by T.C. Evans**  
**Acting Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination**  
**Before the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer**  
**Kansas City, MO**  
**Monday, October 18, 1999**

It is nice to have the opportunity to update you on the continuing growth and development of GPO Access. Because the evolution of GPO Access is happening so quickly, I never seem to be short of material to report. This fact is a strong testament to all of those at GPO whose relentless efforts to expand and improve our service provide me with this material and they deserve our thanks. Opportunities to add additional products and a desire to make those currently available better will always combine with the requirements of maintaining our ever-expanding electronic collection to keep these hardworking individuals occupied.

Our users also deserve a word of thanks for their role in the development process. The value of their feedback cannot be overstated. It has certainly been evidenced by our selection as the first recipient of the AALL Public Access to Government Information Award and recent press praising the ease with which users can locate and access the pieces of our growing collection.

But this by no means is an end to the changes on GPO Access. Work is already underway on collecting user feedback to continue the improvement process. An online user survey is currently available through GPO Access. The deadline for participation in this survey is December 15, 1999 and I hope you will take the opportunity to help us out if you have not already done so. We will use the results as part of our Biennial Report to Congress on the status of GPO Access. As of last week we had received 95 responses to the survey, with 41 coming from persons representing depository libraries.

I would also like to remind you about our open forum to be held Wednesday at 10:30 a.m. in the New Yorker room. With Robin Haun-Mohamed’s able assistance I will preview several new things to get your reactions and also discuss any aspect of GPO Access that you feel needs adjustment. Please join us and let us know what you think. We very much want to hear what you have to say.

Efforts to continue improving system performance have been very successful. Data indicates that the implementation of the additional bandwidth and server controller array have definitely provided a superior balancing of our user load and effectively distributed the workload.
throughout our resources. We will continue to monitor bandwidth utilization and load
distribution to ensure the best possible system response based on the factors we can control.

A comparison of congressional and other legislative resources available on GPO Access and
other Government and non-government Web sites has recently been completed and copies of the
results provided to Council. Seven Web sites were selected for in-depth analysis: GPO Access,
THOMAS, House.gov, Senate.gov, Lexis-Nexis, Congressional Universe, and CQ.com. The
comparison was based on three factors:

- What resources they make available
- The scope of those resources (i.e., the range of years or sessions of Congress they cover)
- The source of those resources (i.e., whether they house their own information content or
  link to other Web sites for it)

Findings from the resulting report indicate that GPO Access fares quite well by comparison to
these other sites. The strength of GPO Access lies in its breadth of online legislative resources,
all of which it houses on its own servers. Of the 22 resources in the comparison, GPO Access
provides 19, and it offers four resources that are not on any of the other Web sites in the analysis;
its closest "competitor" is Lexis-Nexis, with 15 resources. However, GPO Access is not as
strong in its scope of these resources; its coverage--strictly in terms of years--is greater than or
equal to the coverage on the other Web sites for only eight of the 22 resources. Many of the
noted differences between GPO Access and the other Web sites stem from GPO Access' mandate
to provide free public access to authoritative electronic Government information from all three
branches of the Federal Government.

We have also spent a considerable amount of time examining usage and the ways in which we
measure GPO Access usage. The system changes necessary to improve performance and
accommodate the growth of information forced us to change the way in which we capture the
number of documents downloaded each month. As a result, an improved interim process for
fully capturing all downloads from GPO Access has been implemented. A more programmatic
method to accomplish this task is being explored.

Since the new method was employed in February, an average of over 21 million downloads per
month have been recorded. Based on FY 99 data, this impressive figure is growing by almost
400,000 downloads per month. At our average of approximately 44,000 bytes per document
downloaded, this means that an average of 924 Terabytes of information are downloaded from
GPO Access each month. Or on a daily basis it averages out to almost 700,000 documents and
more than 30 Terabytes of data.

GPO Access now contains more than 101,000 electronic titles and points to more than 59,000
others. This represents a growth rate of almost 25% for the fiscal year that just ended. There are
over 1,300 databases available on GPO Access, which is also a significant increase over the
same time last year.
An analysis of individual page use on the Web site indicates that, as time goes on, fewer users are starting at the GPO Access home page, as it has fallen to fourth in popularity. Many users appear to be bookmarking pages for specific applications and returning directly to those pages in the future. The Federal Register application is the most popular starting point, followed by the page that allows multiple databases to be searched at the same time. In third place we find the page that allows users to browse that day’s table of contents for the Federal Register. Our redesigned online bookstore has been rising in popularity as a starting point ever since the new page was released in April. Appearing in the top ten initially at number nine, it has subsequently risen to number seven.

Since the Code of Federal Regulations is far and away the numerical leader in documents downloaded, it is somewhat surprising that none of the CFR pages show up in the top ten entry pages. Further examination revealed some reasons why this is the case. Browsing appears to be much more popular than searching and many browsers are interested in only a specific area of the CFR. Each of these separate areas can be individually bookmarked so that the user can immediately go to the section that interests them most. This spreading of entries into the CFR application prevents it from showing up in the reports, but it is still clearly the most popular application on GPO Access.

Our analysis has also revealed a direct correlation between system usage and inquiries to the GPO Access User Support Team. While this evidence matches our experience, and so was not surprising, it should prove useful in the future since the trend indicates that we will soon need to add more electronic product specialists to the team.

I have already mentioned that our redesigned Online Bookstore was receiving more traffic. This rising traffic is translating into increasing electronic sales. Of particular interest is the indication that there is a transition period that new users of this application go through. It appears that new users of the Online Bookstore prefer to print out their orders and mail them in rather than submitting them electronically. This area has grown almost 400% this year. As time goes on, users appear to switch to submitting their orders electronically and this area has shown growth of more than 120% for the year. We are working to translate what we have learned into improved customer service on our secure site. While encryption ensures that a user is actually dealing with us and that their personal and payment information is protected, improvements to the shopping cart and some of our topical and product lists will make the electronic shopping experience better for our users.

None of this would have been possible without the dedicated efforts of GPO personnel from many organizations. This includes the Web Committee, the many hardworking men and women in Production and Documents who strive to support the demands placed upon them, and the many people in the user community who give of their time to help GPO Access grow. Although many of these individuals cannot be with us today, and most are back at the office toiling away, they all deserve our thanks for a job well done.

At this point I would like to spend a few moments describing some of the recent changes to GPO Access. Of special note are:
• The addition of a site search application. This long-requested improvement to GPO Access proved to be quite a challenge and there is much yet to do, but I am confident that you will find it to be a useful aid in using our service. Released this past Friday, the index currently includes all of the HTML pages on GPO Access and the metatags that GPO personnel imbedded in them to aid in searching. In time, the index will hopefully be expanded to include the many PDF files available through GPO Access. While the search does not reach down into the databases themselves, indexing the many browse applications such as the Federal Register table of contents has provided excellent access by returning results that allow clicking to the individual documents themselves.

• Our PubScience partnership with DOE.

• Browseable links to the Congressional Record sections containing roll-call votes.

• The new Congressional Directory for the 106th Congress.

• The Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, beginning with William J. Clinton (1997, Vol. 1). Other volumes will be added as they become available.

• The robot exclusion has been removed for the past several weeks in a test to ensure the stability of the system. The test has proven successful and a plan is being implemented to invite the major search engines to index the GPO Access site.


In addition to the improvements already described, there are some upcoming changes to GPO Access that bear mention. They are:

• Deschler’s Precedents of the United States House of Representatives is being readied for release on GPO Access.

• A Statutes at Large application is under development.

• Work is underway to develop a Web Site for the U.S. Supreme Court that should be released within this Court’s term.

• A pilot project with NARA’s Office of the Federal Register is in progress that would lead to a more frequently updated electronic version of the Code of Federal Regulations.

• We are also adding Electronic Product Development Specialists to work with publishing agencies to bring new products to GPO Access. They will operate as a team led by Mike Bright, who has a long and successful record in working with agencies to create electronic products that have benefited all of Documents programs.

As you can tell, GPO Access is continuing its rapid evolution. I remind you how important your feedback is to this process and I hope you will take the time to participate with me in the open
forum on Wednesday, at 10:30 a.m., in the New Yorker Room. I look forward to discussing with you then, or at any time, the ways in which you feel that GPO Access could be improved.

Library Programs Service
FY 1999 Report to the Depository Library Council

Summary

Online electronic U.S. Government information became the most prevalent dissemination medium in the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) in Fiscal Year (FY) 1999. This continues the trends of the previous five years, and affects both program content and administrative functions. Since the beginning of the electronic transition, the Library Programs Service (LPS) has concentrated on increasing the electronic content in the program and on building the support mechanisms to enable depository libraries and the public to locate the desired electronic resources and to ensure that those resources remain permanently accessible. For the most part these developments have been funded from program savings resulting from agencies reducing the numbers of titles published in print media. Due to continuing funding constraints, future efforts will have to focus more on reducing duplication of formats and media and on containing costs.

LPS’ 1999 highlights include:

- Online electronic content becomes the most prevalent medium in the FDLP
- Electronic Collection Plan published; recognized as a “notable document”
- Significant personnel changes; Electronic Collection Team established
- Initial implementation and testing of the electronic archive
- GPO/NCLIS Assessment of Electronic Government Information Products published
- Biennial Survey revised and enhanced for 1999; report for 1997 published
- Internet Service Guidelines issued
- Y2K remediation, testing, and compliance

Personnel Changes

Gil Baldwin was selected as Director, Library Programs Service in November 1998. He began his career with GPO in 1973 and since 1974 has held a variety of staff and management positions in LPS. From 1994-1998 he was Chief of LPS’ Library Division. He has been concentrating on the development of the FDLP permanent public access initiatives and other aspects of the transition to a more electronic FDLP.

Sheila McGarr was appointed Chief of the Library Division in June 1999. Her new duties include oversight of the Depository Administration Branch, the Cataloging Branch, and the Depository Services Staff. She began her career at GPO in 1981. She will continue to supervise
the depository library inspectors and organize the annual Federal Depository Conference and the Interagency Depository Seminar.

Laurie Beyer Hall was appointed Supervisory Program Analyst in March 1999. Her duties in this new position include supporting all of LPS’ developing and legacy automated systems, coordinating the requirements analysis for a future integrated library system (ILS), and managing LPS’ budget preparation. She is responsible for directing the activities of the LPS Program Analysts, the Office Automation Specialist, the Electronic Transition Specialists, and network operations. Laurie has been with GPO in a variety of positions within LPS since 1985.

George Barnum, who came to GPO in 1997 as an Electronic Transition Specialist, was selected to be LPS’ first Electronic Collection Manager (ECM), and joined LPS on a permanent basis in September 1999. In this new librarian position, he will establish, review, maintain and modify comprehensive plans to assure permanent public access to products in the FDLP Electronic Collection. He will work closely with the Electronic Collection Team on permanent public access for electronic Government information, creating partnerships between depository libraries, Federal agencies, information-related organizations, and GPO, as well as on managing the FDLP Electronic Collection (FDLP/EC).

Judy Andrews left LPS in August 1999 for Portland (OR) State University where she assumed the position of regional documents librarian. She came to GPO in July 1998 from James Madison University in Harrisonburg, VA on a one-year appointment as an Electronic Transition Specialist. Her primary focus was on the FDLP/EC. She worked to develop the Electronic Collection Team that concentrated on ways to implement procedures to streamline electronic products into the FDLP. She managed the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) pilot project and worked closely with the participating libraries to launch the active phase of the project in January 1999 and evaluate its potential for the FDLP.

John Tate was appointed Chief of the Acquisitions and Classification Section of the Depository Administration Branch (DAB) in August 1999. He will supervise acquisitions and Superintendent of Documents classification of products in all media for the FDLP. He began his career at GPO in 1974 as a classifier, and from 1985-1999 worked in the Depository Services Staff as the designation program specialist.

Steve Kerchoff joined the LPS staff as an Electronic Transition Specialist for a one-year term, beginning in October 1999. Kerchoff, a librarian from the Library of Congress’ Federal Library and Information Center Committee (FLICC), will use his extensive knowledge of Federal libraries and information resources to assist in increasing awareness about the FDLP electronic information dissemination activities and in developing additional partnership opportunities with agencies.

**Electronic Collection Team**

In FY 1999, LPS staff concentrated on implementing the plans for the FDLP/EC, increasing outreach to Federal agencies and libraries, and developing the infrastructure and relationships that will provide permanent public access to FDLP electronic information.
Since the publication of Managing the FDLP Electronic Collection in 1998, LPS has worked to identify and implement the steps that will bring the Plan's provisions into practice. A cross-organizational work group from the Depository Administration and Cataloging Branches, the Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services (EIDS) and others has been working to define the possibilities, identify the issues and develop strategies for dealing with the issues. The work group was successful in this endeavor and has been re-configured into an ongoing "Electronic Collection Team," which is examining and evaluating electronic products for inclusion in the Electronic Collection. While looking at these products, the team develops the processing procedures necessary to fully incorporate electronic resources into the FDLP. The Team also maintains the Pathway Locator service tools and the PURLs applications that enable users to access electronic titles.

Electronic Collection Prototype Archive

Online electronic information is the fastest-growing component of the FDLP, and a significant portion of the FDLP/EC consists of titles at agency sites to which the GPO Access locator tools point. It is GPO’s goal to assure permanent public access (PPA) to the electronic products to which we point and link, since by definition, pointing and linking makes those products part of the FDLP/EC and means that GPO has a permanent public access responsibility for them. Meeting our PPA commitment for the FDLP/EC requires bringing agency-disseminated Internet resources under GPO control, either by establishing a PPA partnership or by incorporating them into a digital archive.

The FDLP/EC digital archive is a cooperative venture, shared by LPS, EIDS, and GPO’s Production Department. A new server and a backup initially configured with two years’ projected storage capacity were procured specifically for the digital archiving project. The first of the new servers was delivered to GPO in July, and has been configured for use as the prototype digital archive. Functionally, the prototype FDLP/EC archive will be populated with electronic source data files by FTP transfers, downloads, file captures, or other means. The initial set of test files consists of source data files captured by LPS staff earlier in FY 1999 in conjunction with processing additions to the Browse Electronic Titles service. The files will be accessible through a persistent naming application, and made freely accessible to public users through a Web interface. Users will be able to search cataloging or Pathway locator services record descriptions linked directly to the content described. LPS’ goal is to open the FDLP/EC archive for public use later in 1999.

LPS Web Applications and Tools

LPS and EIDS staff have been examining different audiences and events for GPO Access exhibits and demonstrations. Much of the new focus is on teachers, media specialists, and the K-12 sector, so we decided to add features to GPO Access that are targeted specifically toward young people and K-12 students. Several LPS and EIDS staff have been working on the development of “kids’ pages” in order to make our content more understandable for young people. A prototype set of pages is being developed with the goal to announce it at the American Association of School Librarians’ Conference in November 1999.
NRC Collection

LPS staff worked with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to produce a cooperative plan to ensure public access to a finite body of NRC information that is available in microfiche. For a number of reasons, including budgetary constraints and their electronic transition, NRC will be ending the Local Public Documents Room (LPDR) program as of September 30, 1999. The goal of the GPO and NRC is to maintain at least one microfiche collection in a depository library in each state formerly served by one or more LPDRs. Eighteen libraries that housed an LPDR chose not to retain this collection. In August 1999, the Superintendent of Documents accepted the materials from these LPDR libraries into the FDLP and announced that this collection would remain U.S. Government property as a depository item. In letters sent to 18 regional libraries, he informed them that they would be receiving the collections from NRC. LPS staff has been working with the librarians at the 18 regionals to help with details relating to the shipment of the materials as well as any selective housing agreements to be worked out.

Cataloging Operations

Beginning October 1, GPO no longer produces records that represent specific issues of annual or semi-annual publications or multi-part works. Instead, GPO maintains, updates, and creates, as appropriate, records that represent serials irrespective of the frequency of issue. This change should eliminate confusion caused by the production of piece level records for serials issued semi-annually and less frequently. Application of a uniform standard for bibliographic control of all serials will be most noticeable in the year 2001, when all serials will be represented in the Serials Supplement (the successor to the Periodicals Supplement). The last issue of the Periodicals Supplement, to be published in 2000, will include only titles issued three or more times per year.

A uniform practice for bibliographic control of serials has been established in consultation with the Depository Library Council, the Cataloging Distribution Service of the Library of Congress, the Cataloging Committee of the Government Documents Round Table, American Library Association, and commercial tape vendors.

The transition to a more electronic FDLP has resulted in a more complex cataloging workload, due to the infusion of online products and the necessity to determine and describe the relationships among products in various media. Through August 1999, the number of titles processed approximately equaled the nearly 32,600 titles in various media that were received for cataloging. With this level of production and the new policy regarding products that would have previously required availability records, LPS finished FY 1999 with a cataloging backlog of approximately 9,450 products. Of this amount, less than 150 represent titles in the FDLP/EC.

Most FDLP products in paper and CD-ROM and those available via the Internet are cataloged within one or two weeks of receipt. Our participation in the Electronic Collection Team has hastened the cataloging of most titles listed in Browse Electronic Titles (BET). Approximately 50% of these titles have been cataloged as of the day they appear on the BET list.
MoCat on the Web

Users of the Web edition of the Catalog now have a "user-friendly" display option that includes selected data elements that are clearly labeled as to content. The full record, numeric MARC-tagged display remains available as an option. The search screen and associated documentation have been enhanced. The Web edition of the Catalog consists of approximately 133,000 records and of that number, approximately 9,700 records contain hot links to the content described. As broken links in records with URLs are re-established, these works are made accessible via PURLs.

Fugitive Document Activities

LPS receives many inquiries for information on fugitive publications. The average time to research, request, acquire, and process fugitive publications exceeds over 2.5 hours per document. The Depository Administration Branch receives an average of 24 requests per month for true fugitive documents, tangible products not ordered or printed through GPO. LPS also receives many additional requests for missing issues and updates for serial titles.

LPS staff worked with auditors from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to determine if NIH printed products were being supplied to GPO for distribution to the FDLP and inclusion in the Cataloging & Indexing Program. Since NIH has specific statutory authority exempting it from printing through GPO, this audit may be viewed as an example of the effect that decentralized printing has on fugitive documents. The Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services issued the audit report in March 1999. Of the FY 1997 printing jobs randomly chosen for this audit, only 22% of the titles within scope for the FDLP had actually been provided to GPO. Since this audit, LPS has seen a significant increase in notification and cooperation in obtaining NIH publications for distribution to depository libraries and for inclusion in the Cataloging & Indexing Program.

Products Made Available through the FDLP

The distribution of tangible products through the FDLP changed only slightly compared to FY 1998. The Electronic Collection is growing rapidly; increasing to some 44% of the titles disseminated this year. The estimated distribution of products in the FDLP in FY 1999 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Copies</th>
<th>% of FDLP Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online (GPO Access)</td>
<td>17,885</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online (other agency sites)</td>
<td>14,166</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper (includes direct mail &amp; USGS maps)</td>
<td>14,513</td>
<td>7,054,619</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche</td>
<td>25,740</td>
<td>9,815,918</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>277,662</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,986</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,148,199</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conferences

The 8th annual Federal Depository Library Conference and spring meeting of the Depository Library Council was held April 12-15, 1999 at the Holiday Inn in Bethesda, MD. There were more than 550 attendees and 82 speakers. Over 95% of the participants registered via the Web. Proceedings from the conference have been posted on the FDLP Administration Web page and will be available in print soon.

DSS coordinated the weeklong 12th Annual Interagency Depository Seminar held June 2-9. Intended for those documents librarians with three or fewer years' experience, this seminar is designed as “basic training.” All-day sessions were conducted by GPO, the Patent & Trademark Office, and the Bureau of the Census. A number of other agencies described their electronic products and services during shorter sessions for the remainder of the workshop.

In July, DSS conducted a one-day workshop for 40 law librarians as part of a post-conference program for the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) meeting in Washington, DC.

DSS also developed programs for the concurrent sessions for both the fall 1998 Depository Library Council in San Diego, CA and the fall 1999 meeting being held in Kansas City, MO.

Self-Studies and Inspections

At the end of FY 1999 there were 1,348 depository libraries, compared with 1,360 at the end of FY 1998. During the year, three libraries were added to the program and 15 relinquished their depository status.

During the same period DSS conducted 100 on-site inspections of depository libraries. In addition, the three library inspectors prepared 252 self-study evaluations that summarized the strengths and weaknesses of the depository operation. There is currently a backlog of 219 self-studies awaiting evaluation.

The Self-Study Review Committee, consisting of volunteers from the Depository Library Council, librarians from regionals, a selective, a selective housing site, and Depository Services Staff, completed its work. The revised Self-Study of a Federal Depository Library was posted on the FDLP Administration Web page and will be distributed in paper in October 1999.

Policy Guidance

LPS issued policy guidance on three topics relevant to the collection and public use of electronic FDLP information:

- FDLP Internet Use Policy Guidelines (January 15, 1999 issue of Administrative Notes)
- 1999 update of the Recommended Specifications for Public Access Work Stations in
Federal Depository Libraries (June 15, 1999, Administrative Notes)

Biennial Survey

The draft 1999 Biennial Survey of Depository Libraries appeared in the May 15, 1999 issue of Administrative Notes to provide the depository library community with the opportunity to comment on the survey questions. The survey will be conducted via the FDLP Administration Web page during October and November 1999.


Other Publications

Two editions of the Federal Depository Library Directory, one dated February 1999 and the other August 1999, were printed and distributed to all depositories, GPO Bookstores, etc. Members of Congress and staff in their local offices received a copy of the February 1999 edition.

A new brochure promoting the FDLP, Keeping America Informed, was distributed to all depositories in early May. Each library received a packet of 100 brochures. Additional copies can be ordered at no cost.

LPS Outreach

In addition to our usual appearances at American Library Association conferences and Depository Library Council meetings, LPS spoke and made presentations concerning various aspects of the FDLP in a variety of venues, including:

- Sheila McGarr conducted LPS tours for a variety of groups including FLICC, seven librarians from the Ukraine, and the director of the South African Library, sponsored by the U.S. Information Agency.

- McGarr and Robin Haun-Mohamed spoke before the FLICC Institute for Federal Library Technicians on how to acquire Government information for free and for a fee.

- Haun-Mohamed attended the Cartographic Users Advisory Council meeting in May and visited the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) with Vicki Barber and Jeff Axline in Denver to negotiate a new Interagency Agreement for map distribution.

- Gail Snider, Cynthia Etkin and Thomas Oertel attended the March 1999 meeting of the Maryland, Delaware, and District of Columbia selective depositories, provided an “LPS Update” and answered questions.

- Snider provided an “LPS Update” at the spring 1999 meeting of the Missouri documents librarians. During the AALL annual conference, she spoke on “Electronic Service
Guidelines.” Her presentation at the GPO/AALL Workshop covered “Writing the GPO Self-Study” and “Promotion of the FDLP to the Community.”

- Etkin presented “CDs in a Webbed World: Implications for Federal Depository Libraries” at the April 1999 Federal Depository Library Conference. In June, she discussed the “Impact of the Electronic Environment on Collection Development and Public Service” at the Interagency Depository Seminar. The topic, “Your Depository’s Web Presence,” was delivered at both the June Interagency Depository Seminar and the July AALL annual conference.

- In October 1998, Oertel spoke before the Government Publications Librarians of New England on “Writing the GPO Self-Study.” At both the June Interagency Depository Seminar and the July AALL annual conference, he spoke on “Guidelines for Substitution of Electronic for Tangible Versions of Depository Publications.” His presentation before the GPO/AALL Workshop was entitled “Depository Inspections and Access Issues in Law Libraries.”

- Gil Baldwin, Judy Andrews, George Barnum and Laurie Hall spoke to a number of organizations and Federal agencies, including ALA, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Transportation, and the Federal Library and Information Center Committee about partnerships and the electronic collection plan.

- Tad Downing and Sandy Morton-Schwalb serve as chairs of two FLICC working groups; Downing with the Personnel Working Group and Morton-Schwalb with the Education Working Group.

- A number of LPS staff members worked at the GPO booth at both the ALA mid-winter (January) and annual meetings (June), as well as during the Computers in Libraries Conference in March.

NCLIS Assessment

In March the Assessment of Government Electronic Information Products was released by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) and published by GPO. The report was distributed to all depositories libraries, sent to more than 75 individuals from Congressional committees, including the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, Government agencies and library and information-related associations. LPS staff worked with the GPO Office of Congressional, Legislative and Public Affairs in producing a news release about the assessment. The final report makes 16 key findings and will be a useful tool as the FDLP continues its transition to a more electronic program.

Year 2000 Preparations

Several activities are underway to ensure that LPS’ computer systems and applications are Year 2000 (Y2K) compliant. GPO’s Office of Information Resources Management has completed Y2K remediation and testing on our mainframe legacy systems: ACSIS (Acquisitions,
Classification, and Shipment Information System), DDIS (Depository Distribution Information System), and MOCAT/SAMANTHA (Monthly Catalog publishing system). The ADDS (Automated Depository Distribution System, formerly known as the Lighted Bin System) uses proprietary hardware and software supplied by the system vendor, Engineered Systems of Omaha, Nebraska. ADDS software is being upgraded to meet Y2K requirements and obsolete hardware will be replaced before "zero day" on 1/1/2000. In addition, all LPS local applications and computers have been tested for Y2K compliance and necessary remediation or replacement is essentially complete.

GPO, together with other Federal agencies, developed business continuity and contingency plans (BCCP) as required by the General Accounting Office. Each of the BCCPs addresses activities within one of GPO’s agency mission or core business areas. LPS’ activities fall within GPO’s information dissemination mission area. We have developed BCCPs for LPS’ major functional activities to enable us to carry on even if confronted with Y2K problems or other emergencies.

Michael F. DiMario
Public Printer
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Good morning. I want to thank Jeanne Simon for inviting me to speak. Jeanne and I have kept in close touch during her tenure as Chair of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Her advice and guidance have been very helpful to me and the GPO in our work with Congress, the Administration, and the library and government information communities. She is doing a great job as Chair of the Commission and I am very happy that the President appointed her for a second term. I’m sure all of us here today send a “get well” message to her and wish her the best of luck.

As this conference is on “Government Information Issues in the 21st Century,” I thought it would be useful to go over the historical, constitutional, statutory, and administrative foundations of our current policy for providing access to Government information, and then comment briefly on how those foundations are impacted by technology and the issues it’s raising in the Information Age.
Gutenberg’s Invention

With the Year 2000 approaching, a number of retrospectives have been published about the events of the previous millennium. Many of these name the most significant events of the era. Which would you say are the most important? Nuclear energy? Columbus’s voyage to America? Vaccinations? The automobile?

Life magazine is reporting that the most significant event of the past 1,000 years was Johann Gutenberg’s development, in 1455, of movable type. (Cited in Graphic Communications World, July 12, 1999.) This was not simply a means of producing ink-on-paper more economically. Gutenberg invented the concept of easily transferring language to a medium for widespread dissemination. The technologies we have today for accomplishing the same end—computers, e-mail, online systems—are indebted to this invention.

With movable type, printing flourished. In 1455, there were fewer than 30,000 books in the world, all hand-made. By 1500, there were more than 9 million. (Graphic Communications World.) With increased printing came the spread of ideas, and with that came the Reformation, the Age of Discovery, and the Enlightenment. The transmission of ideas and information through printing eventually ushered in the revolutionary notions of democracy and self-government. During the ratification of the Constitution, William Cushing, Chief Justice of Massachusetts, wrote in a letter to John Adams, that “[t]he propagating of literature and knowledge by printing or otherwise tends to illuminate men’s minds and to establish them in principles of freedom…” (Letters of William Cushing and John Adams, 27 Massachusetts Law Quarterly 1942, p. 14, cited in David Mitchell Ivester, “The Constitutional Right to Know,” 4 Hastings Constitutional Law Quarterly 1977, p. 121.)

One of the most important results of Gutenberg’s invention was that it fundamentally altered the relationship of people to their governments. This change was brought about by the concept of providing public access to information by and about government. We consider this notion absolutely basic to our form of government. But what are its bases in our constitutional and statutory history, and what do those foundations imply for the direction of public access in the 21st century? An examination of the roots of Federal public access policy can point to both the positive and troubling consequences of the use of electronic information technology from the standpoint of public access.

Historical Background

Public Access and Self-Government  The foundations of the “right to know”—the right of public access to government information—lie in the basic principle that self-government requires the public to be informed of the activities of the government. All of us here this morning are familiar with James Madison’s famous dictum about a “popular government without popular information,” and that “a people who mean to be their own Governors must arm themselves with the Power which knowledge gives.” (Letter from James Madison to W.T. Barry, Aug. 4, 1822, in The Complete Madison, S. Padover ed., 1953, p. 337, cited in Ivester, p. 123.)
There is a requirement in the Constitution that Congress publish a journal of its proceedings. But some observers have argued that the right to know is inherent in the structure of self-government itself, and because of this, it can be assumed to be as much a part of the Articles I and II of the Constitution as it is the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights. (Ivester, p. 117, citing Parks, “The Open Government Principle: Applying the Right to Know Under the Constitution, 26 George Washington Law Review 1957.) Thus, according to these observers, even though the right to know isn’t a specifically enumerated right, it doesn’t have to be. Instead, the right to know is deeply embedded in our system of government as established by the Constitution, limited only in cases where there is a compelling state interest, such as national security, privacy, to protect the integrity of investigations, and so on.

Foundations of Public Access in England The roots of the principle of public access to government information extend directly to the early years of printing. With the development of movable type there was an explosive period of growth in the printing trade, leading to the formation in England and other countries of printing guilds. By the 17th century in England, two developments—a period of religious and political ferment and the proliferation of non-guild printers—led to a move in Parliament to license printing presses. This action was backed by the Stationers Guild, which sought exclusive rights to printing work, and by those in Parliament who opposed growth in the publishing of ideas they disagreed with.

The licensure proposal was opposed by the poet John Milton, who had published a non-licensed tract arguing for a more liberal view of divorce—namely, his own. In the now-famous essay Areopagitica—published, incidentally, without a license in 1644—Milton argued, “Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties…” (John Milton, Areopagitica: A Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing, to the Parliament of England, 1644, cited in Ivester, p. 125.) Milton’s essay has endured through the ages as a classic defense of freedom of the press.

The efforts by the Stationer’s Guild to circumscribe the activities of non-guild printers ultimately failed. With the growth of printing in England, both licensed and unlicensed, there was an expanding interest in the open discussion of governmental matters. Sounds a lot like today’s Internet, doesn’t it? At the same time, there was a gathering movement to gain greater access to governmental information, including proceedings in Parliament. This was fueled in part by the new interest in government and in part by the printers who were responsible for producing this information until Her Majesty’s Stationery Office was established in 1776.

Colonial Experience Perhaps in reaction to the attempts to license printing in England, some of the early American colonists imported fairly liberalized notions of public access to government information and codified them into law. For example, the Massachusetts Body of Liberties, produced in 1641, stated that, “Every Inhabitant of the Country shall have free libertie to search and veeewe any Rooles, Records, or Regesters of any Court or office…” (1 The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts, 1641-1691, J. Cushing ed., 1976, cited in Ivester, p. 127.)

But other colonial governments from the beginning closely watched the activities of their printers. Printing first reached America in 1639 when a press was established for the use of Harvard College. Most early printing was official crown printing—performed by “publick
printers”—and it was closely controlled. (Government Printing Office, 100 GPO Years, 1861-1961, GPO: Washington, 1961, p. 1.) Despite the provision for public access in Massachusetts, censorship was established there by 1664, and in 1671 the Governor of Virginia said:

But, I thank God, there are no schools nor printing...for learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects into the world; and printing has divulged them, and libels against the best government. God keep us from both. (GPO, p. 2, see also Robert E. Kling, Jr., The Government Printing Office, Praeger: New York, 1970, p. 6, citing The Statutes at Large, being a collection of all the laws of Virginia, from the first session of the legislature, in the year 1619, W. Waller, ed., New York, 1823, vol. 2, p. 517.)

As in England, however, the growth of printing—which produced newspapers, tracts, pamphlets, and other materials—spurred in the colonies a growing demand for independence of the press as well as access to government information. Moreover, critical examination of the government was gaining popular approval in the colonies. In 1735, in a case that was closely watched, printer John Peter Zenger won acquittal from a charge of libel brought because of his criticism of colonial government. The case helped solidify the argument for freedom of the press, interpreted broadly as the freedom not simply to print about the government, but to acquire information from the government to examine and debate. (see Ivester, pp. 127-28.)

Public Access and the New Government

By the time of the American Revolution, the concept of public access to government information was widespread throughout the colonies. The 1776 Pennsylvania Constitution, for example, included the phrase: “The printing presses shall be free to every person who undertakes to examine the proceedings of the legislature, or any part of government.” (Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776, § 35, in 3 The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws, F. Thorpe, ed., 1909, cited in Ivester, pp. 129-130.)

This concept was adopted by the new national government. The Continental Congress passed a resolution “…that the Journals...except such parts as have been or shall be ordered to be kept secret, be printed...weekly...” (cited in GPO, p. 4.) This formulation was to be used repeatedly thereafter. Article 9 of the Articles of Confederation said, “The Congress of the United States...shall publish the journal of their proceedings monthly, except such parts thereof, relating to treaties, alliances or military operations, as, in their judgment, require secrecy...” (cited in Merrill Jensen, The Articles of Confederation, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1940, p. 269.)

During the Constitutional Convention of 1787, the issue of public access to government information was specifically discussed, and the debates were over the extent to which the government could impose secrecy. Many delegates held that secrecy was not objectionable where there was a compelling interest, such as in foreign relations or war. But in general, open access to government information was held to be the rule, and secrecy the exception, rather than the other way around. Patrick Henry said, “The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be, secure, when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them…” (4 Debates in
the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, J. Elliot, ed., 1901, p. 170, cited in Ivester, p. 131.)

Like the resolution of the Continental Congress and the Articles of Confederation, Article I, section 5, of the Constitution requires that “Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in the Judgment require Secrecy…”

Notice that the timing of publication had gone from “weekly” under the Continental Congress and “monthly” under the Articles of Confederation to “from time to time” under the Constitution. In forming a strong national government to replace the weak government under the Articles, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention were more willing than their predecessors to accept limitations on the right to know. In fact, delegate Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut objected to this clause altogether, arguing that “The legislature will not fail to publish their proceedings from time to time. The people will call for it, if it should be improperly omitted.” But in response, James Wilson of Pennsylvania said, “the people have a right to know what their agents are doing or have done, and it should not be in the option of the legislature to conceal their proceedings.” (Elliot, p. 408, cited in Ivester, p. 132.) This statement today places public access to government information on a firm constitutional footing.

Public Printing at the Federal Level

In Madison’s statement on public access, made many years after the Constitution was written, he talked about the necessity of “popular information” to a “popular government,” as well as need to have a “means of acquiring” this information. How did the early national government respond to the requirement that “the people have a right to know what their agents are doing or have done?” How did it provide the public with the “means of acquiring” government information? How did it enable the press and the public to stay informed of its actions? The answer to that question lies in the development of government printing and a system for distributing government documents.

Until 1860, Congress—which then accounted for the majority of Federal printing work—fulfilled its printing needs through available private printers, operating in much the same way as the earlier British Parliament and the colonial governments. But as at least one observer has noted, “the National Government was not well served by this arrangement.” (Harold C. Relyea, “Title 44, United States Code—Public Printing and Documents: A Brief Historical Overview,” Congressional Research Service Report No. 79-36 GOV, February 23, 1979, p. 6.) Work was performed sporadically, and was often left uncompleted if it was undertaken at all. There are many examples of incomplete or nonexistent records from the earliest Congresses: in one, Congress was not provided with a complete set of the statutes of the United States until 1845. (Relyea, p. 6.) Other observers have remarked on problems with accuracy, appearance, and form, which varied widely and generating continuing complaints in Congress. (Kling, p. 10.) Moreover, these early systems of public printing in the United States were costly and subject to scandals, fraud, and corruption.
Beginning with the First Congress, printing was contracted out to the lowest bidder. After the Printing Act of 1819 (3 Stat. 538), the Senate and House of Representatives elected their own printers, and contracts were let to each based on a fixed-rate basis. Technology improvements soon lowered the costs of printing dramatically, and the fixed-rate system proved to be inordinately profitable. Congress re-established the system of low-bid contracting in 1846 (9 Stat. 113), but it was so badly mismanaged that it proved more costly that its predecessor. The fixed-rate system was returned in 1852 (10 Stat. 35).

Public outcry over abuses connected with Federal printing led Congress in 1846 (9 Stat. 113) to establish the Joint Committee on Printing, which was given the statutory authority to adopt measures “deemed necessary to remedy neglect, delay, or waste” in Government printing. This step toward gaining control of Federal printing was supplemented in 1852 (10 Stat. 35) with establishment of a single Superintendent of Public Printing, who was charged with overseeing the activities of printers for the House and Senate.

But Congress wouldn’t go farther. Proposals for centralizing the Government’s printing capability had emerged as early as 1819, when a joint committee of Congress recommended establishing a “national printing office…which should execute the printing of Congress while in session, and that of the various departments of Government during the recess.” No action was taken, however. A similar idea was advanced in 1840, accompanied by an estimate that a centralized office would reduce Federal printing costs by half, but this proposal also failed.

By the late 1850’s, however, Congress was willing to revisit the issue. The renewal of the fixed-rate system for printing generated enormous profits for contract printers. The profits were converted into political contributions, which were given in exchange for preference in the award of printing contracts, or worse. One report found that:

> Politicians who had no practical knowledge of printing succeeded in securing the place of printer, and farmed out the work to practical printers at a percentage of the receipts. The dominant party elected the printer with a positive understanding that he would devote specified sums out of his profits for partisan purposes. The record shows that much of the printing of the executive departments was given out secretly and at extravagant figures. In some cases six times a fair rate was paid for certain jobs and the plunder thus secured was systematically distributed for partisan purposes. (Relyea, p. 9, citing Laurence F. Schmeckebier, The Government Printing Office: Its History, Activities, and Organization, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1925, p. 7.)

A number of congressional investigations ensued, culminating in 1860 in legislation to centralize all Federal printing in GPO (12 Stat. 117). When it opened in 1861, GPO was directed to execute “the printing and binding authorized by the Senate and the House of Representatives, the executive and judicial departments, and the Court of Claims.” The benefits of the new office were realized almost immediately. In GPO’s first year of operation, the Superintendent of Public Printing [the precursor of the Public Printer] reported an annual savings of $60,000 over pre-GPO costs; in the second year, a savings of more than $200,000 was reported. Savings more than doubled again in the third year, to more than $580,000 by September 1863 (GPO, pp. 38-39.)
Further centralization of Government printing followed in the succeeding years, and in 1895 all Federal printing and distribution systems were consolidated in GPO with the General Printing Act. This Act, in the words of one observer, marked “the institutional realization of a panoply of reforms pertaining to public printing policy.” (Relyea, pp. 11-12.) The Act brought under GPO control other Federal printing plants then in existence and provided for the production of virtually all other Federal printing at GPO itself.

Significantly, the Act also relocated the Office of the Superintendent of Public Documents, formerly at the Interior Department, within GPO, administratively completing—nearly a century later—the “means of acquiring” government information that Madison had envisioned. As a GPO official, the Superintendent was made responsible for documents sales to the public, cataloging and indexing Government publications, and the distribution of documents to depository libraries nationwide. By placing the Superintendent of Documents within GPO, Congress created a system that facilitated the efficient selection of publications for public distribution from the comprehensive body of documents printed by GPO.

** Depository Library Program **

Before the Superintendent of Documents was connected with the GPO, the early national government struggled with the issue of distributing government documents to the public. Initially, special acts were passed periodically to distribute particular documents to State legislatures, governors, colleges and universities incorporated in each state, and historical societies. (see Joint Committee on Printing, Government Depository Libraries: The Present Law Governing Designated Depository Libraries, Joint Committee Print, 97th Congress, 1st Session, GPO: Washington, 1981, pp. 3-4.) These weren’t for archival purposes, since it is clear that the distribution of documents to governmental as well as educational bodies was for the ongoing use of these institutions. In 1813, however, the 13th Congress enacted a resolution (3 Stat. 140) providing for distribution of documents on a regular basis to these institutions for that Congress and “every future Congress,” passing what was in effect America’s first Freedom of Information Act.

This system of distribution, performed variously by the Librarian of Congress, the Clerk of the House, and the Secretary of State, remained relatively undisturbed until 1857, when the responsibility was transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, who was directed to distribute the documents to colleges, public libraries, athenaeums, literary and scientific institutions, and boards of trade or public associations designated by the Representatives. (11 Stat. 253; JCP, Government Depository Libraries, p. 4.)

Subsequent laws required the Interior Secretary to receive, arrange, and distribute documents, to keep accurate statistics on the receipt and distribution of all documents, and to distribute maps and charts as well as books. Congress also provided Senators with the power to designate libraries, and the Interior Secretary was empowered to designate libraries and to remove depository status from libraries which weren’t “suitable” depositories. (11 Stat. 368, 379) In 1869, the post of Superintendent of Public Documents was established within the Interior Department, and his distribution responsibilities were broadened to include executive branch documents. (15 Stat. 292; Kling, pp. 111-112.)
Yet there were significant problems with document distribution in these early years, and until the 1895 General Printing Act was passed, the distribution and storage of government documents was, in the words of an observer, a “hopelessly haphazard operation.” Here is a general characterization of the situation:

Copies of documents were ordered with little regard for public or official interest. Of the 420 official depositories [by 1895], some were overwhelmed by mountains of government publications, while others received no regular distribution at all. Copies ordered for congressional use accumulated in Members’ offices until no storage space remained, at which time Senators and Representatives dispatched them to home libraries to crowd shelves often already jammed with other documents that had been obtained by direct distribution. Not wishing to offend Members of Congress, successive public printers stored leftover publications until natural deterioration solved the warehousing problem. In addition, no standard system for titling government documents existed. Consequently, practical cataloging was virtually impossible. (Kling, pp. 110-11.)

The Printing Act was directed at resolving these problems by codifying all of the laws concerning the receipt, care, and distribution of government documents. Order was imposed on the system of documents distribution: proper storage was organized, excess distribution was curtailed, standardized cataloging was implemented, and duplication and waste were eliminated. Other major reforms followed: an act of 1913 made depository status permanent, to end the practice of removing depository status when redistricting occurred or a new Member was elected (38 Stat. 75); and in 1922 depository libraries were authorized to designate the publications they wished to receive, rather than receiving every government document that was produced (42 Stat. 436). These reforms continued through the 1962 Depository Library Act and remain in effect today.

**Current Issues**

Following Gutenberg’s invention, the great hurdle of the 17th and 18th centuries was to gain acceptance of the concept of public access to government information, and to give it a fundamental, constitutional basis. In 19th century America, the hurdle was to design a statutory and administrative system that made public access a working reality. As we approach the 21st century, the challenge that confronts us is how to preserve the principle of public access in the age of electronic information technologies.

**Continued Need for Printing** With the growing use of electronics, there is the temptation to say that the government no longer needs a printing capability. I think this temptation should be resisted. Last year, GPO produced more than $650 million in printing services, sold millions of documents, and distributed millions more to depository libraries. (GPO Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1998.) Tax forms, press releases, passports, legislative documents, informational pamphlets and books, regulations, statutes, statistical data, and more—in printed form these documents continue to represent a major avenue of communication between the government and the public.
Ink-on-paper today is still the most egalitarian of information formats. It is accessible, transportable, and economical. The increased dissemination of government information in electronic formats should indeed be pursued: improving our economy, sharpening our trade competitiveness, expanding our research and development capabilities, promoting educational opportunities, and a vast range of other public objectives depend on it. But protections must be provided for those who do not have access to computers and the other technologies necessary to make electronic access meaningful. If we are not careful about maintaining policies to provide for the efficient and equitable access of all citizens to government information, we run the risk of turning into a Nation of information-haves and information have-nots.

I read the other day that white, high income Americans continue to predominate in the online world, according to a recently-released Commerce Department study. (Commerce Department, “Falling Through the Net: Defining the Digital Divide,” 1999, as reported in the Washington Post, July 9, 1999.) Even the President has said:

> [t]here is a growing digital divide between those who have access to the digital economy and the Internet and those who don’t, and that divide exists along the lines of education, income, region, and race…If we want to unlock the potential of our workers, we have to close that gap. (Ibid.)

Public spending on Internet access in libraries is making a real difference in closing this gap, yet the “digital divide” remains a problem. Until the gap is erased, printing remains an effective safeguard for ensuring that those without access to computers can still use government information, and for guaranteeing both the authenticity of official government information as well as permanence.

**Simplifying Public Access**  In the electronic information era, there is a strong need to provide systems that help people find the information they want. In recent years, in response to a variety of social, governmental, and economic issues, Congress has passed hundreds of laws requiring public disclosure. These were not the Freedom on Information Act or government-in-the-sunshine laws, but statutes requiring the dissemination of information on a wide variety of Federal programs. Such statutes were a common feature of Federal legislation in the 1960’s and 1970’s.

A few years ago, while we were conducting our study on the electronic transition of the depository library program, the Congressional Research Service compiled a list of the various statutes requiring or authorizing the dissemination of Government information to the public. Approximately 400 statutes were identified. (Jane Bortnick Griffith and Harold Relyea, Congressional Research Service, “Compilation of Statutes Authorizing Dissemination of Government Information to the Public,” January 29, 1996.) But when you layer on top of that the presence of the Internet and the World Wide Web, which are now used by each of the Federal entities covered by those 400 statutes to perform their required dissemination functions, what results is a tremendously decentralized system of information dissemination. In 1997, the General Accounting Office identified more than 4,300 web sites in the Federal Government. (GAO, “Internet and Electronic Dial-Up Bulletin Boards: Information Reported by Federal Organizations” GAO/GGD-97-86, June 16, 1997).
The mathematics of this situation are astounding. In fact, we now have highly disorganized and confusing system of public access. GPO and NTIS are about the only entities where there is some degree of coordination of information dissemination. Throughout the rest of the government, as shown by NCLIS’s recent report “Assessment of Electronic Government Information Products,” “responsibility for electronic publishing within agencies is decentralized, diffuse, and unclear,” and “there is an overall lack of Government information policy guiding electronic publishing, dissemination, permanent public access, or information life cycle management.” (“Assessment of Electronic Government Information Products,” report of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science commissioned by the Government Printing Office, March 30, 1999.) Ominously, the report concluded that “the concept of permanent public access is not well understood” among Federal agencies.

Now, a reasonable argument can be made that a democratic society is better served by multiple points of access to government information than by a single or limited number of resources. Censorship is less easily imposed in such an information environment. But providing for the effective coordination of government information, and reducing and eliminating the confusion and frustration of finding that information, shouldn’t summon up images of Big Brother, nor should it spell the end of multiple points of public access. As information dissemination grows more decentralized because of technology, the need for organizing public access to government information—through bibliographic services, cataloging and indexing, locator and Pathway services—grows stronger. Decentralization undercuts the goal of public access, and in today’s information-dependent economy and society, information delayed is information denied. We need to combat the confusion, frustration, and delays imposed by decentralization with improved services to help the public find what they want quickly and inexpensively.

“Access America” We’ve been approached by the Office of Management and Budget to participate in the new “Access America” initiative, which was recently discussed at the annual American Association of Law Libraries conference in Washington, DC. There are a number of purported “one-stop” shops on the web for government information, and our site, GPO Access, tries to be one of them, although none of them really is—although some are a great deal closer to this ideal than others. We agree in concept with OMB’s efforts, but I wonder whether this isn’t simply another layer of web services which in the end will only be a temporary fix to the real problem of decentralized points of access. There’s a question about whether this will be a content-oriented site or a directory, like GILS. And I question whether the host agency for this undertaking—the General Services Administration—is the appropriate agency to take this on.

To my knowledge, the only government-wide program whose express purpose is to act on the principle of providing effective, comprehensive, and equitable access to information produced by all three branches of the government is the depository library program. In this age of a multi-trillion dollar government, this program performs on an annual budget of a little less than $30 million. To tackle the problem of finding government information, why not invest in the agency whose mission—whose traditional and historic partnership with the library community—is to achieve that goal?

Draft Legislation Recently, in response to draft legislation prepared by the Inter-Association Working Group in the library community, we proposed legislation that would improve upon and
expand our authorities under chapter 41 of Title 44—the legislation that created GPO Access. Among other things, it contains an authorization of appropriations, in effect calling on Congress to make a serious funding commitment to an online information system that has been successful beyond all projections. While GPO Access is now one of the government’s most popular and heavily used websites—more than 20 million documents are downloaded each month, and nearly 150,000 titles are available—it continues to be hamstrung by the current funding system. We continue to be required to fund this system out of savings achieved through the reduction in printed matter. A real commitment to GPO Access would enable immediate, full implementation of our electronic collection plan. From there we can move on to other objectives designed to simplify and improve public access to government information. I think that, with GPO Access, we have already proven that if we are given the tools, we will do the job.

NTIS Following the Commerce Department’s recent announcement that it plans to close NTIS and transfer its archive function to the Library of Congress, we made a number of inquiries about whether this was an appropriate disposition of this function and suggested GPO as a potential alternative. I testified about this at a hearing earlier this week before the House Science Committee’s Subcommittee on Technology. This is not the first time such a consolidation has been proposed. A consolidation of NTIS with GPO was nearly achieved following negotiations with the Commerce Department in the early 1980’s, and later that decade, when the Department was unable to find a home for NTIS under its privatization initiative, GPO offered to take the agency on.

NTIS’s 3 million-title collection—and that’s what it is, a working collection and not an “archive”—is a tremendously valuable resource for the public. Its shortcoming has always been that it was not made available to the public through depository libraries, due to the NTIS position that its publications are “cooperative” publications, which necessarily must be sold to be self-sustaining. Consequently, they have been exempt by law from the requirement to be distributed to depositories, and this collection today remains the largest source of fugitive documents in the government. As you know, GPO has a small pilot project with NTIS to make image files from some of these documents available to a limited number of libraries. Under this project, we reluctantly agreed to NTIS’s condition that the files not be made available for reuse or redissemination. A consolidation of NTIS with GPO would make all of the collection available for dissemination to depository libraries, with no restrictions on reuse or redissemination. It would eliminate the fugitive document problem almost entirely, at one stroke. We would fund this dissemination through GPO’s salaries and expenses appropriation for the library program, and we have made it clear to all that this would require an increase in our appropriation. The increase, however, would be fully justified by opening up the NTIS collection for the first time in its 50-year history to public use through the libraries.

Transferring NTIS to GPO would also consolidate the government’s two largest publications sales programs. With the Commerce Department’s announcement of the NTIS closing, there has been a lot of discussion about the inappropriateness of the government selling its information products. If that were the only way the government made information available, I would agree. But I think that if the NTIS collection can be made available for the free use of the public through depository libraries, there is nothing wrong with also offering copies for sale for those who want them, at a reasonable price that recovers the marginal cost of reproduction, handling,
and postage. There are possibly a number of efficiencies that could result from consolidating the 
GPO and NTIS sales programs. We would eliminate costly and unnecessary competition, under 
which we have split revenues for similar products, such as the IRS CD-ROM. GPO’s larger 
program, which last year sold some 18 million copies, could potentially offer a number of 
economies of scale to the NTIS operation, which only sells about a million copies annually, 
possibly lowering NTIS prices. Finally, a consolidation of these operations would help to 
eliminate public confusion about where to go to obtain government information. This would 
have tremendous value in making public access simpler and more user-friendly.

**Permanent Access** Beyond these issues, we need to have a system for providing permanent 
public access to government information. In this age of electronic documents, which are put up 
and then removed from the web at will, ensuring continuing, permanent access to government 
information is emerging as a tremendous challenge. The same is true for agencies that are 
terminated and go out of business. Their information resources need to be made permanently 
available for active, ongoing use. This is a function that will involve a variety of institutions: 
government agencies, GPO, the National Archives, and the library community. What we are 
talking about is not simply creating archives of information, but permanently accessible and 
available collections, similar to the concept of permanent collections in regional depository 
libraries. We have already had a great deal of success in establishing partnerships with libraries 
to house specific agency collections. The government’s role in assuring permanent public access 
to government information is completely appropriate. The government can’t continually adopt 
new technology for making current information available to the public while at the same time 
abdicating its responsibility to provide for the safekeeping and accessibility of information that’s 
no longer current or “hot.”

The principle of public access to government information, and its long history in this country at 
the constitutional, statutory, and administrative levels, provides a rich set of precedents for 
today’s information disseminators to live up to. As technology continues to change, government 
rules, as well as the rules and roles of those in the library community, must continue to evolve. 
But what must stay constant is a continuing adherence to the principle of public access and its 
centrality to our system of informed self-government.
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