

# Recommendations of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer 1980 - 1984



FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM  
MAKE THE CONNECTION | <http://www.fdlp.gov>

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL  
TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER 1980–1984  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|                           |           |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Introduction</b> ..... | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1980</b> .....         | <b>4</b>  |
| Spring Meeting .....      | 5         |
| Fall Meeting .....        | 14        |
| <b>1981</b> .....         | <b>24</b> |
| Spring Meeting .....      | 25        |
| Fall Meeting .....        | 38        |
| <b>1982</b> .....         | <b>43</b> |
| Spring Meeting .....      | 44        |
| Fall Meeting .....        | 53        |
| <b>1983</b> .....         | <b>58</b> |
| Spring Meeting .....      | 59        |
| Fall Meeting .....        | 64        |
| <b>1984</b> .....         | <b>74</b> |
| Spring Meeting .....      | 75        |
| Fall Meeting .....        | 82        |

## INTRODUCTION

---

This document presents the recommendations of the Depository Library Council from the Spring and Fall Meetings 1980–1984. The recommendations are presented in sections sorted by year, then further divided by spring and fall sessions. This document replaces the minutes previously found on the Web pages listed below.

**Please Note:** This document serves only as an archival record of what was previously published. Links referenced in this document may not exist, may be superseded, or changed.

### 1980

Spring Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rsp80.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp80.html)

Fall Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rfa80.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa80.html)

### 1981

Spring Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rsp81.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp81.html)

Fall Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rfa81.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa81.html)

### 1982

Spring Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rsp82.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp82.html)

Fall Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rfa82.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa82.html)

### 1983

Spring Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rsp83.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp83.html)

Fall Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rfa83.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa83.html)

### 1984

Spring Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rsp84.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp84.html)

Fall Meeting: [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fdlp/council/rfa84.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa84.html)

---

# 1980

---

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, APRIL 28–30, 1980 • ST. PAUL, MN

---

### Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council commends John D. Livsey for his contributions in the last six years as Director of the Library and Statutory Distribution Service. Responsive to librarians' problems, receptive to their ideas, Jim has been instrumental in improving the Depository Library System, which in turn has made it possible for depository libraries to offer improved services to their constituencies. His long-term emphasis on automation and improvement of the depository distribution system and firm and knowledgeable demand for technical quality of depository microfiche have resulted in achievements to which we wish to give special recognition.

### Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council commends John J. Boyle for his service as Public Printer. His pioneering implementation of electronic printing, micrographics and other technological innovations has served well the needs of Congress and government agencies, depository libraries, and the public's right of access to public information.

#### *Response*

Resolutions 1 and 2 were commendations for Jack Boyle and Jim Livsey. They were passed on as received with gratitude.

### Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office initiate the publication of KWIC index to the Monthly Catalog consistent with the prototype presented at the April 1980 meeting. The index should be offered on a pilot basis for the 1980 year, commencing with the semiannual cumulation and July issue. User response should be solicited and reported to Council in April 1981 to permit further consideration of indexing for the *Monthly Catalog*.

#### *Response*

Resolution No. 3 has a long history and the particular wording here came out of a spirited, if not heated, Council discussion and vote. When I got back from St. Paul, I made it one of my first priorities to give this whole issue additional study. Members of my staff reviewed the KWIC format sample in light of the problems identified by Council's Bibliographic Control Committee, as did GPO Data Systems personnel. We received some very helpful letters from Judy Myers, Karlo Mustonen, and John Henry Richter, further expressing the committee's concern and offering suggestions and assistance. Given all of this combined effort, I believe you will find that the Key Word Index as it first appears in the July 1980 Monthly Catalog contains many of the enhancements Council requested, certainly as much as we could do in the tight time frame required for timely issuance of both the July issue and the semiannual cumulation. A special notice announcing the Key Word Index will appear in the special notice section of the Monthly Catalog beginning with the July 1980 issue, and you can be assured that Council will be kept informed of user reaction. Recommendation 4

## Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office continue to adhere to the basic SuDocs classification theory in establishing new classification numbers. This would mean that the author would come before the period (.) and the series before the colon (:). Example: EP1.23/5:no.

Specifically, we recommend that the Classification numbers assigned to the Serial Set and Congressional reports and Documents be reviewed to conform with established SuDocs classification philosophy, as shown below:

- X 96-1.1: no. (Serial Sets)
- X 96-1.2: no. (Senate Documents)
- X 96-1.3: no. (Senate Executive Documents)
- X 96-1.4: no. (Senate Reports)
- X 96-1.5: no. (Senate Executive Reports)
- X 96-1.6: no. (House Documents)
- X 96-1.7: no. (House Reports) Response

### *Response*

Resolution No. 4 relates to adhering to the basic SU/DOCS classification theory in establishing new classification numbers. I have received a number of comments on the problems involved in the use of the X Number and have a file of correspondence with GODORT on the subject. In a letter to Francis Buckley on June 4, 1980, I suggested two options for GODORT to review and now have in hand a letter from Jeanne Isacco, the new GODORT Chairperson, indicating that GODORT members preferred the second option. I would like to defer a response to this resolution until Council has had an opportunity to react to the GODORT proposal, which reads as follows:

The proposals in your letter were discussed in several meetings at the ALA Conference. GODORT members preferred the option on page two of your letter, of using Y 1.1/ (numbers): for all of the series. The advantages of this classification over the one shown on page one of your letter are:

1. No publications (such as House and Senate calendars) would be interfiled with the Congressional documents and reports.
2. Using the suggested classes shown below, Congressional documents and reports could be shelved or filed in the same order that these series will be cumulated into the *Serial Set*. We feel that this arrangement will make the organization of the material clearer to users, and will minimize the shifting of documents as the *Serial Set* volumes or microfiche replace the original pieces.

The specific classes proposed by GODORT will be provided to you for your review. (Council later agreed to the GODORT proposal. See Resolution No. 23).

---

## Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office continue to use established SuDocs class numbers when there is no change in issuing agency or change in the philosophy regarding the treatment of a publication.

As a specific instance, the SuDocs class number previously established for the Slip Laws is GS 4.110:. In the January 1980 *Monthly Catalog*, Slip Law appeared with a class number of X (Congr.)-(sess.): Public Law no. This occurred because the Library Division previously has not used the GS number in the *Monthly Catalog* and, in January, placed all previously

unclassified material in the new X class. We recommend that the Library Division use the established GS class that this classification number appear in the *Monthly Catalog*.

### ***Response***

We will continue using established SuDocs class numbers when there is no change in issuing agency or change in the philosophy regarding treatment of a publication. The change in class numbers for the slip laws for GS to X occurred when we attempted to consolidate previously unclassified and related items in the X Class. In regard to your specific example we have adopted the Class Number GS 4.110: for use in the cataloging of the individual public slip laws; correspondingly, GS 4.110/3: was adopted for private slip laws. These classification numbers will appear as such beginning with the October 1980 *Monthly Catalog*.

---

## **Recommendation 6**

The Council feels that Recommendation 16 of its last Council meeting was not understood. We recommend that the Government Printing Office notify depository libraries via the Shipping Lists when action is being taken to obtain missing issues of periodicals and numbered and dated serials.

### ***Response***

Assuring shipping list notification, investigating reasons for missing issues, and making sure that all issues of serials and continuations are actually distributed will be part of the responsibility of Mr. Bob Barnes who will now be coordinating our overall acquisition effort. When a hardcopy shortage occurs, we will make every effort to obtain additional copies for distribution. If this turns out to be impossible, then we will obtain at least one copy and convert and distribute in microfiche. We realize that this will break up your collection but we have been assured by all of our depository orientation participants and other groups we have spoken to that they would rather have the document in microfiche, than not get it at all. We will send regionals both a hardcopy and microfiche whenever we have enough hard copies.

---

## **Recommendation 7**

Council expresses its concern over the fact that the Government Printing Office is considering contract cataloging as a means of eliminating its backlog. We are particularly concerned with effective quality control and the time and effort required on the part of the Government Printing Office staff to review the work of the contractor. We recommend that the GPO reconsider the option of using GPO staff and facilities to accomplish this task.

### ***Response***

After a thorough review of our present cataloging capabilities versus our projected cataloging input for the next few years, we developed a two-part plan to allow us to be more current with cataloging by the end of Fiscal Year 1982. First, we proposed, and the Public Printer approved, the hiring of 13 additional professional catalogers as quickly as possible. This effort is now ongoing and we expect to have the first cataloger on board within a month or so. We felt that 13 catalogers would enable us to cut down the backlog and keep up with normal growth. However, the Fiscal Year will begin day after tomorrow. FY 1981, and FY 1982 are not going to be normal. And neither was FY 1980. Due to new titles received in microfiche and our own efforts and those of the JCP to acquire more titles in general, our cataloging workload in FY 1982 will be more than double the workload in FY 1979— 23,800 in FY 1980 compared to 51,717 projected for FY 1982. We believe that the number of titles received will begin to stabilize by FY 1983. So, to handle the extraordinary growth, we see no options except to contract for cataloging in FY 1981 and FY 1982. This was the second part of our plan which was approved by the public printer - - to contract for the cataloging of approximately 19,000 titles a year for two years. Based on our projections, this plus the extra 13 catalogers should allow us to be near a zero balance at the end of FY 1982. However, at that time we will have to have in place a new cataloging system that will give us at least a 25% productivity improvement or we will begin to fall behind again.

We share your concerns about the problems with contract cataloging. But, we believe that by carefully selecting those materials that can best be handled by a contractor, not limiting the contractor to only our backlog, that we should be able to make it work satisfactorily. One of the things we would like the Bibliographic Control Committee to advise us on is the categories of titles that would be the most logical for a contractor to work and over which we can maintain the highest quality control.

---

## Recommendation 8

In view of the importance of the SuDocs numbers to the retrieval of government publications, Council recommends that the Government Printing Office urgently pursue the issue of obtaining OCLC implementation of the SuDocs number search key prior to October 1, 1980. OCLC has announced a one-year moratorium on software changes during its move to new facilities, to begin October 1980.

### *Response*

Resolution No. 8 “relates to the OCLC implementation of the SU/DOCS Search Key and, as many of you know, this was implemented on September 9th. Chris Grabenstatter of OCLC is here today with a terminal and will be giving demonstrations. Essentially, the computer searches on the 086 field, the machine address of the SuDocs Class Number in the Marc Format. The SuDocs Keys uses the prefix GN. The system then indexes the first two alpha characters and up to ten numeric characters which follows: But, Chris will show it to you later in the meeting.

---

## Recommendation 9

Council recommends that the Library Division discontinue its present practice of using serial records to create monograph analytics. The current practice creates a record in the Monthly Catalog and the Government Printing Office’s archival tape, but does not create a record for the monograph analytics in the OCLC database. The current practice also places nonstandard information on the GPO tapes and inhibits computer searching, because the MARC serials and monograph formats have different search tag numbers. We therefore recommend that all monograph analytics be input as individual records, using the MARC monograph format.

### *Response*

Resolution No. 9 has to do with the input of all monographic analytics. Here’s what we propose:

- c. A. All individual titles of a monographic series will be cataloged separately. A serials entry will be made for the monographic series.
- d. B. Technical reports and contractor reports will no longer be handled as open series. Each report will be cataloged as an individual monograph.
- e. C. We will continue to catalog annuals with distinctive titles as serials; however, we will add a 246, 12 field (distinctive title) qualified by date to preclude the current difficulties in retrieval. We believe that the serials format more than adequately provides for cataloging direction without hindering retrieval, either manually or by machine. We do recognize the need for an enhanced subject approach for those annuals with a distinctive subject focus (e.g., *Yearbook of Agriculture*) and will continue to study this problem.

All of the above changes will be implemented with the adoption of AACR-2.



## Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office initiate further discussion with the Library of Congress regarding LC's access to the SuDocs class number for inclusion in the LC MARC record.

### *Response*

Resolution No. 10 will be implemented automatically with the transfer of cataloging responsibility for federal documents from LC to GPO. By the time LC receives the cataloging record, either supplied by GPO or directly from OCLC, the SuDocs Classification Number will be a part of the record and should be retained throughout LC processing.

---

## Recommendation 11

Resolved that the Public Printer explore the possibility of having the official list of depository libraries published annually in the *Government Manual*.

### *Response*

I wrote to Mr. Robert E. Lewis, Director, Presidential Documents Division, Office of the Federal Register, inquiring about the possibility of including the official list of Depository Libraries in the *Government Manual*. Mr. Lewis replied that he thought that this list would be more appropriate in the *Directory of Federal Regional Structure*, a companion publication to the Manual. He indicated that if this position is satisfactory to the Council, he would be pleased to work with our Office to publish the listing in the 1981-1982 Edition. I await your decision on this one!

---

## Recommendation 12

In response to recent suggestions by depository libraries, the Government Printing Office, and/or federal agencies that certain voluminous series (for example Census microfiche not available in printed form, the *Flood Insurance Studies*, and maps related to each series) not be offered to depository libraries or be removed from depository distributions, the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that:

1. These series be offered, or continue to be offered, for depository distribution,
2. GPO work with the Joint Committee on Printing and the Council to develop on a pilot basis a means of making these series available to regional depositories on a selective basis, requiring only that as a minimum, regionals select publications which cover the state(s) they serve.
3. GPO work with the Joint Committee on Printing and the Council to provide a back-up system so that regional depositories can acquire items not originally selected to meet the regional's needs for their own users and the selective depositories in their area.

Alternative back-up systems which might be considered include:

- a. a back-up loan collection at the GPO,
  - b. arrangements between GPO and the issuing agency to provide requested materials on an on-demand basis.
  - c. interlibrary loan agreements between regionals.
-

### ***Response***

Our General Counsel has informed me that any plan or system which allows discretion on the part of Regional Depository Libraries in selecting documents for deposit is not possible under present law. The major obstacles to implementation of the resolution are Section 1912 of Title 44, which states that Regionals shall receive from the Superintendent of Documents copies of all new and revised Government publications authorized for distribution to Depository libraries, and Section 1902 of Title 44 which states that Government publications...shall be made available to Depository libraries... There is no provision in the law allowing Regional Depositories to pick and choose publications for deposit. Such discretion is only given to Selective Depositories in Section 1905 of Title 44. Our General Counsel states, finally, that it would defeat the purpose of designating Regional Depositories if such libraries did not receive and retain a copy of all Government publications.

---

### **Recommendation 13**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Government Printing Office work with the JCP and the Council to make available for depository distribution federally produced non-print materials such as, but not limited to, slides, sound recordings, films, videotapes, and machine-readable tapes. As a first step, the Council recommends that non-print materials directly related to print materials currently available for depository distribution (for example, the sound recordings produced in conjunction with the Foreign Language Institute Basic Language Courses [Item 872-A]) be made available for depository distribution.

### ***Response***

Resolution No. 13 relates to possible distribution to depositories of non-print materials such as slides, sound recordings, films, videotapes, and machine-readable tapes. I also referred this matter to our General Counsel. He states that the issue with regard to this resolution is: are non-print materials such as slides, sound recordings, films, videotapes, and machine-readable tapes Government Publications? If they are, then such publications would be available for distribution to Depository libraries. The term 'Government Publication' as used in Chapter 19 of Title 44 is defined as: 'information matter which is published as an individual document at Government expense, or as required by law.' Assuming that the non-print material in question is in fact information matter published at Government expense, the issue is whether the present definition of the word 'publication' is broad enough to encompass non-print material.

Several Comptroller General opinions have examined the scope of the definition of the word 'publication' and imply that the definition is expanding to include newly developed technology.

Of considerable importance is the fact that this very question concerning distribution of non-print materials has been the subject of considerable debate in Congress. There is presently pending before Congress a Bill, H.R. 5424 which is a proposed revision of Title 44 of the *U.S. Code*. A definition section in the Bill defines the term 'Government Publication' as 'a publication, document, form, machine-readable data file, microform, audio or visual material, or other similar matter reproduced by printing or other means for a Government entity...' Under the proposed Bill, these types of 'Government Publications' would be made available to Depository libraries. The Bill is presently stalled in Congress. You are aware, I'm sure, that if we even considered sending audio visuals to depositories, we would have to request Congressional funding and I would not, at this point, forecast their approval.

Until the matter is clarified, our General Counsel has recommended that we not attempt to distribute audio visuals to Depository libraries. You should know, however, that members of my staff joined staff members of the JCP in a meeting on September 9, 1980, at the National Audio-Visual Center. The result of that meeting may lead to cataloging of audio visuals in the *Monthly Catalog*.

## **Recommendation 14**

The Depository Library Council recommends that for separate shipments only a claim period of three weeks (21 days) be established through shipping list notices and that libraries be urged to make such claims as late in the period as they consider feasible so that no library has two copies of a publication while others find the available supply exhausted.

### ***Response***

Our claims section is making a special effort to hold stock for six weeks to two months in order to service claims in this category. Since a redesign of the claim form is under active consideration, we will hold off on any shipping list notices at this time. As you are aware, the amount of space available in our warehouse to hold claim stock has been at a premium for some time; however, we now have room to expand this area since consigned stock formerly held in the depository area was moved to our Farrington location last week.

---

## **Recommendation 15**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the language used in communicating class corrections/changes on shipping lists be such that the user clearly understands if the class correction/change is for the one individual publication cited or if the class change is for an entire body of material being distributed under a particular item number. Further study will produce specific suggestions for language to be used.

### ***Response***

I recognize Council's concern with this issue and the basic difficulty involved in communicating the various corrections and changes that occur inevitably in an operation the size of ours. I am delighted to have in hand John McGeachey's detailed report to the Council on 'Shipping List Notes, March 1979-1980' and expect that his carefully documented analysis will help Council and GPO arrive at mutually satisfactory procedures for addressing our sometime communications gaps. I call your attention to page 5, first full paragraph, where John notes that measured against a distribution of 66,000 pieces, the correction rate was just over one percent. While this might be cause for joy, I understand Depository librarians' frustrations in this area and assure you that we are as anxious as you are (1) to see the error rate further reduced, and (2) while seeking this millennium, to communicate with you as clearly as possible.

---

## **Recommendation 16**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office personnel research the legality of a library's disposing of material received under the rubric class added to this item number, when in fact that material was not chosen by the library and report to the Council at its next meeting or sooner if possible.

### ***Response***

Our General Counsel has reviewed your Resolution 16 and finds that the provisions of law pertaining to disposition of unwanted Government documents refer only to the disposition of previously selected documents and do not address the question of unsolicited or unselected documents. I understand the problems that you face when we ship materials under the rubric class added to this item number. You are in effect receiving something you did not originally select; you don't need it; and you can't dispose of it. But, since the statute and legislative history of the Depository Library Act are silent on the question of disposition of unsolicited Government documents, I do not have the authority to authorize its destruction.

By the same token, under this procedure, you very often receive documents that you wish to keep but may not have received if it had not been designated 'class added.' What I would like to do is refer this back to Committee, ask you to study the effect it is having on 10-12 representative libraries, and let me know of the impact so that I may pursue the matter.

---

### **Recommendation 17**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the acquisition program of the Government Printing Office continue to be emphasized with the [The rest of recommendation is not available. Editor's note.]

#### ***Response***

We do plan to keep up our acquisition efforts. Let me give you an idea of the results so far over the last 3 years and what this has done to our workload and to yours. In FY 1978, the number of titles shipped in hardcopy was 41,236 and in microfiche was 4,054 - - a total of 45,290. This coming Fiscal Year 1981, we expect our distribution to be nearly 81,000 titles with about half shipped in film format and half in hardcopy. In FY 1982, film will surpass hardcopy with the breakdown being approximately 45,000 in hardcopy and 52,000 in film for a total of 97,000 - - more than double the 1978 volume.

Mr. Bob Barnes on the Director's Staff at LSDS is now coordinating this effort for the Library and Statutory Distribution Service. He will be the single point of contact for dealing with agencies to obtain new titles in both hardcopy and microform, and for working out shortage problems and why they occurred. Depository Librarians may call him at (703) 557-2025 when you find titles that are not in the system that you would like investigated or when you notice missing issues of continuing type materials, but I prefer a letter to the Director of LSDS giving him as much information as possible.

---

### **Recommendation 18 (not available. Editor's note.)**

#### ***Response***

Resolution No. 18 "asks that we endorse a project initiated by the Minnesota Regional. I have written to Mr. LaBissoniere commending him on his efforts in this area. For those of you who were not at the April Council Meeting, Bill has initiated a project to build a data base containing information about Depository publications that appear on the shipping lists. The system uses Boolean logic to search by item number, class number, title words, or date of publication. Ultimately, access to this system will be extended to members of the Research Libraries Network (RLIN). I'm sure Bill will be glad to explain the project in greater detail to anyone who is interested.

---

### **Recommendation 19 (not available. Editor's note.)**

#### ***Response***

Resolution No. 19 asks that the Superintendent of Documents reevaluate his response to an earlier recommendation passed by the Depository Library Council at its October 1979 meeting. The recommendation asks that the full hierarchical arrangement for an agency be provided on survey cards in the *List of Classes*. Further, it requests that a detailed description of the agency, including its function, purpose, scope, and objectives, as well as a reference to the statutory source which established the agency, and/or the *Federal Register* Reference which announces the establishment, merger, transfer, etc., of that agency be provided on the survey card for the first item issued by that agency.

Originally our response stated that we were limited as to what will fit on a 3 x 5 card. In reviewing this response, I think we should have said that provision of detailed information about other Government agencies is outside of our responsibility, and

that resources are not available to perform such a service. I'm sure all of you are aware that information of this sort may be found in the *U.S. Government Manual* and in the *Federal Register*, both of which are available to depositories. Our records indicate that most Depository libraries are already receiving both of these titles.

The final part of the recommendation in question requests that for survey cards representing title or classification changes, the Superintendent of Documents provide the former item number, former SuDoc Classification Number, former title, etc. It is understood how important this information is to you, and we will make every effort to provide it in the future.

---

**Recommendation 20 (not available. Editor's note.)**

***Response***

Resolution No. 20 contains recommendations relating to the 1980 Census publications. We began surveying for the 1980 Census of Population and Housing with Survey 80-35-A (Shipping List No. 14,492, June 27, 1980) and Survey 80-49-A (Shipping List No. 14,679, August 8, 1980). These surveys follow Council's recommendations as stated in Part A. of this Resolution. The summary tape files on microfiche (Part B.) will be offered in a later survey and the breakdown will be as you requested. In answer to Part C., I can tell you that we expect to offer the maps in fiche, with a breakdown by states. There will be approximately 32,000 maps on 20,000 fiche. We are working with Census Bureau personnel now to ensure that the SuDocs Class appears in the title area.

---

**Recommendation 21 (not available. Editor's note.)**

***Response***

Resolution No. 21 involved your recommendations for selecting a replacement for Jim Livsey. As you know, on July 14, 1980, Jay Young was selected for the position. I believe that Jay will do a good job and I ask that you work with him.

---

**Recommendation 22 (not available. Editor's note.)**

***Response***

Resolution No. 22 both Mr. Philip Ziegler of the Classification and Cataloging Branch and Mrs. Lueglla Burgesser, Chief, Depository Section, Depository and Service Branch, are here to give the benefit of their knowledge and experience.

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, SEPTEMBER 29 – OCTOBER 1, 1980 • ALEXANDRIA, VA

---

### **Recommendation 1**

The Depository Library Council supports the GPO microform conversion program which affords depository libraries the option of selecting certain Government documents in hardcopy or microfiche. In particular, the Council would like to see the microform conversion program for Congressional committee publications expanded to encompass all Congressional Hearings and Committee Prints. It is the desire of the Council that all depository libraries have the opportunity to select this highly important category of materials and that no library be limited in its selections because of space or monetary constraints. Therefore, recognizing and responding to individual requests from depository librarians, a unanimous resolution from regional depository librarians meeting in Alexandria, Virginia, on September 28, 1980, and communications from other library associations and groups, the Depository Library Council recommends that depository libraries be surveyed to determine their individual selection needs for each committee's publications in either hardcopy or microfiche format, distribution of all Committee Hearings and Prints in the format selected to begin with the 97th Congress, 1st Session.

### ***Response***

We surveyed the Depository Library Community for their preference of either hardcopy or microfiche format of Congressional Hearings and Committee Prints with distribution starting with the 97th Congress, 1st Session. 833 libraries responded with 45% selecting hardcopy and 55% selecting microfiche. The new prospect of availability in microfiche of Hearings and Committee Prints prompted 17% of those responding to select for the very first time these important publications, thereby broadening public access through depository libraries.

An economic analysis was prepared and presented on November 24, 1980, to members of the Public Printer's Council on Micropublishing. The analysis indicated there would be an estimated 1981 cost reduction of approximately \$350,000 to be realized by introducing a microfiche option along with hardcopy of Hearings and Committee Prints. The Council on Micropublishing responded with a positive recommendation to the proposal. On December 15, 1980, the Public Printer announced his decision to convert to microfiche all Congressional Hearings and Committee Prints beginning with the 97th Congress.

---

### **Recommendation 2**

The Depository Library Council desires that no depository library have to refrain from selecting available documents because of space constraints. The Council therefore urges that in the future, in addition to considering the cost savings to GPO of offering titles in microform, the impact upon space and the cost savings to depository libraries be considered of equal importance.

### ***Response***

We are in agreement with this resolution and believe that further development of microform distribution will result in cost savings not only to Government, but to depository libraries as well.

### **Recommendation 3**

Be it resolved that the Depository Library Council commends and expresses its appreciation to Carl LaBarre and Jay Young for their efforts in reorganizing and expanding the Library Division of the Library and Statutory Distribution Service. Council believes these actions will result in significantly improved output and staff in the Division.

#### ***Response***

The appreciation expressed by Council to the Superintendent of Documents and to the Director of the Library Statutory Distribution Service for efforts to reorganize and modernize the Library Division is most welcome. Regrettably, the recent job freeze was imposed before completion of these efforts and may delay achieving some of the original goals

---

### **Recommendation 4**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO catalog and classify its own publications which are of general interest to libraries for distribution to depository libraries.

#### ***Response***

GPO will classify and catalog its own publications which are of general interest and suitable for distribution to depository libraries. We have treated in this manner the Annual Report of the Public Printer, and plan to continue this with the PRF Users Manual which will be available this summer.

---

### **Recommendation 5**

The Depository Library Council requests that GPO survey new items rather than use the classes added method of distributing publications, except in those cases where such documents are determined to be related materials; or a single publishing effort.

#### ***Response***

We will survey new publications that are unrelated to existing items numbers. We will only use the Classes Added method where it is appropriate. Also, steps are being taken to identify item numbers which happen to include related and unrelated publications. The April issue of Public Documents Highlights asks librarians to nominate the five most irritating item numbers. When we study these responses, we will resurvey and assign new item numbers.

---

### **Recommendation 6**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO resurvey the microform offering of the GAO Legislative History File, in the variety of options feasible, with a clear description of its physical limitations and file size.

#### ***Response***

Assuming budgetary conditions allow, and if our supplemental request is approved, plans for distribution of the GAO Legislative History File will continue. A new survey will be conducted which will include a clear description of the image quality, with a sample law on fiche. It will be stressed in the description that the material leaves much to be desired, but that nothing better is available through GAO or GPO. We will also provide a disclaimer notice with this product. Covering material from the 65th through the 94th Congress, will be 20,000 laws in individual envelopes holding a total of 40,000 fiche. This works out to 70 linear feet. Distribution will take place at a rate of 2,000 fiche per month over a two year period.

---

### **Recommendation 7**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO offer dual media editions of the Congressional Record bound edition, with text in microfiche and the index in bound form, and that this item be resurveyed.

#### ***Response***

We have taken a close look at the Congressional Record bound edition with its index to determine the most practical and economical method of distribution. Presently 657 libraries receive the Record in the hardcopy format and 694 receive it in microfiche. Making a third offering available (text in fiche, index in hardcopy), would generate additional expense for GPO. However, if we distribute the bound edition in microfiche only, and the index in hardcopy, a savings of approximately one million dollars per year would be realized. The Joint Committee on Printing is supportive of the Record being produced on fiche. Not only will a savings be realized, but the material would become available more quickly. Microfiche distribution of the Record would help decrease the cost of the depository program without cutting other services.

---

### **Recommendation 8**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO send to regional libraries and state library agencies, on a weekly basis and as a separate and additional service, second copies of shipping lists which accompanied shipments mailed during the previous week.

#### ***Response***

Okay! We will distribute a second copy of the “Daily Depository Shipping List” to regional depository libraries. In order to keep mailing costs low, cumulated sets will be sent in the depository shipment mailed to regionals at the end of each week. State library agencies will be asked regarding their desire to receive this material; and, upon receipt of a positive response, will be included in this distribution.

---

### **Recommendation 9**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Library Division use established means of communication including the depository library inspectors, regional libraries, and state library agencies, to encourage the return of information, (e.g., the computerized item lists, vital to the depository library operation).

#### ***Response***

Communication between our Library Division and depository libraries has been strengthened by the assignment of publication responsibilities to the recently selected Administrative Librarian, Dan MacGilvray. Among other things, he is looking after the newly created Administrative Notes, the GPO Cataloging Bulletin, (being developed) and Public Documents Highlights, all of which are encouraging the flow of information (including printouts) from depository libraries. He will also strive to enlist greater cooperation in information dissemination from regional libraries and state library agencies, as well as from GPO staff to depositories.

---

### **Recommendation 10**

The Depository Library Council requests a report from the Superintendent of Documents on the results of his study on the use of Selected U.S. Government Publications as a marketing tool for Government documents. The Council further requests



additional information on the intended focus and audience for Selected U.S. Government Publications. The Council urges GPO to increase its marketing and promotional efforts in the sale of documents to non-depository libraries and to the general public.

### ***Response***

The administration of the Selected U.S. Government Publications mailing list has been in the hands of a commercial contractor for approximately nine months. A part of this contract requires the matching of Selected List orders received against the mailing list and inclusion of this data on the customer record. A preliminary analysis has revealed that approximately 65% of Selected List orders are from customers who are on our mailing list. We are also aware that a large percentage of our Selected List customers never purchase publications through the monthly issues. At the end of the year, Selected List recipients who have not placed orders will be contacted in an effort to determine why they did not buy from GPO and what are their needs and interests which might be reflected in future issues.

We intend to also use the positive part of the mailing list (those who buy) as a mailing list for promotional flyers. This campaign will highlight Government documents and their availability through GPO.

The Selected List will continue to be mailed to any customer who requests it. We include it as a part of all our promotional activities. GPO is always looking for means of extending our marketing and promotional efforts in the sale of Government documents. Recent agreements have been reached with Lockheed Dialog Information Retrieval Service to make the Publications Reference File (PRF) available on their system. We will also participate in their Dialorder Online Ordering Service which will allow any customer who subscribes to the Dialog System to place orders directly to GPO via the Online System. Both regular and priority processing of customer orders placed through this system will be provided.

---

## **Recommendation 11**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Office of the Public Printer observe procedures for determining which Government publications will be converted to microfiche for depository distribution, as outlined in the letter of August 29, 1980, to Mr. James Adler which was signed by Samuel Saylor and Gordon Andrew McKay. The Council wishes to emphasize the importance of the taking of the survey of depository libraries as a part of this procedure.

### ***Response***

GPO has and will continue to observe procedures on microfiche conversion as outlined in the letter of August 29, 1980. There will be an economic analysis to determine if publications meet the criteria outlined, and a survey of depository libraries will be a part of the procedure.

---

## **Recommendation 12**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that a meeting of regional depository libraries be scheduled to precede the April 1981 meeting in San Antonio, Texas, in order for regionals to discuss their problems and concerns. Discussion during the first session will be limited to regional depository representatives. There will be an open session provided for selective depository librarians to voice their concerns. The session will be moderated by the Depository Library Systems Committee of the Council.

### ***Response***

In response to the concern expressed by many regional librarians, and ably put by Chairperson Barbara Smith, the focus of the Spring meeting of the Depository Library Council is on regionals and their role in the Depository Library Program. This has been publicized in issues of Public Documents Highlights and in Administrative Notes. With this major theme for the three-day meeting, the need for a separate pre-Council session as in the recent past disappeared and none was scheduled.

---

### **Recommendation 13**

The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer on his publicity efforts and recommends that the GPO public service radio spots be distributed to all depository libraries for their use in publicizing the depository library program.

### ***Response***

In response to requests from librarians for publicity materials suitable for radio public service announcements, a usable model of a 60 second spot announcement was published in the February issue of Public Documents Highlights. An article citing the value of radio spot announcements appeared in the same issue; and a contest was initiated to have depository librarians create 30 and 60 second radio spot announcements and send them to the editor. The best announcements will be chosen for publication in Highlights this summer for the use of the entire Depository Library Community.

---

### **Recommendation 14**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the sound recordings produced in conjunction with the Foreign Service Institute Basic Language Courses (Item 872-A) be made available for depository distribution.

### ***Response***

GPO responded during the Fall 1980 Council Meeting to a similar resolution, Number 13, regarding distribution of non-print materials. In our response, we indicated that Congressional funding would be necessary if audio visuals were sent to depositories; and that pending clarification of the definition of the word “publication” our General Counsel advised we not attempt to distribute them to depository libraries.

The Foreign Service Institute has been asked, meanwhile, if they would be willing to supply Foreign Service Institute Basic Language Courses Sound Recordings at no cost to GPO. If their response is positive, we will undertake distribution of the sound recordings to the 594 depositories currently selecting the Basic Language Courses.

---

### **Recommendation 15**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that he communicate with the Joint Committee on Printing with a view toward making briefs available for depository distribution.

### ***Response***

On January 7, 1981, pursuant to this resolution, a letter went from the Superintendent of Documents to the Staff Director, Joint Committee on Printing, concerning Congressional Research Service Publications, such as reports and issue briefs. The Joint Committee on Printing was asked to advise the Government Printing Office as to the availability of such material for inclusion in the Depository Library Program. Bernadine Hoduski has been working on this and may be able to give us a status report during this conference.

---

## **Recommendation 16**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Government Printing Office conduct a study to determine if all unclassified CIA materials received by Documents Expediting Service, Library of Congress, are also being sent to GPO for inclusion in the depository library system.

### ***Response***

Responding to a communication from GPO in regard to this resolution, the Printing and Photography Division of the Central Intelligence Agency began in fiscal 1981 sending to GPO cumulative computer printouts of all unclassified materials that were authorized for release in either hardcopy or microform.

These printouts list the titles of unclassified CIA publications, their identification number, and a distribution list which includes the ordered quantity count for each recipient. One copy of each of these printouts will continue to be sent to GPO for the purpose of assuring that all of the CIA's unclassified documents are included in the Depository Library Program.

---

## **Recommendation 17**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Flood Insurance Studies (Item 594-C) be included in the microfiche conversion program, the text to be converted to microfiche and sent together with the paper copy maps as a package, beginning no later than April 1981.

### ***Response***

Evaluation of the Flood Insurance Studies on microfiche indicate that they are of acceptable quality for distribution to depositories. Regrettably, some of the contour maps do not reproduce well, and may prove illegible on fiche. Due to the considerable costs involved, these maps cannot be separated from the studies and distributed in hardcopy. We cannot bear the initial expense of creating the fiche. We have to encourage the originating agency to produce the fiche so that we can ride their requisition. Meanwhile, we will resurvey with more selective breakdowns by state.

---

## **Recommendation 18**

The Depository Library Council finds the response to the request to publish the Official List of Depository Libraries in the Government Manual unsatisfactory. Council's intention was to have the list published in a widely available document. The Directory of Federal Regional Structure does not fall within that category. Therefore, we recommend that the Public Printer communicate with Mr. Robert E. Lewis, Director of the Presidential Documents Division, Office of the Federal Register, restating Council's position that the list be published in the Government Manual and Council's concern to reach the widest audience as soon as possible.

### ***Response***

The Office of the Federal Register was again contacted regarding inclusion of the Official List of Depository Libraries in the Government Manual. They again declined to include it, but they agreed to have it appear in the Directory of Federal Regional Structure, where it will be included with the next edition.

## **Recommendation 19**

The Depository Library Council believes that GPO, as the center of authority for the cataloging of Federal documents, has a responsibility to issue a cataloging bulletin in order to communicate GPO's cataloging rule interpretations and other detailed cataloging policies, so that catalogers in other libraries can be consistent with GPO policies. Users of the Monthly Catalog and on-line services which provide access to the GPO cataloging tapes also need these interpretations and policies in order to search these data bases effectively. The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO issue a cataloging bulletin containing the information now issued internally as the GPO Cataloging Manual, and that GPO make this publication available as a depository and as a subscription item.

### ***Response***

GPO recognizes its responsibility as a cataloging authority in the area of Federal Documents, along with the desirability of disseminating cataloging decisions, rule interpretations, etc. To enable the library community to better understand GPO cataloging policies and practices, steps are being taken by Dan MacGilvray and GPO Cataloging Librarians to format and publish a GPO Cataloging Bulletin. This publication will be made available to depository libraries at regular Intervals.

---

## **Recommendation 20**

The Depository Library Council commends the Government Printing Office for the reformatting of the Publications Reference File. The PRF, which gives current information on sales publications, has become an indispensable bibliographic source to depository libraries and their users. Council recommends the monthly distribution of the PRF to depository libraries.

### ***Response***

At this time we cannot consider monthly distribution of the Publications Reference File to depository libraries. This type of service would increase our appropriated printing budget by \$85,335.47, and cause us to be in violation of the existing PRF contract. In addition, because of the number of fiche contained in a PRF set, contractors would experience extreme difficulty in meeting production and delivery schedules.

---

## **Recommendation 21**

The Depository Library Council recommends the following enhancements to the microfiche edition of the Congressional Bills, beginning with the 97th Congress:

1. The microfiche should be numbered consecutively throughout both sessions of Congress, rather than starting the numbering over at the beginning of the second session
2. In order to produce the interim Finding Aid rapidly and thus expedite shipment of the bills, the paper Finding Aid should cumulate throughout the first session, then begin a new cumulation with the second session, as is the current practice;
3. At the end of the 97th and subsequent Congresses, a final cumulation of the Finding Aid for the two sessions of Congress should be produced in microfiche;
4. A user's guide to the Finding Aid should appear in each issue.

***Response***

Beginning with the 97th Congress, 1st Session, the microfiche on which the Congressional House and Senate Bills are listed, will be numbered consecutively throughout both sessions of Congress.

Individual Cumulative Finding Aids for each session of Congress will be produced as previously furnished in the past with three exceptions: (1) A table of contents will be listed in each Finding Aid for easy reference; (2) The number of columns used to display the individual bill or amendment number, fiche number, and X-Y grid coordinate will be reduced from 4 to 3 columns; and all Finding Aids will be accompanied by the “Superintendent of Documents Microfiche User’s Guide for Congressional House and Senate Bills”, and instructions for locating X-Y grid coordinates; (3) Pages in the Finding Aid will no longer be color coded for specific categories of bills and amendments, but will be replaced by the table of contents.

A consolidated numerical sequence listing of bills introduced in the two sessions of Congress cannot be considered at this time because of insufficient staff and the limited storage capabilities of the equipment used to produce the Finding Aid. However, we will produce a two-part Finding Aid in one booklet that will list all bills and amendments for an entire Congress. Part one will list those bills and amendments introduced in the First Session, and part two will list those introduced in the Second Session. This document will be issued in both hardcopy and microfiche format.

**Recommendation 22**

The Depository Library Council commends the Government Printing Office for the Keyword in Context Title Index which first appeared in the July 1980 Monthly Catalog. The index is much improved over the sample presented to Council in April 1980. Since this is a trial index, Council recommends that GPO elicit user response via a questionnaire which is to be sent to all Monthly Catalog subscribers. The Bibliographic Control Committee of the Council volunteers to assist with the development of a questionnaire to be mailed shortly after shipment of the January-June 1980 semiannual index to the Monthly Catalog

***Response***

User reaction to the Keyword Title Index was solicited by GPO and the response has been overwhelmingly favorable. It is our feeling that a questionnaire is unnecessary at this time. However, should the Council’s Bibliographic Control Committee presently feel a questionnaire is imperative, and would design such a questionnaire, GPO will be pleased to distribute it to all depository libraries and to all subscribers.

**Recommendation 23**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO accept the classification numbers for the Serial Set as proposed by the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) to GPO and outlined below:

Suggested Classes Examples

- Y 1.1/2: Serial Set .....Y 1.1/2:12165
- Y 1.1/3: Senate Documents.....Y 1.1/3:95-21
- Y 1.1/4: Senate Executive Documents...Y 1.1/4:96-AA

Suggested Classes Examples

- Y 1.1/5: Senate Reports.....Y 1.1/5:96-11
- Y 1.1/6: Senate Executive Reports ....Y 1.1/6:96-17

- Y 1.1/7: House Documents.....Y 1.1/7:96-75
- Y 1.1/8: House Reports.....Y 1.1/8:96-21

Since some of the recipients of the Reports and Documents comprising the Serial Set will retain only the microfiche edition issue originally as House and Senate Documents and Reports, with the classification numbers for their individual series, Council recommends that GPO supply cardboard dividers with the following information:

1. Serial Set volume number;
2. SUDOCs class number of the House or Senate publications comprising that volume;
3. SUDOCs class number of the “Title page and Contents microfiche for that Serial Set volume.

### ***Response***

We have agreed to implement the GODORT Proposal pertaining to classification numbers for Congressional documents. This proposal has been adopted for all Congressional publications beginning with the 97th Congress.

GPO will also supply dividers for the microfiche edition of the Serial Set. This edition was issued originally as House and Senate Documents and Reports with classification numbers for the individual series.

The Serial Set dividers will include the Serial Set SuDocs classification number, volume number, and the inclusive report of document numbers for that volume equivalent. Although the Title Page and Contents microfiche for that volume will have a unique SuDocs classification number, the number will not appear on the divider itself since it appears on the appropriate fiche.

---

## **Recommendation 24**

The Depository Library Council is concerned that GPO’s present policies do not provide for correction of all errors in the cataloging records in the OCLC data base or in the tapes distributed by the Library of Congress, even if errors are discovered and corrected either prior to or following production of the Monthly Catalog. Council recommends that all corrections made in the Monthly Catalog be transmitted to OCLC, and that GPO seek a mechanism by which corrections can be distributed in machine-readable form to purchasers of the GPO cataloging tapes. As a means of distribution of these tape corrections, Council notes that the Library of Congress has, twice in the past year, offered to distribute tapes of corrections. We feel that it is essential for GPO to correct its AACR II records as soon as errors are discovered.

### ***Response***

In consultation with Judy Myers and GPO staff members after the 1980 Fall Council Meeting, a series of guidelines and procedures were designed which would allow corrections to GPO data to be disseminated to the public. A series of new problems were identified during our attempts to integrate the new procedures with existing software. We have identified the new problem areas and are moving toward resolution. As soon as clearance to proceed is received, we will begin processing corrections for general distribution.

---

## **Recommendation 25**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO not limit its search for an automated cataloging system to the three proposals presently being reviewed. We recommend that GPO issue a general request for proposals to the public and to the cataloging utilities.

***Response***

We have expanded our search for a suitable approach to accomplish our automation project. We have investigated numerous resources and utilities in addition to the original three. However, most are not equipped to meet the level of sophistication which we require. The Washington Library Network has been identified in this search as an alternative approach and their software package has been included in our plans for further study.

---

**Recommendation 26**

Whereas, The Government Printing Office has been given statutory responsibility (Title 44, sections 1710 and 1711) for providing a comprehensive master catalog of U.S. Government publications, and Whereas, The U.S. Government publications user community needs a standardized system of access, both bibliographic and subject, to all Government publications, and Whereas, GPO is complying with the internationally accepted code of cataloging rules (AACR II) and the federally and internationally accepted MARC format (which has been promulgated by the National Bureau of Standards as the standard Federal format for machine-readable bibliographic records), and Whereas, Individual U.S. Government agencies have particular subject expertise which is directly applicable to developing a standardized subject access system and to provide both bibliographic and subject input to a master catalog of U.S. Government publications (cooperative cataloging) and Whereas, A cooperative system of standardized input to a master catalog of U.S. Government publications will (1) eliminate duplicate processing and (2) reduce the time and effort required to produce the catalog, thereby reducing the cost of its production, at the same time making it a more useful tool, available to the public in a more timely manner,

Therefore, The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO in consultation with the Joint Committee on Printing and the Federal Library Committee, prepare a plan for the development and production of a master catalog of U.S. Government publications, utilizing standardized cooperative cataloging from all appropriate Government agencies, including, but not limited to the following: The Senate Library, National Technical Information Service, Department of Energy, Department of Defense, National Aeronautical and Space Administration, and the National Bureau of Standards.

***Response***

We are discussing the possibility of shared cataloging of technical report literature with the Department of Energy Technical Information Center at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. We are actively exploring a possible cooperative cataloging venture with the National Technical Information Center, NASA, and the Department of Energy. In addition, consultations have also taken place with the Library of Congress, Federal Library Committee, Joint Committee on Printing, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and others on defining the best means of developing a shared cataloging project or network within the Federal sector. We expect these discussions to continue and will report on developments as they occur.

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

---

**1981**

---



## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, APRIL 13-15, 1981 • SAN ANTONIO, TX

---

### **Recommendation 1**

In order to bolster the Regional depository libraries' capabilities to serve their state missions and in order to assure that Federal documents are available throughout the United States on an equal and expeditious basis, the Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer investigate the feasibility of requiring each state to prepare a plan to coordinate the Federal documents depository program within that state. The plan should be developed through consultation with all designated Federal depository libraries within the state and should address all depository responsibilities outlined in the Instructions to Depository Libraries as well as the concerns expressed through the Regional Depository Library Survey presented to the Depository Library Council at the first afternoon session of the Spring 1981 meeting.

### ***Response***

We recognize the diverse needs of individual states for effective Regional depository services, and, in some instances, more active selective depository support of those services. The Public Printer also recognizes that under current economic and budgetary pressures, a broader interpretation of Title 44, allowing states to cooperate more fully by sharing depository responsibilities, is needed at this time. Having had an opportunity to examine plans for depository service in Missouri and New Jersey, which entailed much work and careful thought about the special needs of those states, we feel that in states lacking Regional depositories, such as Missouri, or in states desiring to strengthen existing Regional depository services, as in New Jersey, these plans have genuine merit. Therefore, we wish to go on record as encouraging depositories in states that have need of such plans to undertake them. To assist in this, and to provide two approaches for creating such plans, we will distribute copies of the plans for Missouri and for New Jersey to all depository libraries.

---

### **Recommendation 2**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer review the forthcoming GODORT report based on the draft version presented to Council by the Committee on Regional Depositories of the Depository Library Work Group of the Federal Documents Task Force (ALA/GODORT) and include consideration of the Committee's findings in responding to Recommendation No. 1.

### ***Response***

A formal GODORT report on Regional Depositories was never received. However, GODORT has communicated to GPO its support of Council resolutions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 17, which deal with Regional depository problems and recommendations.

---

### **Recommendation 3**

Inasmuch as Public Law 96-511, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, places responsibility for Federal information resources management with the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the Office of Management and Budget, the Depository Library Council requests that the Public Printer place the following resolution on record with the aforementioned Office: The Depository Library Council recognizes and appreciates the fundamental roles played by the Government Printing Office and the Depository Library System in disseminating governmentally produced information and making it freely available to the American people. Continued and unimpeded vigorous pursuit of these roles is vital to representative government and the democratic process.

### ***Response***

We have implemented the resolution. This resolution has been formally communicated by Mr. Sawyer to Mr. Stockman at OMB in a letter dated September 16, 1981.

---

### **Recommendation 4**

44 U.S.C. 1912 gives the Superintendent of Documents the authority to allow regional depositories to discard depository publications. Therefore, the Depository Library Council recommends that the Superintendent of Documents authorize that Regionals need only retain material for their Standard Federal Region (as described in the Directory of Federal Regional Structure) when that material is offered in a series by geographic breakdown (i.e., Flood Insurance Studies, Soil Surveys, Water Resources Data), with the following commitments:

- a. After five years material may be discarded after being offered to all Regionals and then publicized to selectives in those Federal Regions.
- b. All depository material retained, of the nature described above, must be made available on interlibrary loan to depositories nationwide.

### ***Response***

We will allow Regional Depository Libraries to limit their retention of material offered in a series by geographical breakdown, to that of their Standard Federal Region as long as one Regional in the Standard Federal Region agrees to continue to hold all material in this category. For purposes of the Depository Library Program, the Standard Federal Region is that outlined on page 1 of the United States Directory of Federal Regional Structure, 1981/1982. The Regional Depository Library that agrees to hold all depository material in this category must submit to GPO a letter stating that fact. The remaining Regional libraries in the SFR must submit to GPO a written agreement signed by the Library Director, committing themselves to adhering to the following policies.

- a. All material to be discarded (over 5 years old, in a series by geographical breakdown) must first be offered to all Regional libraries.
- b. After offering the material to the Regionals it must then be offered to selective depositories in that Standard Federal Region.
- c. Regionals entering into this agreement will provide depository materials relating to their Standard Federal Region on interlibrary loan to all depositories.

This procedure will not be implemented until the Regional in the SFR has been identified and submitted the written agreement. A list of titles in this category will be provided to the Regional libraries at that time. Any Regional desiring to continue to hold all material should feel free to do so.

---

### **Recommendation 5**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Superintendent of Documents seek authorization under 44 U.S.C. 1914 from the Joint Committee on Printing to allow Regional depositories the option to receive selectively, publications for only their Standard Federal Region (as described in the Directory of Federal Regional Structure) when that material is offered in a series by geographic breakdown (i.e. Flood Insurance Studies, Soil Surveys, Water Resources Data), with the commitment that those publications must be made available on interlibrary loan to depositories nationwide.

***Response***

We have sought endorsement of the concept outlined in this resolution from the Joint Committee on Printing to allow Regional depositories the option of receiving selectively, publications for only Standard Federal Region (as defined in the United States Directory of Federal Regional Structure 1981/1982, page 1) when that material is offered in a series by geographic breakdown (i.e. Flood Insurance Studies, Soil Surveys, Water Resources Data, etc.). This concept was suggested in August 1981 for the distribution of Census Bureau Block Statistics paper maps. Distributing material to Regionals in this manner is seen as a positive economic move to reduce depository expenditures and assist regional depository libraries by helping to alleviate storage and retrieval problems.

---

**Recommendation 6**

The Depository Library Council recommends that when there is more than one Regional depository serving a state, the Superintendent of Documents allow those Regionals to arrange cooperatively for the receipt, service, and permanent retention of Federal Depository material.

***Response***

This resolution needs further review. We will provide a response at a later date.

---

**Recommendation 7**

The Depository Library Council requests that the draft revision of the “Guidelines for the Depository Library System” be printed and distributed as a supplement to the Administrative Notes for general comment.

***Response***

We will print and distribute the draft revision of the “Guidelines for the Depository Library System” as a supplement to Administrative Notes for general comment when it is completed by Council. The date for such distribution will be after this meeting, since the Council’s Depository Library Systems Committee is still working in the draft.

---

**Recommendation 8**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the “List of Superintendent of Documents Classification Which May be Discarded” be adopted, printed, and distributed as an appendix to the Instructions for Depository Libraries no later than July 1, 1981.

***Response***

The “List of Superintendent of Documents Classification Which May be Discarded, or the Superseded List,” was distributed on shipping list 16,343 on August 19, 1981. We wish to thank the librarians who compiled it: Anne Diamond, Clyde Hordusky, John B. Phillips, Janis Pivarnik, and Pat Sloan.

---

**Recommendation 9**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO consider the following list of documents from the List of Classes for conversion to microfiche-only format for depository distribution, and that GPO establish a priority from this list, based on

---

cost-effectiveness to GPO operation. When other conversions of items to microfiche-only format for depository are being considered, the Depository Library Council recommends that it again be consulted as to the advisability and impact of the conversion on depository library functions. (See Appendix A for listings.)

### ***Response***

We appreciate the Council's recommendation of titles from the List of Classes for conversion to a microfiche-only format for depository distribution. Only one title, Military Standards, (D 7.10:-) did not fit the approved microfiche conversion policy guidelines and will remain in paper.

---

## **Recommendation 10**

The Depository Library Council recommends that all publications offered in paper copy to the public in the GPO Sales Program continue to be offered for depository selection in paper copy, except when a title is included in the attached list of microfiche-only format (Appendix A). Appendix A: Listing of Documents to be Considered for Conversion to Microfiche-only Format (Council Resolution No. 9)

C 55.12: Federal Coordinator for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research (FCM series) 250-E

C 55.13: NOAA Technical Reports:

- EDIS (series) 208-C-1
- ERL (series) 208-C-2
- NESS (series) 208-C-3
- NMFS (series) 208-C-4
- NOS (series) 208-C-5
- NWS (series) 208-C-6
- OOE (series) 208-C-8

C 55.13/2: NOAA Technical Memorandums:

- EDIS (series) 208-C-4
- ERL (series) 208-C-1
- NESS (series) 208-C-2
- NMFS (series) 208-C-3
- NOS (series) 208-C-5
- NWS (series) 208-C-6

D 7.10: Military Standards 314-J

D 103.24/4: Waterways Experiment Station: 334-A-7

Miscellaneous Papers (numbered)

D 103.42/8: Coastal Engineering Research 334-A-20

Center: Miscellaneous Reports (numbered)

D 103.53: Construction Engineering Research 335-A

Laboratory; Technical Reports

D 103.57: IWR Contract Reports (numbered) 337-B-3

D 210.8: NRL Reports (numbered) 407-H

D 210.15: ONR Report ACR-(series) 407-D

D 210.109: NORDA Reports (numbered) 407-G

D 301.45/46-2: Air Force Flight Dynamics 422-G

Laboratory: AFFDL-TR (series)

E 1.10: Conference (series) 429-E

E 1.16/2: Environmental Readiness Documents 429-HDOE/ERD (series)

E 1.28: Contractor Research and Development 429-T-4 Reports

E 1.30: Resource Applications RA (series) 429-T-7

EP 1.17: Solid Waste Management Series, SW 431-I-7 (numbered)

EP 1.21/9: Research Reports, National 431-I-68

Environmental Research Center, Las Vegas

EP 1.23: Ecological Research Series (numbered) 431-I-11

EP 1.23/2: Environmental Protection Technology 431-I-12 Series (numbered)

EP 1.23/4: Environmental Health Effects Research 431-I-23 Series (numbered)

EP 1.23/5: Environmental Monitoring Series 431-I-24 (numbered)

EP 1.23/6: Miscellaneous (numbered series) 431-J

EP 1.23/8: Interagency Energy-Environmental 431-I-62

Research and Development Reports (numbered)

EP 1.45: Comprehensive Planning Series 431-I-28

EP 1.78: Technical Reports 431-L-3

EP 2.26: Technical Studies Report (TS series) 431-A-8

- EP 5.15/2: TSCA Chemical Assessment Series 431-B-7
- EP 5.15/3: TSCA Economic Analysis Series 431-B-9
- EP 6.10/3: Technical Note ORP/CSD (Criteria 431-I-13 and Standards Division) (series)
- EP 6.10/4: EPA/ORP (series) 431-I-21
- EP 6.10/6: Technical Note ORP/LV (series) 431-I-61
- EP 6.10/7: Technical Note ORP/TAD (series) 431-I-61
- EP 6.10/8: Technical Note ORP/EAD (series) 431-I-61
- EP 6.10/9: ORP (Office of Radiation Programs) 431-L-13 Contract Report
- EP 6.13: Technical Reports 431-I-78
- HE 20.4109: BRH/NERHL (Northeastern Radiological 498-B-5 Health Laboratory Series)
- HE 20.4114/2: Report of the Division of Biological 498-B-11 Effects
- HE 20.4310: FDA Medical Device Standards 499-L-2 Publications (series)
- HE 20.4310/2: FDA Medical Device Standards 499-L-2 Publication Technical Report
- FDA-T (series)
- NAS 1.55: Conference Publication NASA CP 830-H-10 (series)
- TD 1.109/13: Aircraft Accident Reports, Brief 982-I-3 Format U.S. Civil Aviation NTSB-BA (series)
- TD 1.109/16: Report NTSB-AMM (series) 982-I-16
- TD 1.112: Aircraft Accident Reports 982-I-9 (NTSB-AAR series)
- TD 1.112/2: Special Investigation Report Series 982-I-9
- TD 1.112/3: Railroad Accident Reports 982-I-11 NTSB-RAR (series)
- TD 1.112/4: Railroad/Highway Accident Report 982-I-14 NTSB-RHR (series)
- TD 1.112/5: Railroad Accident Reports Brief 982-I-19 Format NTSWB-RAB (series)
- TD 1.116: Marine Accident Reports NTSB-MAR 982-I-21 (series)
- TD 1.117: Highway Accident Reports 982-I-20
- TD 1.117/2: Highway Accidents Reports, Brief 982-I-20 Format NTSB-HAB (series)
- TD 1.118: Pipeline Accident Reports NTSB-PAR 982-I-10 (series)

- TD 1.120: Special Studies NTSB (series) 982-I-23
- TD 2.30: FWHA-RD Report (series) 982-G-11
- TD 2.30/4: FHA Reports FHWA-TS (series) 982-G-19
- TD 2.30/5: Report FHWA/PL (series) 982-G-21
- TD 2.30/6: Report FHWA-HO (series) 982-G-29
- TD 2.30/7: Report FHWA-OEP/HEV (series) 982-G-32
- TD 4.32/6: FAA-EM Reports 431-A-20
- TD 4.32/7: Report FAA-ED (series) 431-A-33
- TD 4.32/8: FAA-EE Reports 431-A-20
- TD 4.32/9: FAA-E Reports 431-A-25
- TD 4.32/10: FAA-QS Reports 431-A-19
- TD 4.32/11: FAA-AVP Reports 431-A-24 TD 4.32/12: FAA-C Reports 431-A-22
- TD 4.32/14: Reports FAA-ASP (series) 431-A-29
- TD 4.32/15: Report of FAA-AP (series) 431-A-28
- TD 4.32/17: FAA-MS (series) 431-E-4
- Y 3.N88:10 Report NUREG (series) 1051-H-2
- Y 3.N88:25/ Contractor Reports NUREG/CR 1051-H-11 (series)
- Y 1.4/1 thru 9: Public Bills and Resolutions 1006 (House and Senate)

### ***Response***

Resolution Number 10 listed several publications sold in paper with the recommendation that they continue to be offered in paper to depository libraries. Many documents in the GPO Sales Program, such as publications of a popular nature, reference works, and periodicals will remain in paper copy for distribution to depository libraries. However, under present Congressional guidelines, we must continue to review each document published in paper format as to its suitability for conversion to microfiche consistent with the policy on “Format of Publications Distributed to Depository Libraries”.

---

### **Recommendation 11**

The Depository Library Council recommends that realistic guidelines for the handling and storage of microfiche be developed by GPO and included in the “Instructions for Depository Libraries”.

### ***Response***

We agree on Number 11, guidelines for the handling and storage of microfiche have been developed by GPO and will be included as an appendix in the revised “Instructions for Depository Libraries”. Distribution of the appendix will be made to depositories after this meeting.

---

### **Recommendation 12**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO’s production of microfiche be done in a timely manner and that distribution be made with adequate finding aids. GPO should recognize that the depository function of availability is defeated if microfiche are unduly delayed or finding aids are difficult to use.

### ***Response***

Our production of microfiche is continuing to undergo enhancements making for more timely distribution with better finding aids.

Refinements to the Bill Finding Aid requested by the Council, were incorporated in the product in April 1981.

We will continue to monitor closely both microfiche and finding aids with an eye to possible improvements, and will continue to welcome suggestions from librarians.

---

### **Recommendation 13**

The Depository Library Council recommends the inclusion of military specifications in the depository program in microfiche-only format.

### ***Response***

We have completed an economic analysis on the conversion and distribution of military specifications to a microfiche-only format. It is our conclusion that this material will not be cost-effective in a microfiche format, due to the very low number of pages per specification.

---

### **Recommendation 14**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO separate the item numbers for Congressional Committee Prints from the item numbers for Congressional Committee Hearings so that a depository library may select either series in either print or microfiche format.

### ***Response***

We have a problem with this resolution. After taking into careful consideration the cost factors involved with creating 84 new item numbers and resurveying libraries for Congressional material, we have decided against implementing this recommendation. We feel the costs to be excessive and resources would be better utilized distributing new material, previously unavailable.



**Recommendation 15**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO consider separately subseries within a class number and omit from microfiche conversion any title which in itself is unsuitable for such conversion.

***Response***

In order to more appropriately apply our distribution format policy to all titles, we will subdivide large series of documents by subseries within a class number. Any title which does not fall within the established criteria for conversion, will remain in paper. Such decisions are of vital concern and will be given careful consideration by the Library Division's new Classification Specialist.

---

**Recommendation 16**

The Depository Library Council commends the Government Printing Office on (1) the progress made to date toward the objective of providing a comprehensive master catalog of U.S. government publications and (2) the efforts which it has made toward defining a cataloging project which will provide the government publications user community with a comprehensive standardized system of access, both bibliographic and subject, to all government publications. The Council further commends GPO on its leadership role in this regard. The Council recommends that GPO continue to provide the leadership in (1) the coordination of input from other government agencies involved in this project and (2) the development of an overall master plan. The Council also recommends that the GPO give the highest priority to this vital undertaking, and that it provide a progress report on this project at the next meeting of Council.

***Response***

We appreciate the support evidenced in this Resolution and we are continuing to work towards this goal. A contract has been issued through NTIS to a private consultant which should get this project moving again. A meeting between the consultant and representatives of the scientific and technical agencies, GPO and Library of Congress, was held two weeks ago as a first step.

---

**Recommendation 17**

The Depository Library Council requests the further consideration of DARP for Regional and 100% selective depositories. We request that estimates be provided on the number of new cataloging records that would occur in the first and second year of an automated cataloging project, and an initial and recurring cost estimate for Regionals and 100% selectives planning to participate in the project.

***Response***

*[See Response to no. 18]*

---

**Recommendation 18**

The Depository Library Council requests that GPO continue its discussions with OCLC on DARP for less than 100% selectives, in particular to determine a method of providing OCLC with current item selection data so that holding symbols can be maintained and displayed with the OCLC cataloging records for Federal Documents.

### ***Response***

Resolutions number 17 and 18 both relates to DARP. We have been in contact with OCLC concerning continuing development on DARP. On August 18, GPO and OCLC representatives met in Columbus, Ohio, to further this effort. OCLC's position on this matter will be addressed by Chris Grabenstatter in her presentation tomorrow.

*(Response to both 17 and 18 are the same)*

---

### **Recommendation 19**

The Depository Library Council requests that GPO ask OCLC to display GPO on the menu of truncated records, in the same way in which it displays DLC.

### ***Response***

We have implemented this Resolution. OCLC has begun a Project Initiation for securing the designation GPO on the menu of truncated records on multi-find search. It will appear much the same way that DLC currently appears on the system.

---

### **Recommendation 20**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO continue to investigate the feasibility of creating a brief, temporary machine-readable record at the time the Shipping List is produced. We recommend that GPO use this information to create an interim finding aid, in the form of a monthly and quarterly cumulated list, to provide more immediate access to distributed but uncataloged publications. The cumulated lists should be arranged in SuDocs class order, including the title and item number, as well as providing alphabetical title, title key word, and item number indexes. Council further recommends that GPO discuss with OCLC the possibility of placing this temporary record in the OCLC data base and on the GPO tapes until the complete bibliographic record is provided.

### ***Response***

We recognize the value of a skeletal record generated at the time the Shipping List is compiled and made readily available to the library community. We have begun discussions regarding the matter in-house as well as with OCLC and L.C. Kay Baily will provide you additional information on this subject tomorrow.

---

### **Recommendation 21**

In the interests of cooperative cataloging among government agencies, Council requests that GPO encourage NTIS to participate in LC's Cooperative Name Authority Project.

### ***Response***

We have been continuing our discussions with L.C. and NTIS regarding bibliographic control. A meeting was held and the two agencies exchanged Name Authority Project data. This item will be addressed by representatives from the agencies in their remarks tomorrow.

---

## Recommendation 22

The Depository Library Council requests that GPO establish and publicize procedures to acquire, classify, catalog, and distribute expeditiously those publications which have been identified by depository libraries and have not been distributed by GPO or included in the Monthly Catalog. If GPO has any restrictions on material which they either will not distribute or add to the Monthly Catalog, these should be communicated to the Council and depository libraries.

### *Response*

We agree with you on Resolution 22 and, a draft policy statement detailing GPO procedures for the acquisition, classification, cataloging, and distribution for publications not distributed by GPO or included in Monthly Catalog is being written. As soon as we have draft policy statements we will provide them for review.

---

## Recommendation 23

Recognizing the difficulties of continuing the Monthly Catalog as a presentation of the complete data base of U.S. Government publications because:

- a. It has become too large to produce and to make available in a timely fashion;
- b. It has become too expensive for both the producer and the subscriber;
- c. It has become so unwieldy that it is less frequently used as a reference source; and
- d. It has become less used as a source of cataloging copy.

We recommend that GPO investigate the acceptability of printed and microform products from the Monthly Catalog master data base in lieu of the present Monthly Catalog.

Council recommends consideration of the following options, among others:

### *PRINTED CATALOG OPTIONS*

- a. Reformat the present contents of the Monthly Catalog to save space by presenting the records in paragraph form.
- b. Produce a printed catalog of abridged records, containing the following data elements: authors, titles, subtitles, stock number, SuDocs classification number, item number, series/report number, subject headings, collation.

### *MICROFORM CATALOG OPTION*

Catalog to be issued in two sections:

- a. The Register, in which each month's new publications are arranged in SuDocs classification order and listed with full bibliographic data;
- b. The Indexes, which would include all of the currently produced indexes and brief bibliographic description consisting of the author, title, item number, pagination, series, report number, SuDocs classification number, and a reference to the record in Section A. This index section should cumulate throughout the year, with annual indexes cumulating up to a five-year period.

Council recommends that GPO solicit additional options from other user groups. Council further recommends that GPO distribute a questionnaire to recipients of the Monthly Catalog, soliciting their preference among the feasible options.

## *Response*

We have been actively pursuing approaches for improving the Monthly Catalog. As a first step, we are evaluating a number of options regarding the reformatting of contents. Samples of these options are provided in your notebook. Implementation of any one of these will decrease the size and thus the costs associated with production.

A second step, will be to change the actual format in which Monthly Catalog is issued. Various microfiche options are under consideration.

[The Office of Superintendent of Documents issued a Policy Statement, 8/21/81, on “Format of Publications Distributed to Depository Libraries”. The text is as follows.]

### *Policy.*

Publications will be sent to depository libraries in either paper or microfiche format. Distribution will be made in microfiche rather than paper format, whenever possible, to minimize the cost of printing and binding and help alleviate space problems in depository libraries.

Documents published by Federal agencies in microfiche will be distributed to depository libraries in that format. Documents published in paper format will be reviewed for suitability for conversion to microfiche. Primary considerations will be the physical characteristics of a publication, the nature of its content, and its relationship to other publications. Consistency of format and maintenance of the usability of depository collections will be continuing objectives.

Types of publications which usually will not be converted to microfiche are:

- a. Publications whose physical characteristics would make them unusable in microfiche or which would not be cost-effective to convert. These include publications containing 14 pages or less (unless one of a series when the series is already in microfiche); maps/foldouts or any publication that exceed the height of 11”; brochures and flyers; posters and charts; publications requiring updates and inserts (except cumulations); publications in which color or half tones are essential to use; publications having characters smaller than 6 point or containing a large percentage of illegible characters; publications using paper other than white; publications having continuous tone photo graphs; hand written documents; prints from office copiers.
- b. Publications of a popular nature intended for the general public, the homeowner, senior citizens, etc.;
- c. Standard reference works;
- d. Periodicals in a magazine or newsletter style.

### *Scope*

This policy pertains to all U.S. Government documents subject to distribution to Federal Depository Libraries.

### *Application.*

- a. This policy will be applied in the following manner, based on the way in which documents are issued:
  1. Serials. Serials are publications issued in successive parts, usually bearing a numerical or chronological designation, and intended to be continued indefinitely. A decision to distribute a serial in microfiche format will apply to all future issues. Serials may be divided into three categories:
    - a. Monographic series. These are groups of publications related to one another by the fact that each item bears, in addition to its own title, a collective title applying to the group as a whole. Series may be numbered or unnumbered. Earlier numbers of numbered series will not usually be converted.

- b. Periodicals. These are dated publications issued three or more times a year. Conversion of a periodical will begin with the first issue of the volume or year.
  - c. Semiannual, annual, and biennial publications.
- (2) Monographs. Monographs are defined as publications complete in one part or a finite number of separate parts. An individual decision as to distribution format will be required for each monograph.
- b. The Chief, Library Division, is responsible for the application of this policy. Exceptions to this policy may be allowed under provisions of SOD 52, Depository Shortages. Exceptions must be approved by the Chief, Library Division, or his/her designated representative.

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, SEPTEMBER 28-30, 1981 • ALEXANDRIA, VA

---

### Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council requests that the Public Printer communicate to the Census Bureau the importance to the library community, and to the public at large, of having the text and statistical tables of the 1980 Census Tracts, Block Statistics, and Detailed Characteristics available in paper copy.

#### *Response*

The Public Printer did communicate to Mr. Chapman, Director of the Census Bureau, the concerns of the Council as expressed in this resolution. Mr. Chapman responded, noting the severe budgetary pressures faced by the Census Bureau. He stated that the census tract reports will be paper as originally planned; but he does not see a likelihood of paper for other reports for which only microfiche is planned. His complete response is included in your notebooks for your information.

---

### Recommendation 2

In order for depository libraries to identify and retrieve government publications, Council reiterates (see Council resolution 26, Fall 1980, and resolution 16, Spring 1981) that it is essential that bibliographic records for all government publications (including scientific and technical materials) appear in a common data base available to library bibliographic utilities. To fulfill its statutory responsibility to provide a comprehensive master catalog of U.S. government publications and to achieve economy in the provision of bibliographic records, Council advises the Government Printing Office to actively pursue this objective. Until a common data base for government publications is realized, GPO must assure the depository libraries that the Government Printing Office will provide a full bibliographic record for all depository publications which will facilitate the retrieval and use of these depository materials.

#### *Response*

We are pursuing the goal to include all Government publications, including scientific and technical materials, in our cataloging data base. Our primary area of concentration at this time is to pick up bibliographic records of the technical reports published by or through the National Technical Information Service, the DOE Technical Information Center, the NASA Scientific and Technical Information Center, and the Defense Technical Information Center. Our approach is to develop the capability to receive machine readable bibliographic records from these agencies automatically. We do not intend to duplicate the work they are already performing.

The standardization of data elements is a necessary step toward automatic transfer and GPO is now in the middle of a project to compile a Data Element Dictionary (DED) encompassing the data elements each agency uses in its bibliographic processing. The purpose of such a dictionary is twofold: first, to provide to the four technical report processing agencies a tool to guide their efforts at further standardization to improve their own processing; secondly, to provide to them, GPO and the Library of Congress a mechanism by which to explore avenues of cooperation in the bibliographic processing of all Federal documents. GPO is furnishing the computer support for developing this Data Element Dictionary and has developed the necessary computer programs. We have given each of the agencies requirements for submitting a magnetic tape to our computer center, defining their formats and data elements. We have asked that this be furnished as soon as possible. These will be processed under the data element dictionary capability in our data base management system and output products will be produced to allow for review to see what the relationships are and to determine how and what data elements would be transferred automatically.

Jay Young has a set of the system requirements here if you would like to see that.

Keep in mind that, overall, this is a long-range project and extremely complex. To our knowledge, no one has taken a COSATI record and transferred it into a MARC data base before. In the meantime, we will continue to catalog technical publications received through our normal GPO channels that are distributed to depository libraries.

---

### **Recommendation 3**

Council recommends that as the Government Printing Office now begins to fulfill its role in providing bibliographic control for all government publications, it investigates the feasibility of providing free access for depository libraries to unclassified bibliographic data bases produced by federal agencies. The feasibility study should evaluate free access to at least the following data bases: NASA, DOED, ERIC, and MEDLINE.

#### ***Response***

Our General Counsel advised us that under the current provisions of Title 44, the Government Printing Office is not required to provide access to bibliographic computer data bases belonging to Federal agencies to the depository libraries. The complete opinion is attached for your review.

While the opinion is negative in terms of access to data bases, this in no way precludes our continuing efforts to work with Federal agencies for cooperative bibliographic control. At present there are several ongoing projects with federal agencies to improve access and availability of documents for the Depository Library Program which will be discussed later today by members of my staff.

---

### **Recommendation 4**

Council recommends that when errors which would affect identification or retrieval are discovered on microfiche headers, the Government Printing Office supply corrected microfiche.

#### ***Response***

We will supply corrected microfiche whenever this occurs for fiche which we produce. For microfiche originated by other agencies, we will contact the agency, but can provide no assurance that the fiche will be replaced.

---

### **Recommendation 5**

The Depository Library Council commends the Government Printing Office for its initiative in developing a cost-saving combined shipping/claims form. The Council believes it is important that the form be reproducible on a standard office photocopier.

#### ***Response***

We appreciate the Council's commendation on our development of a combined shipping list/claims form. We began using the form on November 9, 1981. It has received considerable praise from Depository Librarians and has made claims processing a more efficient operation.

## **Recommendation 6**

Whereas, the Federal Government Budget is undergoing reduction and all reasonable economy is encouraged, and Whereas, the 1980 Census block maps would be costly to produce and distribute in hard copy, and

Whereas, the Census Bureau has assured GPO that they will provide an adequate original for reproduction, and

Whereas, the Depository Library Council has determined that the 1980 block maps are useable in microfiche,

The Depository library Council recommends that GPO distribute in microformat or hard copy to Depository Libraries all the 1980 block statistics they select, with the following specifications for maps in microcopy:

1. That the maps be reproduced one per fiche in a common reduction ratio so that hard copy produced from the fiche can be combined into a single paper copy;
2. That clear and adequate header information appear on each fiche to facilitate use.

### ***Response***

Every effort is being made to provide users of Census Block Statistic Maps with usable high quality reproducible microfiche. There will be one map per fiche with a reduction ratio of 12X. Header information on each fiche will include: SuDocs class numbers, Census accession numbers, as well as Geographic Area and Map numbers.

---

## **Recommendation 7**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the following categories of publications be added to the Standard Reference Works listed in the “GPO Guidelines for Microfiche Conversion, Part II”:

- Administrative Decisions
- Abstracts
- User Manuals and Finding Aids

In addition, the Council recommends that GPO utilize the attached annotated copy of List of Classes as a guide to the types of materials that would entail a hardship on library users were they not distributed in paper. This list is not intended to be exclusive or final, but to provide examples.

### ***Response***

We have carefully studied the Council’s recommended additions of Administrative Decisions, Abstracts, User manuals, and Finding Aids, to the Standard Reference Works listed in “GPO’s Guidelines for Microfiche Conversion, Part II”. We agree with your recommendations and with few exceptions these categories of publications will be distributed in paper format. The annotated List of Classes has been most helpful as a guide.

---

## **Recommendation 8**

Responding to the Public Printer’s support of Council’s resolution 1 of April 1981, Council recommends that the Public Printer proceed to encourage the development of state plans for the Federal Depository program. Such plans would provide a cost-effective means of enabling states to share the responsibility for the development of collections and the provision of services. Council has developed two examples of state plans and an initial list of the elements recommended for inclusion. The



examples and the list of elements are intended to ensure that individual state plans provide a comprehensive mechanism of addressing the need for free public access to government information. Council requests that this concept be publicized and that the material describing and illustrating state plans be disseminated within the depository community and to the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies. An Ad Hoc Committee of the Depository Library Council has been appointed to assist in developing materials to describe and publicize the state plan concept.

### ***Response***

The Chairperson of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA) was contacted prior to their October meeting in Santa Fe; and the issue of State Plans was placed on their agenda. At that meeting, Barbara Weaver and Sandy Faull explained the significance of State Plans and contact persons for each state. State librarians not responding with names of contact persons at the COSLA meeting have since received two letters from GPO regarding State Plans.

To date, thirty-five states have advised us that they have named contact persons. Two additional states have responded saying they do not need such plans. Some states have begun to report on their activities.

One of the plans submitted has been carefully reviewed by GPO's General Counsel which has provided us with an opinion of the proposed State Plan for Missouri. The opinion indicates that the Plan basically fulfills the requirements of Chapter 19 of Title 44 and allows the State to organize its depository system without the benefit of a regional depository. The General Counsel recommended some amendments to the Plan which are included in the memo attached to the resolution response.

The key is that the Plan, its amendments, and any actions taken to implement it must comply with all the applicable provisions of 44 U.S.C §§ 1901-1914. If there is any conflict between those statutory provisions and the State Plan, Chapter 19 must take precedence. Contingent on incorporation of the recommended amendments to the State Plan, we concur and the Plan may be implemented. We shall transmit this in writing to Missouri when we return to Washington.

---

## **Recommendation 9**

Council requests that GPO communicate to NTIS and DOE the need for including in Government Reports, Announcements and Index and Energy Research Abstracts the SuDocs classification number and item number for depository publications.

### ***Response***

We have communicated to NTIS the desirability of having the SuDocs class number appear in Government Reports, Announcements and Index (GRA and I). NTIS agreed with the idea, but felt that such enhancements would be best accomplished if the information were included on the tapes submitted by the report processing agencies for inclusion in GRA and I.

We immediately began working with NASA and DOE, to this end. NASA is now inputting the SuDocs class numbers for several major series in the report number field of its cataloging records for Scientific and Technical Aerospace Reports (STAR). NTIS will print these classes in GRA and I as soon as they begin appearing on the STAR tape.

The Public Printer has written to the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Energy requesting inclusion of the class number in records in Energy Research Abstracts (ERA) and in the headers of microfiche produced by the DOE Technical Information Center. As in the NASA project, the appearance of this data on the ERA tapes would trigger its presence in GRA and I.

We also plan to communicate with the other scientific and technical agencies regarding the inclusion of the SuDocs class in their data bases.

We have not addressed inclusion of the item number in our work with the agencies because we feel that the class number is the key element and we did not wish to further complicate the issue at this time.

## **Recommendation 10**

Council urges GPO to provide the depository library community as soon as possible with the DOE scientific and technical reports that they currently have in-house regardless of age, and with the 8,000+ publications offered by DOE to them for distribution this year.

### ***Response***

Since very few of the DOE scientific and technical publications are obtained in paper copy through GPO and DOE microfiche are not produced through GPO, the Public Printer wrote to the Secretary of Energy requesting that DOE comply with Title 44, U.S.C. and provide GPO with microfiche of technical reports for distribution to depository libraries. The depository requirement was an average of 375 libraries for each of the approximately 17,000 publications produced a year. The letter proposed that the microfiche for depositories be produced by the DOE Technical Information Center at the same time as DOE copies are made and indicated that the GPO would pay the Technical Information Center to make the distribution to depository libraries.

The Assistant Secretary of Energy for Management and Administration responded to the Public Printer's letter stating that the cost for the microfiche would be approximately \$1 million and that such funds were not available. This letter has been referred to the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing for whatever further action he deems appropriate.

To attempt to handle even half of this large volume of 17,000 publications in any other manner than we propose would result in duplication of effort and would be totally inefficient and non-cost effective to the Government. Considering that just half of the DOE reports is equivalent to about one-third of our total microfiche output, for us to attempt this workload would mean either greatly increasing our micrographics staff or causing great delays in getting other material to you, if the DOE reports were added to our regular micrographics workflow. Neither of these alternatives is viable.

Until an arrangement can be worked out for the DOE Technical Information Center to handle the production and distribution of DOE technical publications in microfiche for the Depository Program, we will distribute only those publications that are current and are obtained through the main GPO or a GPO Regional Printing Procurement Office.

*Originally input Oklahoma State University*

---

**1982**

---

---

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

### SPRING MEETING, APRIL 26-28, 1982 • BOSTON, MA

---

---

#### **Recommendation 1**

Council appreciates the GPO Cataloging Guidelines Manual and encourages the GPO to complete and distribute to depository libraries this manual and the supplementary "Cataloging Bulletin" as soon as possible.

#### ***Response***

Work on the cataloging guidelines manual is in progress, with the editorial review currently underway. Distribution will be made on a section by section basis as each is completed. The first section is scheduled for release on November 15, 1982, and all sections of the basic volumes will be distributed by April 15, 1983. The bulletin updating system will become operational as soon as the first section is released. The guidelines will be available both for depository selection and as a sales item.

---

#### **Recommendation 2**

Council appreciated the GPO samples of a new microfiche format for the Monthly Catalog Register and Index. The index samples submitted either included unnecessary data elements or lacked essential ones. Council reiterates its desire for COM-produced records and indexes as outlined in Resolution 16, Spring 1981.

#### ***Response***

We have reviewed the recommendations of Council for the Monthly Catalog Register and Index, and have taken them under advisement. However, since we have concentrated for the past six months on improving the timeliness and quality of data recorded in the Monthly Catalog, there was not sufficient time to produce a new sample set. This matter is being addressed and sample copies are expected to be mailed to all Council members during January 1983.

---

#### **Recommendation 3**

Council recommends that the bibliographic record indicate dual distribution for those items for which insufficient paper copies are available for depository distribution.

#### ***Response***

This resolution has been adopted. We have announced through Administrative Notes (September 1982, volume 3, number 2), that Publications which appear in the Monthly Catalog with the designation 'short' in parenthesis following the item number were not available in sufficient quantity to make complete distribution in paper format to depository libraries. The shortage of copies was made up by distributing the document in microfiche format to some depositories. The use of the short designation will begin with the Monthly Catalog for November 1982.

---

#### **Recommendation 4**

Council appreciated the draft policy statement on "Cooperative Cataloging with Depository Libraries". We encourage GPO to work toward cooperative cataloging as expressed in Council Resolution 26, October 1980. However, we find this draft policy

statement insufficient for implementation and ask GPO to review current cataloging agreements in which they are involved and use them as models in developing a comprehensive plan. Council requests that GPO submit for its review a policy statement, a sample contract, and an implementation plan.

### ***Response***

Because we are in the process of reconciling conflicting issues between our existing cooperative cataloging agreements and those which we hope to conclude in the future, a final policy statement has not been written. When all of the areas of concern have been addressed and resolved to the mutual satisfaction of the prospective cataloging partners, a new draft proposal will be submitted for your review by April 1, 1983.

---

## **Recommendation 5**

Council appreciates the draft policy statement on “Acceptance of Government Documents from Depository Libraries for Bibliographic Control/Depository Distribution”. Council recognizes a critical problem in the current lack of a mechanism for bibliographic control of non-depository items in a national bibliographic facility. However, Council feels consideration of such a policy is premature until acquisitions activities and the responsibilities of the new Acquisitions Section are clearly defined.

### ***Response***

A detailed report of the duties, activities, and responsibilities of the newly formed Acquisitions group within the Depository Administration Branch will be given at this meeting. Now that the group has been established, we can reconsider our draft policy statement for bibliographic control of non-depository items. A new draft statement on depository distribution will be issued in January 1983 for your review.

---

## **Recommendation 6**

Council commends the Government Printing Office for its efforts to reformat the Monthly Catalog to save space. In order to improve readability, we recommend that there be paragraph breaks at the beginning of the collation and at the beginning of the tracings.

### ***Response***

A request to modify the Monthly Catalog software to conform with the Council’s request has been submitted to our Data Systems Service. Work is progressing on this request and is expected to be completed by November 1, 1982.

---

## **Recommendation 7**

Council recommends that the Government Printing Office make efforts to improve quality control in the Monthly Catalog. Areas requiring priority attention include: correction of simple clerical errors, consistency in series index listings, and the inclusion of item numbers on records for all depository material. Furthermore, we reiterate Council resolution 24, October 1980, which recommends that the corrections made in the Monthly Catalog be transmitted to OCLC and that GPO seek a mechanism by which corrections can be distributed in machine-readable form to users of the GPO cataloging tapes.

### ***Response***

We are expending every effort to improve quality control in the Monthly Catalog, including the adoption of more stringent evaluation standards for both GPO and contractor personnel. Quality of work in every aspect of the operation is being

carefully monitored. We still believe that a mechanism for transmitting retrospective corrections to Monthly Catalog users is a meritorious goal and have incorporated this capability in our CATS proposal. After carefully reviewing the present software and the difficulties that would ensue from attempting to transmit the corrections at the present time, and in light of the imminent approvals for CATS, we have decided not to pursue implementation of this activity until CATS is installed. Installation is expected in April or May of 1983.

---

### **Recommendation 8**

Council recommends that the “List of Special Materials” in each issue of the Monthly Catalog include only: changes, errata, addenda, notices, dividers, amendments, transmittals, releases, binders, updates, corrections, and forms, and that all other materials receive cataloging records and be indexed. Materials not falling into the above categories but which have appeared previously in the “List of Special Materials” should receive cataloging records and be indexed.

#### ***Response***

We have modified the guidelines for the types of materials to be included in the “List of Special Materials” to conform with Council’s recommendations. The new criteria have been retrospectively applied as well. Cataloging for those items formerly listed which did not meet these criteria should be completed by January of 1983.

---

### **Recommendation 9**

The Depository Library Council requests that the Public Printer convey to the Joint Committee on Printing the need for a definition of minimum level of free public access to Federal Depository Libraries.

#### ***Response***

(Awaiting response from General Counsel to Superintendent of Documents’ Memorandum dated May 28, 1982.)

---

### **Recommendation 10**

The Depository Library Council again requests that the transcripts of Council meeting not previously distributed, be sent to selecting Depository Libraries in microfiche format.

#### ***Response***

A retrospective filming of the transcripts for previous Council meetings has begun. The transcript for the Spring 1981 meeting has been filmed and distributed, and we are presently working on filming the transcripts for the Spring and Fall meetings of 1980. We hope to complete this project by the Fall Council meeting of 1983.

---

### **Recommendation 11**

The Depository Library Council requests that the Public Printer ask the Joint Committee on Printing to clarify the definition of cooperative publications to insure that all appropriate government publications are included in the depository library system.

#### ***Response***

(Awaiting response from General Counsel to Superintendent of Documents’ Memorandum dated May 28, 1982.)

## **Recommendation 12**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the meetings of the Depository Library Council and the Information Industry Council to the United States Government Printing Office have a representative from the other Council at the meetings of each for the purpose of sharing views and making available to each Council the expertise of the other.

### ***Response***

Raymond Mason Taylor, Superintendent of Documents, is a member of both the Depository Library Council (Ex Officio) and the Information Industry Council. Thus, he acts as an appropriate liaison between the two councils.

---

## **Recommendation 13**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that when a Depository Library has selected the publications of a Congressional Committee in microfiche and when a publication of that Committee is distributed only in paper copy that paper copy be sent to those libraries selecting microfiche.

### ***Response***

We have requested that GPO's Congressional Information Division alert the Acquisitions group of any publications which cannot be converted to microfiche. We will then order sufficient copies to ensure complete paper distribution for those libraries selecting either format.

---

## **Recommendation 14**

In response to the three opinions from GPO's General Counsel which were presented at this Council meeting, the Depository Library Council requests that the Public Printer inform the Joint Committee on Printing of the need to amend Title 44 and/or the Printing and Binding Regulations to provide greater flexibility in the allocation of responsibilities currently delegated to Regional libraries under the present law.

### ***Response***

(Awaiting response from General Counsel to Superintendent of Documents' Memorandum dated January 28, 1982.)

---

## **Recommendation 15**

The Depository Library Council requests that the Senate Amendments be filed in the same fiche sequence as the Senate Bills, and the Senate Amendments be listed in the Bill Finding Aid -- directly under the corresponding bill numbers. This would eliminate the need to check a different section of the finding aid and the fiche file for amendments to bills. In order to expedite the receipt of bills, Council requests that GPO send the microfiche and finding aid via first class mail.

### ***Response***

For the balance of the 97th Congress, Senate printed Amendments to Congressional Bills and Resolutions will continue to be listed in the Amendment Section of the Bill Finding Aid.

Beginning with the 1st Session of the 98th Congress in January 1983, the Senate printed Amendments will be listed directly under the corresponding Bill or Resolution which they amend.

---

Also, beginning with the 98th Congress in January 1983 microfiche shipments containing Bills and Resolutions and the Bill Finding Aid will be mailed to depository libraries via first class mail.

---

## **Recommendation 16**

The Depository Library Council encourages the Government Printing Office in its marketing program for sales and has the following specific suggestions for the public relations effort directed toward enhancing the depository system:

1. That Council members be sent, for comment, the comprehensive public relations and sales promotion plan.
2. That the flyer for Depository Libraries be redesigned, incorporate a more exciting and informational design encouraging the public to use the resources provided by Depository Libraries.
3. 3. That the marketing effort be coordinated with Depository Library access to sales information by making the P.R.F. distribution more current, by consistently including the SuDocs number in sales promotion literature, and by including with each out-of-print reply from GPO a list of the Depository Libraries in each state (making sure each of the 50 lists note that Libraries do not sell publication).

## ***Response***

1. Title 44, USC, requires Depository libraries to provide custody of Government documents and to make them available for the free use of the general public. It does not require Depository libraries to sell or to assist in the sale of Government documents. The policy of the Superintendent of Documents has been to provide Depository libraries sales literature, flyers, price lists, subject bibliographies, and order blanks only when a Depository Library requests them. But we have not asked Depository libraries or members of the Depository Library Council to sell documents or to develop sales marketing plans. In our opinion, to do so would be illegal and would impose an unwarranted burden on Depository libraries. The plan developed by the GPO Marketing Director is a dynamic working plan for GPO; it is not a published document. Each segment of the plan is subject to modification as we receive feedback about the effect that segment is having on sales. For these reasons, we do not believe it would be appropriate to reproduce it for submission to the Depository Library Council.
2. The flyer for Depository Libraries was revised as you requested. Based on the reaction of the librarians at the ALA meeting in Philadelphia, I believe that most of them liked the appearance and think that the revised flyer will encourage the public to use the resources provided by Depository libraries.
3. We have been studying two ways to make the PRF distribution more current. One way is to add the 50 Regional Depository libraries to the weekly distribution of PRF fiche at a cost to the Depository Library Program of about \$37,000 per year. The other would be to distribute 50 sets of week-old fiche. Most of our marketing items, such as subject bibliographies and catalogs, either now have or will have Superintendent of Documents Classification numbers. But, there will be a few flyers developed to be distributed simultaneously with the release of some documents that will not have SuDocs class numbers because these numbers will not be determined until after the flyers have been printed. Our new form 3844 does have a list of the 50 Regional Depository libraries and does make it very clear that the Depository libraries have Government documents for reference purposes only, not for sales.

---

## **Recommendation 17**

Whereas, Public funds are currently and increasingly being used to produce electronic data files rather than to produce this same information in traditional print or fiche, and

Whereas, the trend toward data available only in electronic format is likely to continue, and



Whereas the opinion of the GPO General Counsel is that “Under the current provisions of Title 44, the GPO is not required to provide access to bibliographic computer data bases belonging to Federal agencies to depository libraries”, and

Whereas, The J.C.P. has established an ad hoc Committee on Depository Library Access to Federal Automated Data Bases.

Be it therefore resolved that the Depository Library Council reaffirms its support of access by depository libraries to unclassified government information in electronic data files, and

Be it further resolved that the Public Printer communicate to the J.C.P. that the Depository Library Council commends and supports the J.C.P. for undertaking a study to determine the cost-effectiveness and utility of making electronic data files available in the Depository Library Program, and

Be it further resolved that the Public Printer communicate to the J.C.P. a Depository Library Council request that J.C.P. review Title 44 and the J.C.P. Regulations for changes necessary to update the definition of “government information” to encompass new technologies, and

Be it further resolved that the Public Printer communicate to the J.C.P. a Depository Library Council request that options for providing access to unclassified government-produced electronic data be included in the J.C.P. study, and

Be it further resolved that the Public Printer request that the J.C.P. provide the Depository Library Council a status report on this resolution at the September, 1982 meeting.

### ***Response***

(Awaiting response from General Counsel to Superintendent of Documents Memo 5/28/82.)

---

## **Recommendation 18**

The Depository Library Council requests that the Government Printing Office retain periodicals in their Sales stock for a minimum of 15 months so that libraries may identify and obtain periodicals to satisfy their binding lacks.

### ***Response***

The request that the Sales Program assume the burden of buying and storing copies of periodicals for a minimum of 15 months in order to satisfy Depository library binding requirements would result in either higher prices for sales periodicals or an operating loss. As a result, the sales program would be subsidizing the Depository library program. This would be in violation of the law. The only legal way to provide periodicals to replace those lost or worn out by Depository Libraries would be through the appropriation for the Depository Library Program. In our opinion, it would be difficult to justify an appropriation for the Depository Library Program to purchase and store periodicals for 15 months or more to supply an unknown number of copies of periodicals at some unknown future time.

---

## **Recommendation 19**

The Depository Library Council requests that GPO present at the Fall meeting a plan for the transfer of stock which is no longer needed by the GPO for the sales program, to other appropriate distribution facilities.

### ***Response***

The request to distribute stock which is no longer needed by GPO for the Sales Program to other distribution facilities addresses a subject that is poorly understood by most of those who read about or hear about unsalable sales publications. In the first place, unless a document is damaged, defective, obsolete, or superseded, it is offered to the originating agency. This means that almost 100% of the documents that the Sales Program removes from the sales inventory are either useless or are placed in the hands of the originating agency. Attention was focused on unsalable publications in 1981 due to a one-time combination of events. In 1981, there was a 5-year accumulation of unpurged documents; \$2.2 million of which had been transferred to GPO from various Congressional offices, because the Congressional offices could not find anyone who wanted them.

During the past ten years, despite the questionable legality, GPO has tested the feasibility of disposing of unsalable documents to charitable organizations, schools, and other institutions. GPO has also advertised for bids from commercial organizations. These tests indicate it is not feasible because not one copy has ever been given away or sold as a result of these efforts. The only cost effective method we have, after the originating agency has said it has no use for unsalable documents, is to sell such documents to the highest bidder who is looking for raw material for recycling into paper products.

---

### **Recommendation 20**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO recompile U.S. bills and any corresponding amendments in numerical order at the end of each congress, and offer this compilation as a separate item number to depository libraries.

### ***Response***

Members of the Council are provided a background paper entitled, “U.S. Congressional Bill Cost Alternatives Containing Microfiche and Paper Alternatives for Distribution to Federal Depository Libraries”, July 23, 1982. It clearly indicates that the expense of alternative bill arrangements is exceedingly high. By law, the Government Printing Office is neither editor nor publisher. We distribute what others have edited and published. We are not permitted to make editorial refinements, rearrange material, or prepare indexes. Thus, we would exceed our authority if we prepared such a compilation. For all these reasons, we cannot comply with the Council’s request.

---

### **Recommendation 21**

Council recommends GPO consider the following actions to improve service to depository libraries:

- a. More narrowly limit categories within each item number. For example, posters, coloring books and loose-leaf services each should be separate item numbers.
- b. Add regional status indicator on new shipping list/claim form.
- c. Place GPO address on claim form so the depository libraries can use window envelopes for the return of the form when claiming.
- d. Distribute the new books list and bestselling books catalog, when developed, to depository libraries and include the SuDocs number for all items listed.

### ***Response***

- a. The Depository Administration Branch has begun to break down the item categories. We have narrowed approximately 150 item numbers and will continue to look into others.
- b. We have considered the additional cost of revising the shipping list/claim form to identify those forms received from Regional Depositories. Instead of altering the form, we are requesting that Regionals simply write across the top of the

form in bold print the word “Regional”. A special notice to this effect will be sent out next week.

- c. We can place the GPO address on claim forms so the libraries can use window envelopes. However, the variance in window envelopes used in different libraries make this difficult. If Council would like to have all the Depository libraries use the same type of envelopes, GPO could accommodate an address for those envelopes.
- d. GPO will distribute the publication entitled, *New Books*, and the publication entitled, *U.S. Government Books*, to all Depository libraries when the results of our August 27th survey, number 82-101, are received and processed. *New Books*, a bimonthly, is classed as GP 3.17/16:, and given item number 0556-B. *U.S. Government Books*, a quarterly, is classed as GP 3.17/5:, and given item number 0556-A. We will also be sending out flyers, press releases, and circulars announcing individual new publications, packets, or kits, under item number 0555-A, class GP 3.21:.

---

## **Recommendation 22**

Council wishes to commend GPO for its effort in the following areas that have had a positive impact on dissemination of government information in a timely manner:

- a. The implementation of the standing order service through the sales program.
- b. Establishing an outline order system through DIALOG Information Service which offers extremely fast and efficient delivery of sales material.
- c. For strongly supporting the depository library inspection program by recently hiring four inspectors.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office accepts with thanks this commendation. We will do our best to merit similar commendations in the year ahead.

---

## **Recommendation 23**

Council recommends to the Government Printing Office that each state be invited to send a representative to a special meeting session to discuss the state plan. The session to be held in conjunction with the Fall, 1982 Council meeting.

### ***Response***

On August 27, 1982, a letter from the Superintendent of Documents went to all State Librarians, Regional Depository Librarians, and Librarians engaged in coordinating State Plans for Government Documents. They were invited to participate in the “State Plan Information Exchange” held yesterday.

---

## **Recommendation 24**

Whereas the J.C.P. has entered into negotiation with the U.S. Geological Survey and the Defense Mapping Agency for alternative to the current map depository program, and

Whereas these maps are not included in the current GPO depository program, and

Whereas U.S. Geological Survey and the Defense Mapping Agency are not adding new libraries to their depository programs, and

Be it resolved that the Depository Library Council commends and supports the accomplishments made by the Joint Committee on Printing to improve the access to this material via the depository library program, and

Be it further resolved that the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that Regionals be advised of the potential distribution of maps from the U. S. Geological Survey and the Defense Mapping Agency and that the Regional needs to provide appropriate housing for this material, which could include cooperative housing agreements, and

Be it further resolved that the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the status of a GPO Regional not be jeopardized because of its inability to provide an appropriate facility for maps within the area served by the Regional, and

Be it further resolved that the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the distribution of this material be coordinated in conjunction with the revision of the Joint Committee on Printing's Printing and Binding regulations.

### ***Response***

Negotiations between GPO, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Defense Mapping Agency, with guidance from the Joint Committee on Printing, have continued throughout 1982, working toward a centralized distribution of cartographic materials to depository libraries. This program is expected to make some 5,000 maps available through the depository program annually.

The USGS and the DMA have both had their own map depository programs for many years. Both their programs served many libraries already in the Congressional depository program. The purpose in combining the three systems is to reduce the duplication of effort and the expense to taxpayers. The projected distribution will be done through the USGS facility, regardless of whether the recipient has been a GPO, USGS, or DMA depository. All libraries from the three systems are now being surveyed to determine their requirements and interest in the unified map program. This "Survey for the Map Depository Program" was sent to all depositories in a separate mailing with a letter from the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing dated July 26, 1982.

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, SEPTEMBER 20-22, 1982 • ALEXANDRIA, VA

---

### Recommendation 1

Council commends GPO for the substantial reduction of the cataloging backlog from 16,200 to 8,200 and welcomes the continuing effort to eliminate this backlog completely by January, 1983.

#### *Response*

The Government Printing Office appreciates the Depository Library Council commendation for our reduction of the cataloging backlog. As you know, our backlog stood at 16,200 in the summer of 1981; today it has declined to approximately 4,500. We are pleased at the progress we have made and will continue to eradicate our backlog in this area.

Our goal is to ensure a steady workflow of materials through the Service so that you will have access to our cataloging in a timely manner.

---

### Recommendation 2

Due to the increasingly widespread potential use of the GPO MARC tapes by bibliographic utilities, consortia, and individual libraries, the Depository Library Council recommends that GPO investigate the various problems being encountered in the use of these records.

#### *Response*

We recognize the problems being encountered by users of our files. As we enter an era of widespread technological advancement, it is appropriate for us to investigate uses of, and problems with, our machine-readable data, in this case our GPO MARC tapes. Vendors and individual users have varying needs and levels of sophistication which must be recognized. To address the potentially broad requests and requirements of these groups, the Government Printing Office is asking the Council's Operations Committee to serve as an ADP Review Group over our plans as they are developed.

A number of internal efforts are underway which we hope will resolve most of the problems:

1. A major data processing support plan is being proposed by our staff to assure an integrated support system. This will be submitted to GPO Management and the Joint Committee on Printing around the first of May.
2. A Bibliographic Records Coordinating Committee has been examining duplication of various data elements in the SuDocs systems/products.
3. A review of the Monthly Catalog bibliographic entry is being conducted in conjunction with our data processing support planning.

---

### Recommendation 3

The Superintendent of Document's statements at this Depository Library Council meeting have renewed our confidence that the Government Printing Office can and will meet the needs of the American citizenry for Federal publications and for the bibliographic records which provide public access to this information.

Therefore, knowing that the Government Printing Office intends to offer quality service in a timely and cost effective way, we present these proposals and this discussion paper for your consideration. We feel deeply about the importance of bibliographic control and the role of the Government Printing Office in providing records which can be used by libraries throughout our nation. (“proposals” and discussion paper” attached)

### ***Response***

We applaud your encouragement and recognition of our efforts to serve the American public in an efficient and effective way. Before addressing the “proposals” in the attached position paper, we want to point out specific advances we have made in our bibliographic control of Federal publications.

For the last six months, we have made a concerted effort to ensure quality in our Cataloging and Indexing Program. We have tightened the controls over the cataloging records being produced by our staff by adding another quality control, namely the individual responsibility of each Section Chief for the cataloging within his/her section. Each supervisor is also responsible for two of the six indexes in the Monthly Catalog. These quality assurances will help us develop our skills and catch careless mistakes. Another improvement is the marked timeliness of the distribution of the Monthly Catalog. We have held to rigid scheduling which is especially significant with our new adherence to strict quality checks. We will make every effort to continue our timely issuance of the catalog.

To move into the areas brought up in the DLC’s position issue paper, it’s appropriate to first examine the premises. While it is imperative that we maintain standards of accuracy and produce machine-readable records, little else is essential to our goals. GPO can continue cataloging in AACRII without adhering to the time-consuming and, therefore, costly processes required by librarians’ preferences. There has been a tremendous economic shift in this country in recent years, and yet librarians talk about “national level records” as though that meant the same thing to all librarians and was recognized by users. These statements are not entirely true. This premise also urges GPO not to force libraries into having to “upgrade GPO’s records”. In this economic climate we can only agree with the DLC that “the library community should consider alternatives to its present cataloging expectations and processes”.

In keeping with the DLC’s recommendation, we are proposing the following actions to take effect by September 2, 1983:

1. All records will be done in minimal level cataloging (level 1), except where series are involved. These will receive level 2.
2. All personal name authority work will be discontinued for Federal documents.
3. NACO procedures cannot be further streamlined with the Library of Congress, unless we can add additional terminals and receive prompt attention in LC’s review process. We are establishing a two week turn around requirement for LC review and response.
4. Subject Headings may be expanded to include vocabularies other than Library of Congress. The trend used to index technical reports and journal articles may be employed. As DLC points out, this would establish more subject access, but with less complicated forms of subject headings. At the same time, it would ultimately serve the end user in a more simplified and expeditious manner.

We agree with the DLC that authority should continue to be done in the areas of corporate names, series names, and uniform titles.

We appreciate the DLC’s practical and realistic solutions to a serious question with which we’re all concerned.

## **Recommendation 4**

Public funds are currently and increasingly being used to produce electronic data files rather than to produce this same information in traditional print or fiche. The trend toward data available in electronic format is likely to continue. The Depository Library Council reaffirms its support of access by depository libraries to unclassified Government information in electronic data files. The Council recommends that necessary changes be requested to Title 44 to update the definition of “Government information” to encompass new technologies. The Council also recommends that options for providing access to unclassified Government produced electronic data be identified. Because of the long range nature of this recommendation, the Council would appreciate being kept informed of new developments as they take place, and Council would volunteer its expertise on the subject.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office is aware of the trend toward data availability in electronic format, and has some staff members tracking its progress. When the cost of necessary electronic equipment of high quality suitable for document transmission and receipt appears to be within the reach of the majority of depository libraries, we hope to move in that direction, just as we did earlier when microform equipment came within the reach of most libraries.

As to updating the definition of “Government information” as used in Title 44 to encompass the new and rapidly changing electronic technologies, we would welcome Council’s generous offer of assistance on this. If Council would consider the problem and provide an encompassing definition by the Fall meeting, we will welcome it.

On the possibilities of options for providing access to unclassified Government produced electronic data, as soon as the definition of “Government information” is broadened, we will actively pursue such options. Meanwhile, we would welcome Council compiling and maintaining a list of unclassified Government produced electronic data of interest to Depository libraries for review at the Fall Council meeting.

---

## **Recommendation 5**

Regionals and depository libraries in states which do not have regionals are facing severe problems of space, staffing, and finances. It would be helpful to have flexibility in allocation of responsibilities currently assigned to regionals in regard to the selection and retention of materials. Flexibility may require review of the provisions of the laws or regulations under which regionals currently operate. Such a change would facilitate innovation in the development of state plans.

### ***Response***

We have always been impressed by the truly outstanding efforts of the regional depositories to be helpful to the selective depositories in their states, frequently in the face of shortages of space, staff, and finances.

With regard to flexibility in allocation of regional responsibilities for selection and retention of materials, it may be well to review some existing possibilities. The first is the replacement of hardcopy with microforms, where finances permit. Indeed, GPO is helping this process through increased distribution of cost-effective microforms, and a reduction of hardcopy distribution. A second possibility exists in states which have two regionals. They can share their responsibility for retrospective holdings. The central point is that within the state at one of the two regionals a given retrospective document will be found. A third possibility is that regionals may choose where feasible to selectively, house retrospective materials with other depositories in their state. This can best be done in the context of an overall state plan for depository documents. Fourth, in states lacking regional depository service, a state plan for depository documents can enable such service to be provided. The recent plan created by Missouri librarians does precisely this and distributes regional responsibilities among cooperating depository libraries.

These are areas of flexibility which presently exist within the framework of Title 44. Short of rewriting Title 44, as was unsuccessfully undertaken a few years ago, some very specific changes in the law in the form of amendments might prove helpful to regional depositories. To this end, we would greatly appreciate Council members carefully considering this area and making recommendations for the three most significant changes in the law which would prove beneficial to regional depository libraries. These recommendations will be reviewed by GPO's General Counsel. If they appear in order, Council will be so apprised and may wish to take steps to have them as amendments to Title 44.

---

## **Recommendation 6**

Council recommends establishment of a definitive depository collection housed and maintained by the Library Programs Service. Such a collection would assist the division in its work and would improve support to the depository libraries charged with serving all United States citizens.

### ***Response***

We appreciate Council's recommendation that the Library Programs Service establish a definitive collection. The National Archives has that definitive collection and we feel this is the proper place for such a collection. GPO and NARS have been working together over the past several months to assure a smooth transition of materials into the permanent depository archives. This transition will also give the Library Programs Service access to needed publications for its internal use.

---

## **Recommendation 7**

Council wishes to commend the Superintendent of Documents for the initiation of the certificate program. We hope it will continue and be expanded to recognize the following achievements: (a) a depository grade of excellent on an inspection; (b) special anniversary of the library; (c) special program or service which increases the use and effectiveness of the depository system.

### ***Response***

The commendation of the Council for our initiation of a certificate program is most welcome. Currently, only new depository libraries are receiving certificates during designation ceremonies attended by the Superintendent of Documents or a designated representative of his Office. We will be expanding the certificate program this year to include recognition for the following achievements:

1. An earned rating of "Excellent" in all categories covered by the Inspection Visit Form. During 1982, there were 17 libraries which met this high standard.
2. A special anniversary of the depository library, provided that library has had no area below standard during its last inspection visit, and that library is presently a positive force in the Depository Library Program. During 1983, 5 depository libraries will have 100th anniversaries; 7 depository libraries will have 75th anniversaries; and 6 depository libraries will have 50th anniversaries.
3. An outstanding effort to further the goals of the Depository Library Program. During 1982, GPO's Depository Library Inspectors noted that 10 depository libraries deserved special recognition.

---

## **Recommendation 8**

Council recognizes the importance of personnel training in increasing the effectiveness of depository libraries. There are several approaches you may wish to consider: (a) GPO could encourage state and regional library groups to provide training programs



to new depository librarians under the overall supervision of GPO; (b) The GPO could sponsor regional workshops; (c) Internships and exchange programs between depository librarians and GPO personnel would be useful. These training programs would supplement the Washington workshops.

### ***Response***

We share with Council concern for the importance of well trained personnel in depository libraries. Our major effort to encourage this has been our Depository Library Workshop Program, to which many GPO staff people have contributed much time and effort over the past six years. As of this month (April), we have held 53 workshops attended by over 800 people. Although these workshops have been taking place since 1977, there has been no drop in the enrollment. We therefore intend to continue them.

We are also very much aware that many depository librarians would like to share with others in their libraries, and in their states, a better understanding of the Depository Library Program. It is our intention to help facilitate this process by creating a video tape which will draw upon the GPO workshops, the Depository Library Program itself, and major GPO operations, including both printing and marketing. We intend to have this video tape available for the use of depository librarians in the field. We envision this as an adjunct for state and regional library groups which want to provide training programs. In conjunction with the use of such a video tape, it may be possible to have a GPO staff member, such as a Depository Library Inspector, available to lead a discussion, or to answer questions, following the presentation.

We are also looking at cooperative joint programs with library schools to provide a high level of training for depository librarians at a local location. We are also going to continue to explore the possibilities for an exchange of personnel for limited periods of time. Thus far, we have had some truly outstanding documents librarians work at GPO. We have greatly benefited from their work and from the insights they shared with us. In turn, they have spoken highly of the value of such work experience to themselves and of the considerable understanding they gained from working on a daily basis with GPO staff people. To date, we have had no GPO staff member on loan to a depository library. In part, that reflects staff shortages during recent years. However, it may yet be possible to place one of our librarians in a working depository library for two weeks or a month. We intend to further explore this idea, and would appreciate hearing from libraries which would welcome one of our librarians.

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

---

# 1983

---

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

### SPRING MEETING, APRIL 27-29, 1983 • ARLINGTON, VA

---

#### **Recommendation 1**

The Depository Library Council supports GPO's efforts to establish cataloging priorities. Council also recommends that a statement of priorities be distributed to depository libraries.

#### ***Response***

GPO appreciates the Council's endorsement of the establishment of cataloging priorities. We have prepared a list which should serve as a guideline for librarians to guarantee their timely access to bibliographic records.

The suggested priorities give structure to our inhouse processing and in no way imply that one type of publication is more important than another.

We also hope that librarians will be patient as we work out timetables, which will give anticipated turn-around times for these categories. Because we are entering into new contract agreements, we cannot indicate the turn-around times at this moment. We will share them with you as soon as they are established.

Finally, the difference in turn-around time for "Priority One" and "Priority Nine" should not vary too much. We are not putting the lower priorities on the back burner, but are trying to insure overall access that librarians can expect within prescribed time limits.

The priorities are as follows:

1. Congressional publications, including Office of Technology Assessment and Congressional Budget Office.
2. Presidential documents, classes Pr and PrEx.
3. Documents mentioned in the news media.
4. Census materials.
5. Documents sold by GPO.
6. Reference works, including bibliographies.
7. Publications sent to depository libraries, excluding technical reports.
8. Technical reports.
9. Publications not sent to depository libraries.

---

#### **Recommendation 2**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO investigate the use of and evaluate the continued need for multiple document identification numbers, such as item number, SuDoc number, stock number, and Monthly Catalog entry number by both GPO and individual depository libraries.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office has been investigating the use of multiple document identification numbers, including the depository item number, the Superintendent of Documents classification number, sales stock number, and the Monthly Catalog entry number. Each of these numbers currently plays a significant role in one or more facets of the combined GPO operation. In addition, we are aware of a variety of local uses of these identification numbers by individual depositories.

Library Programs Service personnel have been examining the numbering systems both in terms of their current uses, as well as what uses might be anticipated in relation to the overall automation effort. Both the automation and workflow task forces have been evaluating the need for continuing the different numerical systems with an eye toward possible future simplification and integration.

We have also requested Depository Library Council members, as well as all depository librarians, to assist us in our search for a more efficient item number scheme.

We will keep the Depository Library Council and the general depository community informed of our progress.

---

### **Recommendation 3**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO reverse its decision to incorporate the United States Senate's recently developed internal numbering system in the classification of hearings and committee prints. If not reversed, this decision will result in the elimination of any meaningful subject shelf arrangement of this body of heavily used materials.

### ***Response***

GPO has found that the use of the Senate's numbering system in classifying documents is advantageous to GPO's internal classification operations. In addition, GPO has been given to understand that the House intends to implement a similar system soon. Because of these two factors, GPO will continue to use the Senate numbering in classifying Senate publications.

GPO appreciates that changes in SuDocs classes may necessitate changes in shelving patterns in depository libraries. May we suggest that Senate documents classified according to the new scheme be placed at the end of each class. This arrangement is working most satisfactorily in the Classification and Cataloging Branch's shelflist.

---

### **Recommendation 4**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO distribute its classification manual to depository libraries.

### ***Response***

GPO has been developing a classification manual over the past two years. At present it consists of procedural memos which govern in-house practice, and policy memos which define and interpret SuDocs classification theory. The policy memos will most benefit depository libraries and will be distributed to depositories when completed. They are being reexamined by a classification expert at this time.

---

### **Recommendation 5**

Since the Library Programs Service is currently engaged in reviewing the level of its cataloging, the Depository Library Council recommends that GPO continue to catalog United States Government publications in cooperation with the Library of

Congress, and at, or exceeding, the current level. Council also recommends consideration by GPO, in conjunction with the Library of Congress, of the discontinuation of personal name authority work for all names, except those which would cause searching problems, due to their form. Council further recommends that GPO participate in the Library of Congress's proposed cooperative subject access program.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress will continue to exchange their cataloging guidelines and rule interpretations; and the Library of Congress will also continue to supply GPO with new subject heading information. GPO is in the process of drafting an Interagency Agreement with LC to cover the various cooperative ventures between the two agencies.

While GPO will continue to examine methods of providing the best cataloging descriptions to meet modern information needs, for the present it will base its cataloging on AACR 2.

The Government Printing Office will establish personal name authorities through the Name Authority Cooperative Project with the Library of Congress until October 1, 1983, at which time we expect this activity will cease. GPO will continue to do name authority work for corporate bodies, uniform titles, and series for the foreseeable future.

---

## **Recommendation 6**

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that several slide-tape modules be developed based on various aspects of depository library services, such as acquisitions, bibliographic instruction, cataloging, and general operations of LPS, which could then be utilized for education and training programs. Council members and the depository library community will cooperate in the development of the scripts.

### ***Response***

Steps are underway to meet the Depository Library Council concern for the development of effective slide-tape modules based on various aspects of depository library services. Audio and visual materials will be gathered from our Fall workshops and form a part of such modules. Among the themes under consideration are "The Story of a Government Publication" and "The Depository Library Story." The former begins with a depository library patron expressing a need for a special publication. The response of Government to this need is followed from idea through publication to a depository library where the patron receives the publication. "The Depository Library Story" reviews the origin and development of the Depository Library Program, examines the variety of such libraries, and their many services to the public. We will welcome any Council members who would like to help in script preparation.

---

## **Recommendation 7**

The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs Service for working so diligently in developing outstanding workshops.

### ***Response***

The Library Programs Service accepts with thanks the Depository Library Council's commendation for developing outstanding workshops. It is our intention to make the Fall 1983 workshops even better.

## **Recommendation 8**

WHEREAS the inspection program provides professional reinforcement for the documents librarian; and WHEREAS, the inspection program enhances administrative support for depository library programs; and

WHEREAS, the inspection program creates awareness of comparable library programs and services and provides expertise in the area of documents administration,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the inspection program be continued on a regular basis of every 3-5 years for all depository libraries.

### ***Response***

The Library Programs Service recognizes the importance of the Depository Library Inspection Program, and the benefits it provides to librarians. The program will be continued; and guidelines for the program will be issued within the next month or two.

It is important to note that the inspections have not been occurring on a three year basis, as was the goal expressed at earlier Council meetings. We are presently in the process of identifying all libraries inspected during 1977 or earlier to assure that all will have been inspected at least once within the past seven years. The Library Programs Service plans to insure that no library goes seven years without an inspection.

---

## **Recommendation 9**

WHEREAS, the Joint Committee on Printing is currently reviewing their printing and binding regulations; and WHEREAS, these regulations govern depository libraries and the distribution of Government publications; and

WHEREAS, the Government Printing Office will be given an opportunity to review and comment upon the regulations; and WHEREAS, all depository libraries also have a responsibility to review and comment upon the regulations; and

WHEREAS, these regulations originate with a legislative body and are, therefore, not published in the Federal Register,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Government Printing Office print and distribute to depository libraries for public comment the draft regulations as soon as the Joint Committee on Printing makes them available.

### ***Response***

The resolution of the Depository Library Council asking that the Government Printing Office print and distribute to depository libraries for public comment the draft printing and binding regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing, has been forwarded by the Public Printer to the Chairman, the Honorable Augustus E. Hawkins.

---

## **Recommendation 10**

While supporting and endorsing the efforts of the Government Printing Office to take advantage of the new binding technology, we strongly recommend that the Government Printing Office resume printing essential information on the covers of the following publications (listed in priority order):

1. List of Sections Affected: resume printing a listing of the sections affected.
2. Federal Register: resume printing pages included in each issue.
3. Congressional Record: resume printing pages included in each issue.

***Response***

The resolution of the Depository Library Council recommending that the Government Printing Office resume printing information deemed essential by the Council on the covers of List of Sections Affected, Federal Register, and Congressional Record, has been forwarded by the Superintendent of Documents to the Assistant Public Printer for Production.

---

**Recommendation 11**

The Council endorses the Government Printing Office's participation in the Ad Hoc Committee on Depository Library Access to Federal Automated Data Bases.

***Response***

The Government Printing Office appreciates the endorsement from the Depository Library Council on GPO's participation in the Ad Hoc Committee on Depository Library Access to Federal Automated Data Bases.

---

**Recommendation 11**

The Depository Library Council encourages the efforts of the Library Programs Service in developing a comprehensive Automated Data Processing System which will have internally compatible elements with portions of the system eventually accessible to depository libraries.

***Response***

The Government Printing Office appreciates the endorsement from the Depository Library Council on the Library Programs Service' work toward the development of a comprehensive Automated Data Processing System.

*Originally input Oklahoma State University*

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, SEPTEMBER 15-17, 1983 • SEATTLE, WA

---

### **Recommendation 1**

WHEREAS, Sarah Kadec has graciously facilitated the work of the Depository Library Council during her tenure as Director of the Library Programs Service; and

WHEREAS, Sarah Kadec has fostered a cooperative spirit between GPO and the Depository Library Council; and

WHEREAS, Sarah Kadec has significantly improved communications between GPO and the DLC,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Depository Library Council expresses its heartfelt gratitude to Ms. Kadec for her work with us; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the DLC wishes Ms. Kadec every success in her future endeavors.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office appreciates the Council's expressed gratitude for the work of former Director of the Library Programs Service, Sarah T. Kadec. We trust that the work of her successor will maintain a similar high standard and contribute to the further development of the Depository Library Program.

---

### **Recommendation 2**

WHEREAS, Dan MacGilvray has been indispensable in all aspects of arrangements for the Depository Library Council meeting; and

WHEREAS, Dan MacGilvray has consistently facilitated the work of the Depository Library Council; and

WHEREAS, Dan patiently solves all the climatic, logistic, procedural, and other "sticky wicket" problems which make our meetings flow more smoothly,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Depository Library Council expresses its sincere appreciation for all the hard and consistent work that Mr. MacGilvray has done for us (Thanks Dan!); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chair of Council especially expresses her sincere gratitude to Dan for his assistance in planning and implementing this meeting.

### ***Response***

GPO welcomes the appreciation expressed by Council for the work done on its behalf by our Administrative Librarian, Dan MacGilvray. We trust that future work in assisting with Council meetings will continue to meet with your satisfaction.



### **Recommendation 3**

The Depository Library Council commends the Government Printing Office for establishing the classification hotline and urges that this service to depository libraries be continued.

#### ***Response***

GPO thanks the Council for its commendation. The hotline has proved to be of mutual benefit in solving classification problems, and we intend to continue the service.

---

### **Recommendation 4**

The Depository Library Council urges the Government Printing Office to authenticate its serial records through the CONSER project.

#### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office recognizes the value of authenticating its records through the CONSER project, which will allow GPO cataloging records for Federal government serials to be distributed through the MARC tapes to other bibliographic utilities. GPO expects to be the first library to implement the new system of self-authentication under procedures now being worked out by the Library of Congress. LC has proposed adoption of multiple authentication levels, under which participating institutions would authenticate their own records. GPO and six other CONSER libraries who are also members of the Name Authorities Cooperative Project anticipate authenticating records in the near future, guaranteeing the complete record content with the exception of subject headings.

---

### **Recommendation 5**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office give attention to the recent increase in typographical errors in classification appearing on shipping lists and take steps to eliminate the errors.

#### ***Response***

The Library Programs Service has given special attention to the number of typographical errors appearing on the Shipping Lists. As a result, shipping list errors have been reduced to a minimum over recent months. However, the majority of errors are due to an incorrect classification number, for which steps have been taken to increase quality control at the point of classification.

Another positive step in this area has been the development of the “Classification Manual” by former GPO Library Division Chief, Mae Collins. LPS expects that use of a standard “Manual” will result in more accurate and consistent classification decisions.

---

### **Recommendation 6**

The Government Printing Office, in its response to Spring 1983 resolution number five, proposes to discontinue establishing personal name authorities through the Library of Congress NACO project as of October 1, 1983. The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO not unilaterally implement a change of this magnitude without:

1. consultation with the bibliographic utilities to assess the impact on their users and,
  2. examination of alternatives such as discontinuing personal name authority work for technical report material only.
-

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office has sent a letter to representatives of the UTLAS, RLIN, WLN, AND OCLC databases, and to the Library of Congress, asking for their assessment of Council's proposal regarding personal name authority. The responses received to date are included in the information packet provided to Council members.

---

### **Recommendation 7**

The Depository Library Council commends the Government Printing Office for beginning compilation of A Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System. Council recommends that GPO ensure that this manual reflects current classification policies and practices and provides for its updating to accommodate future changes.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office thanks the Depository Library Council for their commendation concerning the compilation of A Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System. GPO also wishes to assure Council that a thorough review of the Guide is underway, and a major concern of this review is to ensure that the Guide is consistent with current classification policies and practices. As we currently envision this project, the Guide will stand as an historical compilation, documenting the application of the SuDocs system from its inception in 1895. LPS staff are also continuing the compilation of the GPO classification policy memos, which are the in-house instructions for applying the classification system in a day-to-day operational environment. It is this portion of the GPO Classification Guidelines material that would be updated to accommodate changes or additions to the operating instructions. LPS intends to issue both sections of the GPO Classification Guidelines to depository libraries in a loose-leaf format as soon as the compilation and review activities can be completed.

---

### **Recommendation 8**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office develop procedures for distributing corrections in machine-readable form to subscribers to the Monthly Catalog tapes distributed by the Library of Congress.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office intends to develop procedures for distribution of machine-readable corrections to the Monthly Catalog. The new procedures will be incorporated into a proposed, new production method for the Monthly Catalog. Under this new method, when an error is discovered after publication of a Monthly Catalog issue, that entire entry would be purged, replaced with a corrected record bearing a new entry number; the corrected entry would appear in a later register and in all subsequent indexes. Thereby, corrected bibliographic records could be distributed in machine-readable form to the Monthly Catalog subscribers.

---

### **Recommendation 9**

At its Fall 1982 meeting, the Depository Library Council submitted the following resolution: "Due to the increasingly widespread potential use of the GPO MARC tapes by bibliographic utilities, consortia, and individual libraries, the Depository Library Council recommends that GPO investigate the various problems being encountered in the use of these records." In its response to this resolution, GPO recognized the problems encountered by users of its Monthly Catalog tapes and stated that a task force would be created by July 1, 1983, to study the issues and report its findings. Council is unaware that the proposed task force has been created. It now wishes to submit the 1982 resolution and urges that GPO take immediate action.

---

**Response**

At the recommendation of the Council, a questionnaire addressing the use of GPO MARC tapes was sent to depository libraries. The text of the questionnaire is as follows:

DETACH AND RETURN TO:  
 U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
 LIBRARY PROGRAMS SERVICE  
 5236 Eisenhower Avenue  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22304  
 ATTN: Sally McLean (SLLC)

Please help the Government Printing Office identify the difficulties experienced by your library when accessing the tapes or data bases which display GPO data files by completing the brief questionnaire and by returning it to us by March 30, 1984.

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. Does your library use the GPO/MARC tapes? yes no
2. Does your library purchase the GPO tapes from the Library of Congress? yes no
3. Describe any specific problems you have encountered in using GPO tapes sold by the Library of Congress:
4. Does your library purchase the MARCIVE tapes or similar tapes from another commercial vendor? yes no other (specify)
5. Describe any specific problems you have encountered with the GPO tapes sold by commercial vendors:  
 Name of vendor:  
 Problems:
6. Does your library access the Monthly Catalog on-line?  
 yes no  
 Circle as appropriate:  
 BRS Lockheed's DIALOG SDC  
 OCLC RLIN WLN  
 Other:
7. Describe any specific problems you have encountered with the GPO files offered by commercial vendors.  
 Name of vendor:  
 Problems:

**Recommendation 10**

In response to the Government Printing Office's request for advice on Monthly Catalog format, the Depository Library Council recommends the following:

To improve searchability:

- a. Continue to provide the indexes to the Monthly Catalog separate from the register of full bibliographic information, but increase the amount of access information in the indexes so that most users need conduct only a one-step search.
- b. Provide the indexes as a microform publication which cumulates monthly to the end of the year and cumulate the annuals at the end of five years.

To reduce cost:

- a. Provide both the register and the indexes in microfiche.
- b. Provide the paper index and the fiche index as separate subscription items. Many subscribers would need only the indexes and not the full bibliographic record provided by the register.

To meet user format needs:

- a. Provide the register and the index in a choice of fiche or paper for depository libraries and as sales items in both fiche and paper.

To reduce printing delay:

- a. The shift by some users to microforms or to purchase of the paper index without the register would reduce the volume of printing. Example of format of records in index:

INDEX TERM IN CAPITAL LETTERS

- SuDoc number
- Main Entry
- Title. Edition. Publisher...Date. p. Format. (series)
- Item number (microfiche) Registry issue no.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office thanks the Depository Library Council for its recommendations to improve the usefulness and timeliness of the Monthly Catalog while reducing its production costs. GPO is considering some of these for the subscription year beginning January 1985. The Monthly Catalog in its present format is compiled using computer software adapted to this application early in 1976. Inherent limitations in this software make changes to the Monthly Catalog content or format costly, difficult, and problematical. Therefore, LPS is requesting that new software be developed to support the Monthly Catalog system, but while this upgrade is underway GPO does not expect to be able to initiate major enhancements to the Monthly Catalog.

After a thorough review of the Council's recommendations, LPS personnel have a number of concerns with some specific items. First, there is a potential problem with the integrity of the 1981-85 five-year cumulative index if any major changes are implemented prior to the 1986 subscription year. Revised software could result in incompatible data reducing the overall quality of the product. Second, major software modifications would probably result in publication delays. The Council has repeatedly expressed its interest in the timeliness of the Monthly Catalog, and in the past year GPO has made significant improvements in this area. GPO is concerned that product and system revisions such as those recommended by the Council might jeopardize the timely issuance of the Monthly Catalog. Third, there is a potential problem with providing adequate identification of various types of publications through the bibliographic description proposed to appear in the indexes. GPO questions whether users will be able to readily determine if a publication is a serial, audiovisual, monograph or map. This problem, coupled with the lack of availability information, including sales statements or stock numbers, reduces the real usefulness of the one-step lookup approach. Finally, Council's recommended enhancements to the content of the Monthly Catalog indexes would lead to a substantial increase in size, which could be expected to translate to increased costs to libraries for subscriptions, binding, and storage.

## **Recommendation 11**

Depository Library Council requests the continued awarding of certificates for: a) achieving an overall depository grade of excellent on an inspection; b) a special anniversary of the library; c) a special program or service which increases the use of effectiveness of the depository system. In addition, we urge that GPO send press releases to the individual library receiving the certificate, the state library, the regional library, the Congressmen and Senators of the state and any other appropriate body.

### ***Response***

GPO appreciates the Council's endorsement of the Certificate of Merit program. We are committed to continuing the presentation of certificates for the achievements Council has recommended.

Our Legislative Liaison/Public Affairs Office has taken over responsibility for preparing the certificates, press releases and for Congressional liaison. However, requests for certificates will still be handled through LPS.

---

## **Recommendation 12**

The recurrent reports of the executive agencies required by law to be sent to Congress should be included in the depository library distribution system. Some of these reports, for example, the Freedom of Information Act annual reporting requirement, are not currently available for distribution to depository libraries. We urge GPO, as authorized by Title 44, to pursue these elusive documents.

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office pursues any elusive document as a matter of procedure as soon as we know of its existence. Any title the depository librarians believe we have missed should be brought to our attention by using the GPO Inquiry Form #3794. Because of the sheer volume of titles required to be acquired and distributed to the depository libraries, we must depend on the depository librarians to assist us in identifying non-depository titles. We are confident that through such cooperation, all Government documents covered by law can enter the Depository Library Program.

---

## **Recommendation 13**

We wish to commend GPO for revising the inspection report form. We recommend that depository libraries be encouraged to conduct a self-evaluation before the actual depository library inspection takes place, using guidelines developed by GPO.

### ***Response***

Council's endorsement of the Inspection Report revision is appreciated. GPO initiated the new form at the start of calendar year 1984. We share Council's concern that depository libraries be adequately prepared for an inspection visit. Since Council formulated the "Guidelines for the Depository Library System" to "provide an inspection tool for the Superintendent of Documents; a guide for education of documents librarians; and a tool for communication with library administrators," these "Guidelines" and the "Instructions to Depository Libraries" provide a good framework on which to conduct a self evaluation of the depository operation.

In December 1983, GPO initiated a new inspection confirmation letter. This letter suggests that, prior to the inspection visit, the library staff conduct a review of the depository operation based on the "Guidelines for the Depository Library System" and the "Instructions to Depository Libraries".

Dear :

In reference to our telephone conversation of (date) . I will be arriving at your library at 9-9:30 a.m. on (date) to inspect the Federal documents collection.

I look forward to meeting you, your staff, and the library director. If you have any questions concerning the Depository Library Program, I will try to answer them during my visit. The Regional Librarian has been invited to accompany me on the inspection.

To help prepare for the inspection, you should review the “Guidelines for the Depository Library System” and the “Instructions to Depository Libraries”. It would also be beneficial to gather any materials which relate to the depository operation (i.e. procedures manual, collection development policy, library guides, and any library literature which specifically mentions the documents collection).

If my travel plans should change, I will notify you as soon as possible so that the appointment can be rescheduled. Please notify me if this date becomes unmanageable for you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH C. McCLANE  
Depository Library Inspector

---

### **Recommendation 14**

Recognizing that GPO has undertaken an intensive campaign to market the Depository Library Program, the Council recommends that GPO establish an on-going, comprehensive continuing education program for documents librarians throughout the country.

#### ***Response***

The GPO appreciates the Council’s recommendation to establish a continuing education program for documents librarians. GPO believes the council’s desire will be fulfilled through our current efforts to produce video and slide-tape presentations for screening throughout the country.

---

### **Recommendation 15**

We support the statutory requirement (Section 1911, Title 44) for retention of depository materials by selective depositories for a five year period.

#### ***Response***

We appreciate Council addressing the question of five year retention of documents by selective depositories, as well as Council’s support of continuing the five year retention period.

## Recommendation 16

The Council reaffirms its support for the development of the Public Printer's endorsed integrated automated support system for GPO's Library Programs Service. It is essential that the development of this system receive widespread input from depository libraries, a nationally recognized systems consultant, the Government Documents Round Table of the American Library Association, and the national library community. The Council urges that it have substantial ongoing and direct representation in the system's development. To this end, it is requested that Council members immediately be supplied with the current and succeeding drafts of the system plan as they are produced for review. The Council recommends that the proposed automated support system be reviewed by a panel of recognized automation systems consultants to insure maximum utilization of current technology and system design.

### *Response*

GPO welcomes Council's reaffirmation of support for an integrated automated support system for LPS. GPO also appreciates Council's concern that widespread input be sought from various quarters and factored into the design of the proposed system. To this end, LPS is presently reviewing input from two key sources. First, the GPO Data Systems Service has completed a technical evaluation of LPS' written definition of system requirements; the resulting DSS report has been provided to LPS. Second, the results of the recent Biennial Survey are tabulated and available. In addition to these two sources, LPS anticipates the release of findings from the JCP's Ad Hoc Committee on Depository Access to Federal Automated Data Bases. It is expected that these findings will weigh heavily in the final definition of requirements and in an optimal system design.

Having reviewed and evaluated all of this input, GPO intends to consult with several sources before developing the integrated system and completing a detailed implementation plan. Depository Library Council members will be closely involved in the system design process, and they will be kept informed during the system development phase.

---

## Recommendation 17

While supporting and endorsing the efforts of the Government Printing Office to take advantage of the new binding technology, we strongly recommend that the Government Printing Office resume printing essential information on the covers of the following publications (listed in priority order):

1. List of Sections Affected: resume printing a listing of the sections affected.
2. Federal Register: resume printing pages included in each issue.
3. Congressional Record: resume printing pages included in each issue.

### *Response*

The covers of the List of Sections Affected are preprinted in large quantity and, therefore, it is not possible to print variable information (information which cannot be determined beforehand), such as pagination on the cover. The cost of printing a sticker and the labor costs for affixing the sticker would increase the cost of the publication significantly. As was stated at the Fall 1983 Depository Library Council meeting, the cost of producing the window on the Federal Register would, in fact, double the cost of each cover.

---

## Recommendation 18

The Depository Library Council would like to bring to the attention of the Public Printer that timely appointments to the Council, the provision of a minimum of 60 days notice of meeting times and places, and the provision of appropriate materials for review at least 20 days in advance of scheduled meetings would significantly contribute to the effectiveness of the Council.

### ***Response***

GPO's staff will do its best to provide early notice of meeting times and places, as well as an early opportunity for Council members to review appropriate materials prior to meetings. Insofar as we can obtain the cooperation of all parties concerned, we will do our best to make timely appointments to Council.

---

### **Recommendation 19**

The Depository Library Council suggests that the GPO, at the earliest possible time, include all non-depository titles appearing in the Monthly Catalog in the depository system.

### ***Response***

The GPO currently includes most of the publications listed in the Monthly Catalog to the depository libraries. Misunderstandings may occur when publications are cataloged as a "rush" and there is some delay in the distribution due to the receipt of poor quality microfiche or insufficient copies received which requires reprinting or acquisition from the agency. When these delays occur the publication is cataloged without an item number and, as such, it may not be thought to be in the Depository Library Program.

Of course when a publication should be in the Depository Library Program and is not distributed, the acquisition technicians begin the investigation process as soon as they are aware of the problem. The acquisition technicians request information and copies from the issuing component, if the publication should be distributed to the depository libraries as directed under Section 1901 through 1903 of Title 44 U.S.C. A carbon of the request is also sent to the JCP for their information.

We are having considerable success though, it should always be remembered, some delays will occur due to printing problems and that under the law some publications are unavailable to the depository libraries.

---

### **Recommendation 20**

The Depository Library Council recommends that no change in the item selection scheme be made at this time.

### ***Response***

Several months ago the Library Programs Service formed a task group to formulate a new item number scheme. The task group came up with several proposals to a new item number scheme; however, no action or response has been made on the new proposals. At this time the item number/selection scheme will remain the same and will not change, especially not before a complete study would be conducted using the Council as a resource.

---

### **Recommendation 21**

The Depository Library Council strongly recommends that GPO meet its previous commitment to distribute to depository libraries the retrospective DOE Technical Information Center microfiche.

### ***Response***

On December 28, 1983, the DOE and GPO signed an interagency agreement providing for the distribution of retrospective and 1984 DOE microfiche reports to depository libraries. Such distribution is currently underway.

---



## **Recommendation 22**

The Depository Library Council wishes to take this opportunity to commend the Public Printer for his farsighted understanding and approval of the concept of an integrated data processing support system for the Library Programs Service. The Public Printer is assured of the Council's desire to assist in bringing this plan to fruition.

### ***Response***

The Public Printer accepts with thanks the Depository Library Council's commendation of his approval of the concept of an integrated data processing support system for the Library Programs Service and appreciates the Council's desire to assist in bringing this plan to fruition.

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

---

# 1984

---

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, APRIL 11-13, 1984 • ATLANTA, GA

---

### **Recommendation 1**

The Depository Library Council appreciates the fact sheets, the “Issues on Which GPO Wishes Advice,” and other materials presented in written form. However, the Council cannot be effective if major issues and large amounts of background materials are brought to Council meetings to be addressed without adequate time for consideration. Council will be more than happy to consult with GPO at any time in order to assist GPO in preparing drafts, policies, position statements, or other materials. Council therefore reaffirms Resolution Number 18 of the fall 1983 meeting that, in order for major issues to be considered, fact sheets and other appropriate background materials must be provided to Council at least 20 days in advance of the meeting.

### ***Response***

We appreciate the need for adequate time to review and prepare responses to complex issues. Whenever possible, we will provide the Council with the necessary material at least 20 days prior to the meeting at which it is to be discussed. If an important issue arises that we feel should be discussed at the nearest opportunity we will make every effort to state it concisely and to keep background material brief.

---

### **Recommendation 2**

Since its spring 1979 meeting, Council has several times requested that GPO initiate a project to eliminate errors and inconsistencies in the catalog tapes. At this time Council reiterates the need of the library community for accurate and reliable records in machine-readable form and requests that the Public Printer investigate the best means of conducting a major cataloging revision project to clean up these tapes. This project should include:

- a. Converting all traced names, series, and subjects to the LC authorized form;
- b. Adding to records in the appropriate field such control numbers as the OCLC number, SUDOC number, technical report number, contract number, item number, and stock number; and
- c. Correcting typos and other random errors.

The corrected tapes should then be made available to all subscribers through the established LC/CDS channels.

This study should also include an evaluation of methods of linking or combining multiple records (e.g., records for monographs in sets and single issues of serials and records for errata slips, shipments of loose-leaf pages, etc.). An on-going correction mechanism should be instituted at the same time so that future errors can be corrected in the data base and the appropriate products.

The Public Printer is requested to report the results of his activities at the Fall 1984 Council Meeting.

### ***Response***

We are pleased to announce that a project has been initiated to clean up the cataloging tapes. The work will be done on contract due to the scarcity of resources inhouse. The arrangements are not yet in place; however, we hope to contract with the

University of Houston to take advantage of the expertise demonstrated by Judy Myers. The scope of the project will include conversion of all traced names, series, and subjects to LC authorized form; provisions of numbers missing from the original record; and correction of other miscellaneous errors, as requested by the Council.

A mechanism for distributing corrections on an ongoing basis will be in place shortly (see Resolution Number 3).

---

### **Recommendation 3**

In response to Council's fall 1983 Resolutions Number 8, the Public Printer described procedures for distributing machine-readable corrections to the Monthly Catalog. Under these procedures an incorrect record would be purged and the corrected version republished with a new entry number. Council commends the Public Printer for developing these procedures and now requests that they be implemented as soon as possible with the addition that these corrected records be clearly identified in some way in the Monthly Catalog issue in which they appear.

#### ***Response***

Personnel from our Data Systems Service are now making the necessary software modifications to comply with the Council's request. We expect to implement the new procedures with the 1985 subscription of the Monthly Catalog.

Library Programs Service personnel will input corrections into the OCLC data base. A note will be added in the 500 file stating the catalog date and entry number where the original record appeared. The entire corrected record will appear in the next issue of the printed Monthly Catalog and on the corresponding tapes distributed by the Library of Congress.

---

### **Recommendation 4**

Council recommends that further publicity regarding Certificates of Merit be disseminated to the library community through Public Documents Highlights or Administrative Notes. It is also recommended that the Legislative Liaison/Public Affairs Office distribute its press releases regarding Certificates of Merit to the following journals: American Libraries, LJ, and Wilson Library Bulletin.

#### ***Response***

Information on the awarding of certificates to new depositories, those having anniversaries, and those achieving a high degree of excellence, is forwarded to the GPO Marketing Librarian. She, in turn, consults with the library on possibilities for publicity and provides them with materials. We have also begun listing in Administrative Notes the names of libraries receiving certificates.

---

### **Recommendation 5**

Council recommends that the following publications be distributed to depository libraries: state plans, How to Become a Depository Library, and the new inspection forms and fact sheets.

#### ***Response***

Thirteen completed state plans, the new inspection form, and fact sheets have been sent to depository libraries on microfiche. An information packet, "On Being Designated a Federal Depository Library," has been given to each Council member. We intend to send this material to regional depositories to share and interpret as the need arises. Four of the six items in the packet are already available on a regular basis to all depository libraries. The packet also will be used by the Library Programs Service to answer inquiries from non-depository libraries.

**Recommendation 6**

Council recommends that the depository library manual be completed and made available by the next Council meeting.

***Response***

Work on the Depository Library Manual is continuing. Review Committee Chair, Margaret Powell, is coordinating the work of volunteers in updating of the Manual's chapters. Once the entire text is received at LPS, it will be printed and distributed to all Depository Libraries in fiscal year 1985.

---

**Recommendation 7**

We wish to commend GPO for developing a slide/tape presentation for screening throughout the country. We would encourage having available for viewing at the next Council meeting the video-tape of the fall 1983 depository workshop. We would like to see this video-tape made available to the library community as soon as possible.

***Response***

The first version of the LPS slide/tape presentation has been completed and will be shown at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday evening, in conjunction with the Public Printer's Reception. The approximately ten hours of video-tape filmed at the November 1983 workshop have not yet been edited into a form suitable for showing.

---

**Recommendation 8**

GPO is to be commended for presenting their two-day workshop for depository librarians in Arizona. This kind of education program is needed around the country. We also recommend the resumption of these excellent workshops at GPO as soon as facilities can be made available.

***Response***

After the Library Programs Service moves from Alexandria, Virginia to Washington, D.C., we hope to resume inhouse workshops. During Fiscal Year 1984, we did carry out three such workshops, as well as the inspector-conducted workshop in Phoenix, Arizona. We also had inspectors speak before groups in Los Angeles, California; Chicago, Illinois; Louisville, Kentucky; Boston, Massachusetts; and Toledo, Ohio.

---

**Recommendation 9**

We recommend that GPO establish a task force comprised of representatives from GPO, GODORT, Depository Library Council, library schools, professional associations, and other appropriate groups to advise GPO on conducting a needs assessment related to government publications education and to develop a written plan for the design of educational activities.

***Response***

We concur with the Council's recommendation for a task force to advise GPO on conducting a needs assessment related to government publications education. We would appreciate the Council's considering the appropriate composition of such a task force and providing us with a list of people who might be willing to serve. It would also be helpful if a member of the Council would serve as task force chairperson.

---

## **Recommendation 10**

From information provided by GPO staff, it appears that there are 500 instances per year where agencies fail to provide copies of items which should be in the depository system. Further indications are that over 80% of these items are not resolved at the GPO/LPS level, but must be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing. Finally, GPO/LPS appears to have no formal system for tracking these efforts to get the missing publications into the system.

We urge the Public Printer to implement formal tracking procedures that will determine the success of these efforts and will publish the final resolution/disposition of the inquiries (including referrals to JCP). We also urge that records be kept on these missing publication inquiries in order to ascertain whether there are patterns or problems of a broader scope which may be acted upon in other than an item-by-item method.

### ***Response***

LPS performs an administrative, not an enforcement, role in this matter. When a “fugitive” publication is identified by LPS, a letter of request is issued to the publishing agency. If the publishing agency fails to respond to LPS within 30 days, LPS send a follow-up letter to the agency. If no response is received after another 30 days, the case is referred to the JCP, which has enforcement authority. LPS maintains a continuous file that enables us to track the status and disposition of every single shortage. We have identified several recurring causes and are taking steps to reduce their occurrence. We are looking forward to development of the ACSIS system, which will enable us to generate comprehensive reports showing the status and probable cause of all shortages. This will allow us to identify trends precisely.

---

## **Recommendation 11**

Whereas it is often difficult for depositories to determine if they have received all shipping lists for a given day, therefore; Be it resolved that LPS append to each issue of Administrative Notes a list of all shipping list numbers since the last issue, grouped ordinarily by paper and microfiche categories.

### ***Response***

Beginning with the May 1984 issue of Administrative Notes, compilations of shipping list numbers, grouped by paper and microfiche categories, have been published on a regular basis.

In response to a resolution passed by GODORT (Summer 1984), and correspondence received from individual libraries, we have decided to return to the old method of numbering depository shipping lists consecutively.

---

## **Recommendation 12**

The Depository Library Council to the Public Printer urges that the impact on the end user be studied when changes in GPO’s production methods are considered. A recent example of this category of problem is the result of new binding procedures for the List of Sections Affected, the Congressional Record, and the Federal Register.

The Council requests that the Public Printer reconsider his response to Resolution Number 17 of the fall 1983 Council. While Council appreciates the GPO’s concern for keeping binding costs down, there are costs to libraries in adding information to these publications to make them usable.

Specifically, Council requests that the Public Printer pursue all possibilities for providing a listing of sections affected on the cover of the LSA and page numbers on the Federal Register and Congressional Record, including going back to stapled binding such that title page information is not obscured.

RESPONSE: We note the continuing concern of Council regarding our new and less costly binding procedures for the Congressional Record, the Federal Register, and the List of Sections Affected. GPO has advised other agencies of the Council's concerns in the past; however, we cannot change their specifications. We suggest that you contact the issuing agency directly.

---

### Recommendation 13

Whereas depositories are painfully aware of the continuing problem with quality control at LPS (see Operations Committee report):

Be it resolved that LPS is requested to implement a comprehensive systematic program of quality control and to report progress on that implementation at the next Council meeting. LPS continues its ongoing program of quality control and reports on the ten problems cited in the Operations Committee Report:

1. Considerable damage to distributed depository microfiche caused by rubberband residue;

RESPONSE: It is necessary to ship microfiche with rubberbands to prevent the fiche from separating or causing possible serious damage from loose fiche getting bent or mutilated. Rubberbands should be removed from all microfiche immediately before being stored. Rubberband residue, although noticeable, causes no real damage during short term shipping to the diazo microfiche distributed by GPO. Any rubberband residue may be removed from diazo fiche by dusting or wiping the film with a dry, lintless cloth, a piece of plush cloth, or with a soft-bristled brush. For more details refer to: "The Cleaning of Microforms," Library Technology Report, Vol. 14, No. 3 (May/June 1978), pp. 217-230.

2. Bending of loosely packed microfiche in shipments;

RESPONSE: Loosely packed cartons of publications and microfiche are now being retrieved and repackaged before they are shipped. On occasion, a small percentage of these packages slip through the system unnoticed.

3. Arrival of unbound publications fastened together with a single staple in the upper left-hand corner, or otherwise without binders (SuDocs numbers HE 20.7002:V 17, Y 3.T 25:45 P 87/final, E 1.45/2:982, HE 20.3362/3:P 94/4/978, I 19.42/4:83-4003 were provided by a member of the audience as recent examples);

RESPONSE: The Government Printing Office cannot change agencies' specifications. The examples cited were produced with agency specifications.

4. Too many separate packages appearing on one shipping list;

RESPONSE: It is both cost effective and less confusing to list as many publications as possible on a single shipping list.

5. Missing shipping lists;

RESPONSE: To bring under control the number of missing shipping lists, Depository Distribution Division personnel are currently conducting random quality assurance checks on a daily basis.

6. Problems inherent in the new shipping list numbering system which make it difficult to determine the number of shipping lists released each day;

RESPONSE: As stated in our response to Resolution Number 11, we have decided to return to the former method of numbering shipping lists.

7. Problems of serials and series being distributed in mixed microfiche and paper format (an instance of a single microfiche issue of the Department of State Bulletin was noted);

RESPONSE: The Department of State Bulletin was converted to microfiche in October 1982. The policy of converting “short” publications to microfiche changed in the beginning of 1983. If a publication ought to be distributed in a paper format (according to “SOD 13”), and was printed through GPO, it is reprinted and distributed in paper. GPO is not authorized to reprint publications not originally printed through GPO. When shortages occur, GPO asks the publishing agency to supply additional copies. If the issuing agency does not supply the copies within 90 days, the matter is referred to the Joint Committee on Printing.

8. Receipt of out-of-print responses to claims, even if claims are filed immediately.

RESPONSE: Every effort is made to fill claims submitted by depository libraries. The micrographics program and Document’s policy to obtain copies from sales stock, whenever possible, have helped. But there are occasions when no stock is available. We apologize for this.

9. Datedness of the Publications Reference File even though it was to be distributed on a far more current basis;

RESPONSE: Three factors are responsible for the datedness of the PRF. These include (until recently) problems with contractor performance, prohibitive costs involved in providing more than a bimonthly distribution of complete sets of the PRF, and the lack of any contractors that are able to produce 300,000 microfiche in fewer than 10 workdays (14 calendar days).

With regard to contractor performance, it should be noted that until recently the contractor that had produced the PRF microfiche had on several occasions failed to produce microfiche without critical defects. Contractor failure meant that sets sent to the Library Programs Service had to be returned to the contractor for corrections, and then delivered a second time to LPS for shipment to depositories. A new contractor assumed responsibility for producing the PRF in April of this year. Thus far they have produced microfiche that have been free of critical defects. LPS is now able to ship the PRF shortly after receipt at the Eisenhower facility.

With regard to the frequency of issue, production costs are such that it is not possible for us to issue complete sets of the PRF more frequently than on a bimonthly basis. However, the biweekly “Cumulative Price and Status Change Report” was developed for depository librarians in response to their concerns that bimonthly issues of complete sets did not adequately reflect more recent price and status changes. If this report is used with the most recent issues of the PRF, users can verify the price and availability of titles listed in the complete PRF and the monthly New Publications Microfiche. In short, this product does provide timely information, and at a reasonable cost.

The third factor is the 10 workday time period from when the contractor picks up PRF tapes until the PRF microfiche are delivered to LPS for shipment to depositories. We attempted to reduce this “turnaround” time when the new contract was written and offered for bids. However, no contractor could be found that was able to produce a minimum of 300,000 microfiche in less than 10 workdays. This means that microfiche dated August 16 would not arrive at LPS before August 30. LPS would then ship the microfiche on August 31 or September 4 (Monday, the 3rd, is a national holiday).

Please keep in mind that the contractor requires 14 calendar days to produce the microfiche, LPS requires 1 or 2 workdays to prepare them for shipment, and the U.S. Postal Service requires from 5 to 21 calendar days (depending upon distance) to deliver materials to depository libraries. Thus, a PRF microfiche dated August 16 that arrived in Dallas, Texas, on September 20 would not be late, but on time.

Although this situation is less than ideal, librarians should use their issues of the “Cumulative Price and Status Change Report” to compensate for the bimonthly production schedule for complete sets of the PRF. Even though contractor performance is no longer an issue, no changes can be made to the length of time the contractor has to produce the microfiche, the time required to prepare them for shipment, and the actual time it takes for the Postal Service to deliver



the sets to depositories. The “Cumulative Price and Status Change Report” is the best means that we have to provide more timely information with regard to the availability and price of sales publications.

10. Receipt of technical report summaries while the full text of the report is available only from the National Technical Information Service;

RESPONSE: We need more specific information to answer this concern. However, in general, LPS is aware of the problem of depository libraries receiving only partial texts of technical reports. We acquire all the Government publications we are aware of. There will, no doubt, always be some publications falling through the cracks. Please provide specific information for any title not distributed to the depository libraries, but known to exist, and we will contact the agency in an attempt to acquire the document.

---

### **Recommendation 14**

Whereas LPS is presently severely understaffed; and Whereas LPS staffing levels directly affect services provided to depository libraries. Therefore, be it resolved that Council recommends that the Public Printer take immediate action to raise staffing levels at LPS.

#### ***Response***

Since the spring meeting, steps have been taken to fill vacant positions at the Library Programs Service. We have been able to obtain a blanket waiver of the freeze on hiring librarians outside of GPO. LPS has recently acquired a new section chief, one librarian, and one library technician. We are going to interview for a supervisory librarian for the inspection area, and we are in the process of recruiting depository library inspectors. Very shortly, we expect to announce a new Chief of the Cataloging and Classification Branch. Recruiting for additional librarians and library technicians also is underway.

---

### **Recommendation 15**

The Depository Library Council appreciates GPO’s response to Council Resolution Number 16 of September 1983, indicating the “Depository Library Council members will be closely involved in the system design process, and they will be kept informed during the system development phase.” However, the Council wishes to note that seven months later, the GPO has not yet involved Council in the review of the integrated automated support system of the Library Programs Service. The Depository Library Council, therefore, strongly reiterates Council Resolution Number 16 of fall 1983 which read:

The Council reaffirms its support for the development of the Public Printer’s endorsed integrated automated support system for GPO’s Library Programs Service. It is essential that the development of this system receive widespread input from depository libraries, a nationally recognized systems consultant, the Government Documents Round Table of the American Library Association, and the national library community. The Council urges that it have substantial ongoing and direct representation in the system’s development. To this end, it is requested that Council members immediately be supplied with the current and succeeding drafts of the system plan as they are produced for review. (Emphasis provided.) The Council recommends that the proposed automated support system be reviewed by a panel of recognized automated systems consultants to ensure maximum utilization of current technology and system design.

#### ***Response***

Council members were provided copies of the draft requirements for the Federal Documents Data Base, last April. However, the House Appropriations Committee denied most of the funding requested for the FDDDB for fiscal year 1985. It is not known yet what impact this action will have for future years. Because of this, it is premature to establish a panel to provide input at this time.

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, OCTOBER 10-12, 1984 • WASHINGTON, D.C.

---

### **Recommendation 1**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Monthly Catalog index be produced in the form as presented in “Exhibit C” as both paper and microfiche products to be cumulated monthly. The register, “Exhibit A”, containing the full record as it currently appears, should be produced as a microfiche product only. The implementation of these format changes should begin January 1, 1986.

#### *Response*

In December 1984, the Library Programs Service submitted formal, written requests asking the GPO Data Systems Service to make the necessary SAMANTHA software modifications to implement Council’s Monthly Catalog format recommendation for the 1986 volume year.

Exhibit C, as approved by Council, will display the register information as it appears currently in the Monthly Catalog, and will issue the register in the microfiche format. The indexes, however, will be issued in both the paper and microfiche formats and will feature the “one-step look-up.” The eight indexes which will be generated are the Author, Title, Subject, Series/ Report, Contract Number, Stock Number, Classification Number, and Title Keyword Indexes. Appearing with each index term will be the 245 field subfield “a” (title), the 260 field subfield “c” (date of publication), the 086 field (Superintendent of Documents classification number), 074 field (item number), 037 field (stock number), and the 001 field (Monthly Catalog entry identification number). The indexing information will cumulate semiannually, annually, and quinquennially.

The Government Printing Office will not cumulate the publication more frequently, since the additional processing time required for more frequent cumulations would jeopardize the timely issuance of the Monthly Catalog issues.

---

### **Recommendation 2**

The Depository Library Council reiterates its interest in seeing the Public Printer implement a comprehensive, systematic, and formal program of quality control at the Library Programs Service.

#### *Response*

INTERIM REPORT: In an effort to improve its quality control program, LPS is conducting a comprehensive survey to define and evaluate all quality control systems and procedures currently in effect. We are hopeful that the survey results will point up opportunities to improve our quality control effectiveness; all such opportunities will be pursued.

---

### **Recommendation 3**

The Public Printer is requested to provide “rain checks” for all “shorts,” regardless of quantity lacking, and for all claims properly submitted within 30 days. Libraries should be notified within 60 days of issuance of “rain checks” if a document cannot be received for distribution.

***Response***

As reported in the February 1985 issue of Administrative Notes, there is good news on the ship-short policy that LPS implemented October 1, 1984. In January of this year, a high priority was assigned to LPS reprint requests. These are working their way through the pipeline. The results should be apparent in April. It is our intention to make good on all rain checks.

**Recommendation 4**

The Depository Library Council requests that the Government Printing Office issue an opinion by the Spring 1985 Depository Library Council meeting, on the replacement of depository Government publications as described in Section 13 of the revised “Instructions to Depository Libraries”, June 1984.

***Response***

[GPO General Counsel opinion follows]

Date: March 12, 1985

**Reply to Attn of:** General Counsel

**Subject:** Replacement of Publications With Microfacsimiles and the Ownership of Those Microfacsimiles

**To:** Superintendent of Documents

The Office of the General Counsel has received a request for an opinion relating to a resolution of the Depository Library Council. The resolution reads as follows:

The Depository Council requests that the GPO issue an opinion on the replacement of depository government publications with privately produced microformats of the same publications as described in Section 13 of the revised “Instructions to Depository Libraries”.

Section 13 of the Instructions to Depository Libraries referenced in the resolution is as follows:

Permission is granted to all designated depository libraries to substitute microcopies for any holdings of U.S. Government publications, provided the microcopies are properly referenced, can be readily located, and are easily accessible. Proper reading equipment must also be available for the type of microcopy substituted for the original. If your library is served by a designated Regional Depository, the regional library should be notified of this action in order to assist you in the disposal of any unwanted paper copies.

In his memorandum transmitting the request for an opinion, the former Chief of the Library Division posed two questions: whether the microcopies which are obtained as substitutes for GPO depository publications become the property of the GPO; and whether, if these publications are not property of the GPO, Section 13 should be reworded to establish this ownership right. After a thorough review of the applicable statute, its legislative history, and past practice in administering the depository library program, we do not consider it necessary to address the specific issue of ownership of the microcopies so long as the original printed documents are disposed of in the manner, and the microcopies are maintained for the periods and under the conditions, indicated herein.

The provision of Title 44 of the U.S. Code which governs the retention of Government publications by depository libraries required that a depository library which is served by a Regional depository library retain those documents for five years. 44 U.S.C. § 1911 (1982). A depository library that is by law allowed to discard the publications after five years must first have those publications offered by the Regional library that serves it to other depository libraries and then to non-depository libraries. 44 U.S.C. § 1912 (1982). Regional libraries and depository libraries not served by regional libraries must permanently retain their Government publications in either printed or microfacsimile form. 44 U.S.C. §§ 1911, 1912. The only

exceptions to this requirement are if a publication is superseded or is issued later in bound form. ID. These groups of documents may be discarded as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents. 44 U.S.C. §§ 1911, 1912.

The Superintendent of Documents has promulgated regulations governing the disposition of documents in Section 11 of the “Instructions to Depository Libraries”, revised June 1984. This section permits depositories not served by Regional libraries to dispose of superseded documents, documents that are later issued in a bound format, documents that are duplicates, or documents which are replaced by microcopies. As to these and other depositories, documents which are replaced by a bound format or by a microcopy cannot be disposed of until they have been offered to other libraries. If disposition is by sale, the proceeds of that sale must be returned to the Superintendent of Documents.

As stated above, the law requires that depository libraries served by a Regional retain the Government publications which they select through the depository library program for five years. However, in the years prior to the passage of the Depository Library Act of August 9, 1962, 76 Stat. 352 (codified in 44 U.S.C. §§ 1901-14 (1982)), depositories were allowed to substitute, prior to the expiration of five years, microfacsimile copies of these Government publications as a way of conserving scarce shelf space. This practice was permitted under the previous Instructions to Depository Libraries and was specifically referenced by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in its report on the 1962 Act. See S. Rep. No. 1587, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. 5 (1962), reprinted in II G. Brown, M. Cramer, M. Carson, Legislative Histories of the Laws Affecting the U.S. Government Printing Office as Codified in Title 44 of the U.S. Code at 1793 (1982). It is a well-settled rule of administrative law that, if Congress is aware of an administrative practice utilized by an agency charged with implementing a statute and the statute is amended without prohibiting that prior administrative practice, the administrative practice will be deemed to have received the sanction of Congress. *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952). In this instance, Congress knew that GPO permitted the substitution of printed copies with microfacsimiles and did not prohibit the practice in the 1962 Depository Library Act. Therefore, GPO’s continued practice in this regard is legally proper, although not specifically provided for in Chapter 19 of Title 44, United States Code.

Having established that substitution of microcopies is allowable, it is necessary to set forth clearly the duties of depositories regarding both the superseded printed copies and their microcopy substitutes. As indicated, the law intends that Government publications received by selective depositories be made available for the free use of the general public for five years. 44 U.S.C. § 1911. Therefore, if a library wishes to substitute a microcopy for a selected publication, that library is under the legal obligation to maintain the microcopy for five years so that it is accessible for the free use of the general public. Therefore, for all purposes, any microcopy that is intended to replace that publication must be treated as if it were the Government publication for the period of time that the library would have had to maintain that Government publication. The microcopy must be maintained in such a way that it is available for the free use of the general public. This requires a library to ensure that it possesses the proper equipment for using a microformat.

Regional libraries and depository libraries not served by Regionals are permitted by law to substitute microcopies for publications which are received in printed format. 44 U.S.C. §§ 1911, 1912. As these depositories must permanently retain the publications received through the depository library program, if there is a substitution in formats, then the microcopies must be maintained in such a way that the microcopies can be accessible for the free use of the general public.

In regard to the disposal of Government publications which have been replaced by microcopies, the Government has an obvious interest in the method of the disposal of those documents. See 44 U.S.C. § 1912. If the library intends that a microcopy will become part of its depository library collection, thereby replacing the printed Government publication, the library must dispose of the printed publication in accordance with Sections 2, 11, and 13 of the “Instructions to Depository Libraries”, as revised.

It is unnecessary at this juncture to address the actual ownership interest in these microcopies. We see no need, in light of this determination, to amend Section 13 relative to that issue. As long as a depository maintains the substituted microcop-

ies in the proper manner and for the requisite periods, and so long as the correct disposition is made of the original printed Government publication, the depository libraries involved have adequately met their obligations under the depository library program.

MARK C. CRAMER  
THOMAS O. MAGNETTI

---

## Recommendation 5

Whereas confusion was caused by GPO's statement in Administrative Notes, volume 5, number 11, page 6, regarding reprints, therefore,

Be it resolved that the Depository Library Council requests that GPO confirm the depositories' long-held presumption that reprints fall under Section 11, "Instructions to Depository Libraries", revised, bound, cumulated, or replaced by other publications which are stated to contain similar information may be discarded.

### *Response*

[GPO General Counsel opinion follows]

Date: March 13, 1985  
Reply to Attn of: General Counsel  
Subject: Resolution No. 5 of the Depository Library Council  
To: Chief, Library Division  
THRU: Superintendent of Documents

This is in response to your request for an opinion regarding the Depository Library Council's Resolution No. 5, passed on October 12, 1984, which dealt with the reprinting of articles from a magazine or journal already present in the depository library collection, and the Council's objection to the distribution of the reprint as a separate depository item. You requested guidance on the issue of whether the Superintendent of Document's determination to include these items for distribution to depositories and require that they be maintained was contradictory to the Superintendent of Documents' general policy regarding disposition of duplicate documents as expressed in Section 11 of the "Instructions to Depository Libraries". A thorough examination of relevant statutes, case law, and administrative practices indicates that it is within the proper administrative discretion of the Superintendent of Documents to require that the reprints in question be treated as separate depository items, and that they not be considered duplicates.

This matter first arose in June 1984, when Michael F. DiMario, then Superintendent of Documents, decided that articles which were reprinted from previously distributed FDS Consumer Journals were to be treated as separate publications, and made available for selection by depository libraries. To implement this decision, depository libraries were notified through the Administrative Notes, Vol. 5, No. 11, August 1984, that if an article is reprinted from a magazine already in the depository collection, and the article is distributed as a depository item, it is to be considered a separate publication and retained for five years.

The Depository Library Council responded to the decision of the Superintendent of Documents by passing the following resolutions

Whereas confusion was caused by GPO's statement . . . regarding reprints, therefore, Be it resolved that the Depository Library Council requests that GPO confirm the depositories' long-held presumption that reprints fall under Section 11,

“Instructions to Depository Libraries”, revised June 1984. This states that publications which were superseded, revised, bound, cumulative, or replaced by other publications which are stated to contain similar information may be discarded.

Section 11 of the “Instructions to Depository Libraries”, referred to in the resolution, provides in relevant part that “[a]ny publication which is a duplicate copy or has been superseded may be discarded.” The Superintendent of Documents previously has interpreted this Section as permitting all depositories to discard any publication which is a duplicate of a publication already within their depository collections.

Chapter 19 of Title 44 of the U.S. Code gives some guidance as to which Government Publications must be made available through the Depository Library Program. Government publication is defined in 44 U.S.C § 1901 (1982) as informational matter which is published as an individual document at Government expense or as required by law. These Government publications are to be made available to depository libraries unless the originating agency determines that the publications are required for official use only, are for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value, are classified for national security reasons, or are cooperative publications which must be sold in order to be self-sustaining. 44 U.S.C. §§ 1902, 1903 (1982). It is evident that the reprints in question are Government publications within the definition contained in 44 U.S.C. § 1901, and that they do not fall within the exception found at 44 U.S.C. §§ 1902 and 1903. Therefore, these publications must be made available to depository libraries.

Having made this determination, it becomes necessary to examine the authority of the Superintendent of Documents to identify those Government publications which are duplicates and may therefore be discarded. Under 44 U.S.C. § 1911 (1982), regional depositories and depositories not served by regionals are permitted to dispose of superseded publications or those issued in bound form “as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents.” See also 44 U.S.C. § 1912 (1982). As to the selective depositories, it has been a long-standing administrative practice of the Superintendent of Documents to allow them as well to discard superseded and duplicate documents. Section 11, “Instructions to Depository Libraries” (1984). This practice was permitted under the 1955 edition of the Instructions and was specifically referenced in the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration’s Report on the Depository Library Act of August 9, 1962, 76 Stat. 352. See Rep. No. 1587, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. 5 (1962), reprinted in G. Brown, M. Cramer, M. Carson, Legislative Histories of the Laws Affecting the U.S. Government Printing Office as Codified in Title 44 of the U.S. Code at 1793 (1982). Under the doctrine of “Congressional acquiescence” since Congress knew that GPO permitted the discarding of duplicates and superseded documents and did not prohibit that practice in the 1962 Act, that administrative practice will be deemed to have received the sanction of Congress. *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952).

It is evident that, although not specifically provided for in Title 44, the Superintendent of Documents is authorized to permit the discarding of documents which he determines to be superseded or to be duplicates. Moreover, an agency’s interpretation of its governing statute or regulation is due proper deference and should be controlling unless plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the statute or regulations. *Udall v. Tallman*, 380 U.S. 1, 16-17 (1964); *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, 401 U.S. 424, 433-34 (1971); *United States v. Rutherford*, 442 U.S. 544, 553 (1979).

It is clear that it is within the administrative discretion of the Superintendent of Documents to determine which documents are duplicates and may be discarded in accordance with the “Instructions to Depository Libraries”. Therefore, the Superintendent of Documents’ decision to include reprints as depository items which can be selected and must not be discarded as duplicates, must be followed by depository libraries. Given this finding, the Administrative Note and Section 11 of the Instructions are neither contradictory nor inconsistent with each other.

It is evident, however, that the Administrative Note is somewhat confusing in regard to the retention of reprints. The Note is entitled “Five Year Retention of Reprints” and states that if an article is distributed as a depository item, it is to be considered a separate publication and retained for five years. The Note does not address, however, the situation where the selected

publication must be retained permanently by a Regional library or a depository library not served by a Regional library. See 44 U.S.C. § 1911. As the Note is presently worded, it only deals with the selection and retention of reprints by depository libraries served by Regionals. Id. I would suggest that the language of the Note be amended to reflect how Regionals and depository libraries not served by Regionals should treat these reprints.

MARK C. CRAMER  
THOMAS O. MAGNETTI

---

## **Recommendation 6**

Whereas the Depository Library Council finds unacceptable the linkage between correcting GPO's Monthly Catalog magnetic tapes and the printing of consequent corrected entries in the paper version of the Monthly Catalog, therefore, be it resolved that retrospective correction of entries on GPO tapes not be reflected in future Monthly Catalogs other than in the traditional manner via the "Monthly Catalog's List of Corrections".

### ***Response***

The Government Printing Office has a responsibility to provide products and services of the highest quality consistent with its statutory mission. Implementation of an automated procedure for correcting Monthly Catalog errors upon their discovery will improve the quality and timeliness of the Monthly Catalog. Consequently, the Superintendent of Documents will implement the Monthly Catalog correction procedure proposed by the Government Printing Office in October 1984.

---

## **Recommendation 7**

The Depository Library Council is greatly disappointed at the failure of GPO to successfully obtain funding to proceed on the Federal Documents Data Base. Council reiterates its continued interest in and support for the FDDDB. We strongly recommend that a recognized library systems consultant be contracted to help GPO determine which facts and figures need to be collected to successfully obtain funding to implement the FDDDB or a comparable alternative.

### ***Response***

LPS has consulted with the GPO Office of General Counsel on the question of GPO's authority to contract with a recognized library systems consultant, who would help GPO determine which facts and figures need to be collected to successfully obtain funding to implement the FDDDB or a comparable alternative. LPS is advised that it lacks the statutory authority to issue such a contract. Moreover, the appropriation under which LPS is currently operating provides no funding for this purpose.

Pursuant to the direction received from the House Committee on Appropriations in its Report of May 31, 1984, LPS is proceeding with enhancements to its Depository Distribution Information System (DDIS), including the lighted bin system. In addition, LPS is making good progress toward automating acquisitions, classification, and related operations with the Acquisitions, Classification, and Shipment Information System (ACSIS). All current LPS automation efforts are within the scope of GPO's existing legislative authority and consistent with the expressed intent of the House Committee on Appropriations.

---

## **Recommendation 8**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the GPO discontinue the inclusion in the Serials Supplement of basic manuals and serials that are sold on subscription by the Superintendent of Documents, only if Library Programs Service has provided the cataloging record in the Monthly Catalog.

### ***Response***

This resolution has been adopted starting with the 1985 Serials Supplement. Previously, GPO had provided dual treatment for these publications since the cataloging records also appeared in the Monthly Catalog, while the sales information could be obtained from Price List 36 or from the GPO Sales Publication Reference File (PRF). This improvement will allow a speedier preparation of future Serials Supplements, and will place a lesser burden on the professional staff.

---

### **Recommendation 9**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO include transmittals, updates, etc., to basic manuals in the “List of Special Materials” which appear in the preliminary pages of every Monthly Catalog. These should not be cataloged in the Serial Supplement.

### ***Response***

This resolution has been adopted. GPO had already been doing this for basic manuals sold separately and for manuals with changes not sold. This improvement will allow our technicians to spend more time tracking down missing issues and inquiring about discontinued periodicals, changes in frequencies, and succeeding entries.

---

### **Recommendation 10**

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO resume cataloging monographic series, e.g., U.S.G.S. Professional Papers, as serials records, in addition to the individual analytics for each monographic series. Both of these records shall appear in the Monthly Catalog printed and tape products.

### ***Response***

In 1981, GPO became the authority for setting up monographic series for Federal documents. Libraries wishing to find how series have been set up by GPO may use the series index to the Monthly Catalog, the Library of Congress data base (MUMS), or OCLC.

There are two ways of cataloging monographic series: (1) collective bibliographic records that describe the series as a whole; and (2) analytic records that describe each title. GPO is currently providing the latter treatment, since it is bound by the statutory requirements of 44 U.S. Code.

The Library of Congress and GPO are now consistent in the practice of providing analytic treatment for individual titles in monographic series, rather than having a classification number for the whole series. This is another reason why LC provides analytics.

Approximately three monographic series are set up daily at GPO. To provide additional, collective bibliographic records for monographic series would impede cataloging production and increase backlogs. To absorb the added workload, one cataloger would have to be added to the current LPS authorized staff ceiling.

For these reasons, GPO does not plan to alter its current practice with regard to cataloging monographic series.

---

### **Recommendation 11**

The Public Printer is to be commended for supporting the Depository Library Council’s recommendations to establish a task force to advise GPO on conducting a needs assessment related to government publications education.

---



We recommend that this task force also be charged with developing a formal plan for the design and implementation of educational activities needed to improve the management of depository libraries and the use of government information.

Council accepts the Public Printer's invitation to suggest a panel of experts who might serve on this task force. Two Council members, Bruce Morton and Patricia Reeling, have volunteered to work with this task force. Council recommends that Patricia Reeling serve as chair of this task force.

### ***Response***

INTERIM REPORT: The Public Printer endorses the establishment of a task force on Government publications education with Dr. Patricia G. Reeling as chair and Bruce Morton as a participant. At ALA Midwinter in early January, Chief Inspector Joe McClane engaged in some useful discussions on the subject; during February, he will be meeting with Dr. Reeling to make preliminary arrangements for the task force. It should be understood, however, that any GPO involvement in and support for this project will be circumscribed by its statutory authority and available resources. Nevertheless, GPO believes that the timing is right to address this important subject, which so directly affects the ultimate delivery of Government information to the American public.

---

**Recommendation 12** Missing. (Editor's note)

---

### **Recommendation 13**

The Depository Library Council recommends the adoption of a sequential shipping list numbering system compatible with GPO computer applications. It is further recommended that GPO survey the depositories prior to implementation regarding their approval of the new shipping list numbering system.

RESPONSE: GPO surveyed the depository libraries concerning their preference for shipping list numbers and compiled the responses on December 7, 1984.

Since 78% of the responding libraries preferred the sequential numbering scheme, LPS implemented that new scheme on January 2, 1985. For more information concerning the number of responses received and the form the new shipping list number will take, please consult Administrative Notes, volume 5, number 15.

---

### **Recommendation 14**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer seek the advice of authorities from the Library of Congress, the National Archives and Records Service, and other appropriate advisors to develop a list of rare documents.

RESPONSE: INTERIM REPORT: The Public Printer has issued letters requesting such advice from the Librarian of Congress and from the Archivist of the United States. The Depository Library Council will be kept informed as responses are received and reviewed at GPO.

---

### **Recommendation 15**

The Depository Library Council recommends that the "List of Superseded Classes" be updated by GPO as a supplement to the List of Classes and a superseded schedule be established for each class when listed.

## ***Response***

The Government Printing Office called for volunteers from the Library community to compile the update to the List of Superseded Depository Documents and received the ten names listed below as members of the Superseded Documents Committee. On November 13, 1984, a letter was sent to each volunteer thanking them for their willingness to compile the document. Without the assistance of these volunteers it would be impossible to undertake this project.

The List of Superseded Depository Documents will be issued as a supplement to the “Instructions to the Depository Libraries”, just as in the past. If the volunteers feel it is possible to keep up with a superseded schedule with each new SuDoc class, GPO would be able to publish the information once it is prepared as an update to the “List of Superseded Depository Documents”.

Since this resolution asks that GPO assume an additional workload, which is impossible to take on at this time, GPO can only promise to publish those products produced by the Superseded Documents Committee. The LPS contact person for this project will be Dan MacGilvray.

Liese Adams  
Kent State University Library  
Documents Division  
Kent, OH 44242  
(216) 672-2388

Marian Carroll  
Milner Library  
Illinois State University  
Normal, IL 61761  
(309) 438-7441

Julie Copeland  
Minneapolis Public Library  
300 Nicollet Mall  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
(612) 372-6535

Charity Davis  
King Library  
Documents Department  
Miami Universities Libraries  
Oxford, OH 45056  
(513) 529-3841

Maureen Harris  
Clemson University Library  
Clemson, SC 29631  
(803) 656-3024

Karen Kottsy  
University of Cincinnati Library  
Documents Department  
Cincinnati, OH 45221  
(513) 475-5009

John Phillips  
Oklahoma State University Library  
Stillwater, OK 74074  
(405) 624-6546

Margaret Powell  
Andrews Library  
Government Documents  
College of Wooster  
Wooster, OH 44691  
(216) 263-2279

Pat Sloan  
Nebraska Library Commission  
1420 P Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508  
(402) 471-2045

Robert A. Walter  
Pittsburg State University Library  
Documents Department  
Pittsburg, KN 66762

---

## **Recommendation 16**

The Depository Library Council has reviewed the item card options offered by the Government Printing Office and recommends the adoption of “Option 1C”, the present format, as appended. Moreover, every effort should be made to provide specific information about the publications to be distributed under each item number, since these records are collection development tools for the depositories.

### ***Response***

GPO (??) appreciates having the Depository Library Council’s review of the item card issue and their recommendation of Option 1C. This option is the current item card format; so no changes will be made.

GPO will continue to provide as much specific information about the item number as can be obtained in a reasonable time frame.

---

## **Recommendation 17**

Whereas the Government Printing Office has issued a legal opinion that depository libraries are held liable for damages to or loss of their depository collections, the Depository Library Council requests that by January 1, 1985, the Government Printing Office notify the directors of all depository libraries of this opinion and provide them with the necessary formulas for evaluating their collections.

### ***Response***

[GPO General Counsel opinion follows]

Date: March 18, 1985  
Reply to Attn of: General Counsel  
Subject: Resolution No. 17 of the Depository Library Council  
To: Chief, Library Division  
THRU: Superintendent of Documents

On December 17, 1984, you asked this office to provide a formula for evaluating a depository collection in terms of the monetary worth for replacement purposes. This request was prompted by a Resolution passed on October 12, 1984, by the Depository Library Council which reads, in applicable part, as follows:

Whereas the Government Printing Office has issued a legal opinion that depository libraries are held liable for damages to or loss of their depository collections, the Depository Library Council requests that . . . the Government Printing Office . . . provide them (the directors of all depository libraries) with the necessary formulas for evaluating their collections.

After analyzing your request, I feel that it is inappropriate for this office to attempt to provide formulae for evaluating the risk of loss of depository library collections for insurance purposes. Such formulae should be developed by insurance specialists who are utilized by each individual library in evaluating the worth of the library's nongovernmental collections. Specific guidance or suggested methodology may be provided by the Office of the Superintendent of Documents. However, I do not believe that it would be proper for the General Counsel to promulgate either a suggested or a mandatory insurance formula for use in evaluating depository collections.

All Government publications supplied under the Depository Program remain the property of the United States Government. As stated in the General Counsel's opinion of January 12, 1984, which reiterated a depository library's responsibility to replace lost, worn out or destroyed publications as it would replace damaged or lost nongovernment materials, a depository library should pay for the replacement of lost or ruined depository documents. See also, "Instructions to Depository Libraries", revised June 1984, Section 1.

The replacement of portions of or an entire depository collection lost due to natural or man-made disasters must be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. After such a catastrophe, the depository library should contact the Office of the Superintendent of Documents and arrange for either the replacement of the lost collection or some other disposition, as is required by the Office of the Superintendent of Documents.

MARK C. CRAMER

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*