

Law Library Lights

VOLUME 45, NUMBER 1 FALL 2001

A CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

SHOULD I STAY OR SHOULD I GO NOW? LAW LIBRARIES AND THE FEDERAL DEPOSITORY PROGRAM IN THE ELECTRONIC AGE

Peggy Roebuck Jarrett &
Cheryl Rae Nyberg
University of Washington,
Gallagher Law Library

Should I stay or should I go now?

If I go there will be trouble

And if I stay it will be double.

So you gotta let me know

Should I stay or should I go?

The Clash, *Should I Stay Or Should I Go*,
on Combat Rock (Epic 1982)

THE TRANSITION TO A MOSTLY ELECTRONIC DEPOSITORY has complicated the issues surrounding participation in the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). *If most titles are electronic only, freely available to anyone with Internet access, why should my library stay in the program and be subject to external rules regarding service levels and equipment? Does my library still realize cost-savings? How would our users be affected if the library withdrew from the program? Is my library committed or obligated to serve the public at large?* There are no simple answers, but this article offers several reasons for law libraries to remain in the program.

THE ELECTRONIC DEPOSITORY

As directed by Congress, online is now the primary format for titles distributed through the FDLP.¹ In FY 2000, 53 percent of new depository titles were distributed electronically, and as of June 2001, 62 percent of FY 2001 titles were electronic.² Core legal titles, however, have remained in tangible formats (paper or microfiche) and they have a good chance of staying that way. Two FDLP documents support this assumption. First, the list of *Essential Titles for Public Use in Paper Format*³ identifies publications that are "deemed essential to the purposes of the FDLP." Primary legal sources such as the *United States Code*, the *Statutes at Large*, the *Code of Federal Regulations*, the *Federal Register*, and *United States Reports* appear on the list.

Second, the *Dissemination/Distribution Policy for*

*the Federal Depository Library Program*⁴ clearly states that the standard practice is to distribute electronic titles if certain requirements such as authenticity and usability are met. The list of examples of products in acceptable electronic form that should also be distributed in a tangible form, however, includes products "of significant reference value to most types of FDLP libraries, as may be the case with certain compilations, legal resources, permanent legal records or products of historical importance." These policy statements are not guarantees – the *Essential Titles* list may be amended and the dissemination policy is open to interpretation. Their existence, however, signals the Government Printing Office's (GPO) understanding that some titles, particularly legal ones, should remain in paper or microfiche.

The Electronic Depository has certainly made identifying, acquiring, and preserving legal and law-related documents more challenging. Fortunately, the GPO and members of the depository library community have developed tools to ease this transition. Exhibit A is the FDLP Desktop⁵, with its myriad of helpful tools and information. This is not our mothers' GPO.

The recently formed Fugitive & Electronic-Only Documents Committee of the American Association of Law Libraries Government Documents Special Interest Section (AALL GDSIS) illustrates the cooperative spirit of depository librarians. The committee's charge includes identifying electronic-only titles, reporting these titles to the GPO and the documents community, and facilitating hard-copy publication of selected titles. Other examples include the Documents Data Miner, a joint project between Wichita State University and the GPO that provides depository management tools including a searchable *List of Classes*⁶, and Uncle Sam Migrating Government Publications, a site created by the regional

continued on page 3

EDITOR'S COLUMN

Leslie A. Lee
The George Washington University Law Library

WELCOME TO ANOTHER YEAR OF LIGHTS! I would like to thank everyone who contributed articles and/or columns to the fall issue. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Barbara DesRosiers and Leslie Campbell who ably assisted in the editing process, Carol Hardy who patiently entertained my design and layout questions, and Ann Green who cheerfully provided advice and support along the way. As a first-time editor, I hoped for the best and expected the worst; I spent many nights wondering if the deadlines would be met, if my computer would crash, if *The Chicago Manual of Style* could possibly be correct in dictating that professional titles are generally not capitalized. Having survived production of the first issue, I can say with confidence that my fears were unfounded; deadlines were easily met, my computer hiccupped only once, and yes, apparently *The Chicago Manual of Style* is an authori-

ty on the use of capital and lowercase letters.

Along with our regular slate of columns containing valuable information about Society activities, I am pleased to present an issue packed with interesting and informative feature articles on or relating to the Federal Depository Library Program. I am also happy to introduce two new regular features of *Lights*: hot topic articles and a new column, Tech Talk. The hot topic selected for the fall issue—library downsizing—was inspired by a program at the AALL Annual Meeting and Conference in Minneapolis, “The Incredible Shrinking Library,” presented by two law firm librarians, both of whom experienced downsizing at their respective law firms. The first Tech Talk column contains a handy review of two Web authoring tools.

Without further ado (besides pausing to encourage everyone to write for *Lights*!), I leave you to enjoy this year’s first issue of *Lights*. ■

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FEATURES

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Should I Stay Or Should I Go Now? Law Libraries and the Federal Depository Program in the Electronic Age <i>Peggy Roebuck Jarrett and Cheryl Rae Nyberg</i> | 1 |
| Withdrawing from the FDLP: A Responsible Solution <i>Iris M. Lee</i> | 6 |
| Federal Agency Libraries as Federal Depositories <i>Rick McKinney</i> | 8 |
| The Role of the Government Printing Office in Ensuring the Life Cycle of Electronic Government Information <i>Francis J. Buckley, Jr. and Sandy Morton-Schwalb</i> | 11 |
| Fugitive Government Documents <i>Jan Oberla</i> | 14 |
| A New Home for the Howard University Law Library <i>Helane Davis</i> | 16 |
| Hot Topic: Incredible Shrinking Library <i>Beth Langton</i> | 18 |
| Hot Topic: Incredible Shrinking Library <i>Kate Kennedy</i> | 20 |
| Tech Talk: Tools of the Trade: Dreamweaver 4 and FrontPage 2002 <i>Lawrence “Chip” Tomek</i> | 23 |

COLUMNS

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Editor’s Column <i>Leslie A. Lee</i> | 2 |
| President’s Column <i>Ann C. Green</i> | 26 |
| Academic/SIS News <i>Nancy Crossed</i> | 27 |
| Private Law Library/SIS News <i>Scott Larson</i> | 27 |
| Legislative Research/SIS News <i>Julia Taylor</i> | 28 |
| Interlibrary Loan/SIS News <i>Michelle Wollmann</i> | 28 |
| Federal Law Libraries/SIS News <i>Mary K. Grady</i> | 29 |
| Foreign and Int’l Law/SIS News <i>Herb Somers</i> | 31 |
| News of Members <i>Hillary C. Rubin</i> | 32 |
| Eye on Serials <i>Susan Ryan</i> | 34 |

ADVERTISERS

| | | | |
|--------------------|----|-------------|----|
| | | InfoCurrent | 4 |
| Alert Publications | 7 | Lexis | 22 |
| BNA | 17 | Niche | 30 |
| CAL INFO | 34 | TLC | 13 |
| Global Securities | 33 | West | 10 |

Law Library Lights is published quarterly by the Law Librarians’ Society of Washington, DC Inc. 20009, ISSN 0546-2483.

Subscription Rates: Nonmembers (outside Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia): \$35/volume, \$15 single issue. Send subscription requests and correspondence to: Law Librarians’ Society of Washington, D.C., Inc. 8727A Cooper Road, Alexandria, VA 22309. Attn. *Lights* Subscriptions. Subscriptions are also available through F.W. Faxon Co. and EBSCO.

Membership dues include a subscription to *Law Library Lights*. For Membership information, contact the Membership Committee Chair, 8727A Cooper Road, Alexandria, VA 22309. The Law Librarians’ Society of Washington, D.C., Inc. does not assume any responsibility for the statements advanced by contributors to, nor the advertisers in, *Law Library Lights*. The views expressed herein are those of the individual authors and do not constitute an endorsement by the Law Librarians’ Society of Washington, D.C., Inc.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

depository at the University of Memphis that identifies titles moving to electronic form.⁷

Of course, these resources are available to all librarians, not just depository library staff. For those librarians who are not intimately involved with government documents on a regular basis, a special effort must be made to develop the expertise needed to employ these valuable selection and management tools effectively. Using and contributing to the development of these services is a routine part of the depository librarian's job.

CORE LEGAL DOCUMENTS

Law library depositories may select core legal documents in print. Among the titles in this cat-

egory are primary legal materials that virtually every law library owns, despite their availability online. Paper is durable. Citations to and finding aids for printed material are well-established. The printed versions of legal texts are generally accepted as the "official" versions.⁸ In a world of uncertainty over the long-term availability of electronic government resources, law librarians crave the permanence and predictability of print. And in the many academic law libraries that are also research libraries, ownership of core legal documents is an important part of their mission. These depositories retain documents far beyond the FDLP's five-year requirement and they rarely withdraw government material.

The tables below illustrate prices for key legal material.

TABLE 1. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS⁹

| TITLE | PRICE |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Code of Federal Regulations</i> | 1,094.00 |
| <i>CFR List of Sections Affected</i> | 31.00 |
| <i>Congressional Record</i> (daily edition) | 393.00 |
| <i>Customs Bulletin and Decisions</i> | 220.00 |
| <i>FCC Record</i> | 535.00 |
| <i>Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission Decisions</i> | 110.00 |
| <i>Federal Register</i> | 638.00 |
| <i>FLRA Reports of Case Decisions, FSIP Releases, and Administrative Law Judge Decisions of the FLRA</i> | 145.00 |
| <i>Internal Revenue Bulletin</i> | 230.00 |
| <i>Nuclear Regulatory Commission Issuances</i> | 110.00 |
| <i>Treaties and Other International Acts Series</i> (slip treaties) | 164.00 |
| TOTAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION COST | 3,670.00 |

TABLE 2. SELECTED TITLES, PARTIAL SETS¹⁰

| TITLE | PRICE |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <i>Administrative Decisions Under Employer Sanctions, Unfair Immigration-Related Employment Practices and Civil Penalty Document Fraud Laws of the United States</i> (DOJ), 1991-2000, 8 vols. | 494.00 |
| <i>Cumulative Bulletin</i> (IRS), 1992-1 to 1999-2, 20 vols. | 1472.00 |
| <i>Decisions and Orders of the NLRB</i> , March 1991-Aug. 1999, vols. 302-328 (excluding vol. 310), 26 vols. | 2066.00 |
| <i>FTC Decisions</i> , 1992-1998, vols. 115-125, 11 vols. | 703.00 |
| <i>Public Papers of the Presidents</i> , William J. Clinton, 1993-1997, 10 vols. | 623.00 |
| <i>SEC Decisions and Reports</i> , Oct. 1992 - March 1999, vols. 51-53, 3 vols. | 219.00 |
| <i>Statutes at Large</i> , 103d-105th Congresses, vols. 107-112, 23 vols. | 1178.00 |
| <i>Tax Court Reports</i> , 1993-1999, vols. 100-113 (excluding vol. 111), 13 vols. | 512.40 |
| <i>U.S. Code</i> , 1994 edition, 35 vols. | 2397.00 |
| <i>U.S. Court of International Trade Reports</i> , 1992-1998, vols. 16-22, 7 vols. | 489.00 |
| <i>U.S. Reports</i> , March 1991-June 1999, vols. 499-526, 28 vols. | 1851.00 |
| TOTAL | 12,004.40 |

WILL MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC CONTINUE TO HAVE ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS, SPECIALIZED TOOLS, AND SKILLED REFERENCE LIBRARIANS IF THE LAW LIBRARY SURRENDERS ITS DEPOSITORY STATUS?

THIS IS NOT OUR MOTHERS' GPO.

Avoiding the outright purchase price of core legal documents is perhaps the prime attraction of the FDLP. Although document prices are modest, all savings are welcome in this everlasting era of declining budgets and escalating prices.

What about the cost of dealing with unwanted documents, those coloring books and other ephemera distributed under catchall categories like "General Publications" or "Handbooks, Manuals, Guides"? Well-tuned item selection and the decline in the sheer number of publications printed by federal agencies have together dramatically reduced this annoying occurrence.

STAFFING

Depository participation requires a variety of library staff to select, check-in, process, claim, catalog, and shelve. Moreover, staffing is needed to oversee program compliance, troubleshoot title format changes and cessations, manage computer equipment, and handle reference questions.

Assuming a law library has trimmed its item selection to ensure that it receives a high percentage of relevant and desired documents and a

very low percentage of unwanted documents, many duties would remain constant if titles were purchased. Staff would still check-in, claim, process, and provide bibliographic and physical access. Government documents are not (necessarily) more troublesome or problematic than are many other types of legal material, including looseleaf services, supplemented treatises, and volumes updated by pocket parts. In non-depository law libraries, computer equipment needs upgrades and maintenance. And patrons – even primary ones – continue to require sophisticated reference assistance.

In other areas, workloads would increase or change. Ordering, receiving, and claiming from commercial vendors or publishers would be necessary. Invoices would need to be handled. The librarian who oversees FDLP participation would no longer need to coordinate program compliance, complete the Biennial Survey of Depository Libraries and the annual Amendment of Item Selection, or face the twice-a-decade Self-Study and possible on-site inspection. A librarian would still need to select government documents for the collection, however, and without the FDLP, time identifying appropriate titles would increase. A librarian would still need to troubleshoot problems and contribute to the institution's collection development program. Budgeting responsibilities would be added. The increase in electronic resources, whether commercial or government, require high-level decisions regarding library policies; bottom line, the same policy questions of electronic access, control, and preservation still need to be asked and answered.

THE RIPPLE EFFECT

A depository librarian contemplating withdrawing from the FDLP must consider the effect of that action on people and entities outside of the individual library, including public users of legal and government information, other libraries, and the depository library community.

Will members of the public continue to have access to documents, specialized tools, and skilled reference librarians if the law library surrenders its depository status? Many publicly supported academic law libraries – such as the Gallagher Law Library – are open to users regardless of their affiliation with the law school or the parent university. Institutional policies coincide with the depository program's requirement on free public access.¹¹ These libraries welcome public users even if they were not obliged to do so because of their depository status. Some public and private law school depository libraries, however, honor the letter – but not the spirit – of the free public access provision. Their institutional missions are

INFOCURRENT AD



fundamentally at odds with the depository library program's goals. Under these circumstances, it is easy to understand why a few law libraries have already left the depository library program.

Virtually all law librarians strongly support the proposition that everyone should have access to legal materials and information about government programs and services. In fact, the American Association of Law Libraries' Government Relations Policy strongly supports that principle.¹² Law library depositories have played a crucial role in providing access to indispensable government information and, even more importantly, law librarians have applied their specialized knowledge about legal information to assist users in identifying, locating, and using legal materials. A large-scale exodus of law libraries from the depository library program would jeopardize access to legal and government information for some members of the public and may indeed undermine the already beleaguered FDLP.

Depository law librarians have undertaken these activities to ensure that the public has unimpeded access to government and legal materials. No other group within the AALL is more committed to this cause. Significant erosion in this group's numbers may diminish the AALL's ability to influence policy-makers and budget-crafters.

CONCLUSION

Librarians at each depository law library must balance the benefits and costs of continued participation in the Federal Depository Library Program. The GPO's commitment to the distribution of certain types of legal material in print is threatened by agency publication practices and continued congressional pressure to cut costs. At the same time, however, the dramatic increase in agency-produced electronic-only titles greatly intensifies the need for a central, organized information dissemination point. Now, and into the foreseeable future, that dissemination point is the Federal Depository Library Program. In this fluid environment, staying in the FDLP is not double trouble. Law librarians will still find compelling economic and practical reasons to stay.

ENDNOTES:

- 1 In response, the GPO issued the STUDY TO IDENTIFY MEASURES NECESSARY FOR A SUCCESSFUL TRANSITION TO A MORE ELECTRONIC FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM: REPORT TO CONGRESS (1996), http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/study/studyhtm.html.
- 2 Figures reported in Michael F. DiMario, *Prepared Statement Before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, on GPO's Appropriations Request for Fiscal Year 2002*, ADMIN. NOTES,

- July 1, 2001, at 1,8. http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad070101.html.
- 3 http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/estitles.html, dated 12/15/00.
- 4 Superintendent of Documents Policy Statement No. 71, http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/sod71.html. Effective date 1/2/01.
- 5 Includes tools and publications for depository management and the location and processing of depository materials, http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/index.html.
- 6 <http://govdoc.wichita.edu/ddm/GdocFrames.asp>.
- 7 <http://www.lib.memphis.edu/gpo/mig.htm>.
- 8 "Caution: In case of discrepancies between the print and electronic versions of these bound volume materials, the print versions control. . . . Because neither [the] GPO nor the Court has performed costly validation processes, the authenticity or completeness of the data cannot be verified. Only the bound volumes of the *United States Reports* contain the final, official text of the opinions of the Supreme Court." U.S. Supreme Court, "Information about Opinions," http://www.supremecourtus.gov/opinions/info_opinions.html. See also Superintendent of Documents Policy Statement 71, *supra* note 4. "When the product is available both online and in a tangible format the standard practice will be to disseminate the online version to depository libraries. A tangible product will be distributed only if the online version is . . . not recognized as official by the publishing agency."
- 9 Prices taken from U.S. GOVERNMENT SUBSCRIPTIONS CATALOG, Summer 2001, http://orders.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/sale/subscriptions/index.html.
- 10 Prices taken from the U.S. Government Online Bookstore, http://orders.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/sale/index.html, on July 25, 2001.
- 11 "Providing free access by the general public to the resources of the documents collection, including electronic resources, is a fundamental obligation of all Federal depository libraries . . ." INSTRUCTIONS TO DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES, Chapter 7, Public Service, A. Access, http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/instructions/in_ch7.html.
- 12 AALL *Government Relations Policy*, March 2001, <http://www.ll.georgetown.edu/aallwash/grpol.html>. ■

ALTHOUGH DOCUMENT PRICES ARE MODEST, ALL SAVINGS ARE WELCOME IN THIS EVERLASTING ERA OF DECLINING BUDGETS AND ESCALATING PRICES.

LIGHTS DEADLINE

■ ■ ■ Beginning with volume 45, number 1 (Fall 2001) *Law Library Lights* will be published on a quarterly basis. If you would like to write for *Lights*, please contact Leslie A. Lee, editor, at lights@llsdc.org or 202/994-2385. Submission deadlines for this year's remaining issues are as follows: November 2 (Winter 2001), February 1 (Spring 2002), and May 3 (Summer 2002).

WITHDRAWING FROM THE FDLP: A RESPONSIBLE SOLUTION

*Iris M. Lee
The George
Washington University
Law Library*

ALTHOUGH THE DECISION TO FAST TRACK THE AVAILABILITY OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT MAY FACILITATE INCREASED PUBLIC ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, IT ALSO PRESENTS CHALLENGES TO THE FDLP LIBRARIES.

WHEN I JOINED THE LAW LIBRARY STAFF AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (GW) IN THE FALL OF 1999, the librarians were in the process of evaluating the library's participation in the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). Feelings about the value of participating in the FDLP as it related to the library's mission ran very strong. Some members of the public services staff were very committed to the program as a means of public outreach by a private institution, while others felt it was important to reserve the institution's limited resources for its primary patrons, the law school community. Although technical services staff members were less visibly passionate about the issue, they were very concerned about finding alternative vendors to supply government materials, reclassifying depository items into the LC scheme, and withdrawing unwanted materials.

Before coming to GW, I had worked at two other academic law libraries: University of Richmond and Howard University. Both libraries are open to the public and Howard University participates in the depository program. From these experiences, I was comfortable working with public patrons and did not consider serving them a burden. The decision to maintain or drop depository status, however, must involve a cost-benefit analysis as well as consideration of other circumstances specific to the institution. At GW, I quickly saw substantial benefits to withdrawing from the FDLP. As the head of the department responsible for circulation, access, stack maintenance and supplementation of materials, I considered dropping out of the depository program as an opportunity to simplify some departmental issues and practices related to stacks maintenance and access.

COMPETITION FOR RESOURCES

The resolution to many problems in the law library at GW is constrained by a chronic lack of space. It is an ongoing challenge to find space for the collection, to provide the recommended percentage of seats for the student body, and to provide adequate workspace for the library staff. In the past two years, at least 43 patron seats have been removed in order to make room for shelving or staff workspace. Before these seats were lost, the percentage of seats to students was already below the level recommended by the American Association of Law Schools. Although the law school is considering a new law library building, such a change is at least several years away. In the interim, more patron seats are likely to be lost as the size of both the collection and the library staff continues to grow.

Removing access by depository patrons is a reasonable option when one considers that full-time law students at GW will pay over \$28,000 for tuition and fees this year. Restricting access can reduce competition not only for seats, but also for research materials. Although the library has multiple copies of the federal reporters, regional reporters and U.S. codes, there are times when none of the copies of a particular volume is available for a student who is trying to finish a class assignment. Moreover, at GW, I have also noticed much less theft and damage to the library's collection of practitioner aids and looseleaf services than was routinely discovered at Howard University, which is open to the public and host to many local attorneys living near the law library.

ACCESS LOOPHOLE

Because space shortage is not a new problem, the library has had seemingly harsh access policies in place for several years. The library does not have a blanket open access policy to students from other local law schools; access is generally granted if a student from another area law school seeks to use items which are not available at his/her law school's library. A student from another law school is required to have a letter requesting access signed by a librarian at his/her school. If a student arrives without a letter, a reference librarian is likely to check the availability of the item requested to verify its holdings at local libraries.

Requests for access from attorneys are routinely denied so that the library is not inundated with patrons who are not affiliated with the law school. Even the undergraduates at GW do not have unfettered access to the law library. Unless they have a class assignment which requires the use of legal materials, undergraduates may not enter the law library; moreover, GW undergraduates needing to check out books from the law library must request an interlibrary loan through the University library. In a sense, the withdrawal from the FDLP closed a huge loophole in the library's already restricted access policy.

Another problem related to permitting access by depository patrons was how to train the circulation staff to determine which public patrons should be granted access. Many patrons seeking to use government information are not aware of the FDLP or their rights within the FDLP libraries. To minimize confusion and ensure adherence to the FDLP guidelines, public patrons were routinely referred to the reference desk. Reference librarians determined if



the information sought entitled the patron to admission under the FDLP guidelines.

During the hours that the reference desk was closed, however, the decision fell on the circulation staff, some of whom (comprising full-time staff and student assistants) were ill-equipped to make the determination. More extensive training of the circulation staff about government documents was viewed as an opening for them to provide reference assistance and/or legal advice. In an effort not to place the circulation staff in the awkward position of providing reference service and to avoid confusion as to patrons' expectations of the types of services rendered at the circulation and reference desks, circulation assistants were instructed to tell public patrons to call the reference desk during the hours it is staffed.

ELECTRONIC MEDIA NOT A PANACEA

Although the decision to fast track the availability of government documents in electronic format may facilitate increased public access to government information, it also presents challenges to the FDLP libraries. At GW, the law library faced several challenges in providing access to electronic media. One concern involved the library's computer network; access to computers had to be provided without compromising the security of the library's network. Countless hours were spent attempting to network a CDROM tower in order to provide access to government documents. In terms of providing access to Web-based government documents, the library faced the question: to filter or not to filter? In the end, the simplest way to provide access to electronic media was for the library to allocate resources to set up a stand alone computer for the FDLP patrons to access CDs, DVDs and government Internet resources. Although electronic media is not a panacea for all depository issues, it has reduced the amount of materials of questionable value such as coloring books and shopping bags included in the FDLP shipments. Flyers advertising government CDROM titles, however, continue to be popular items in the shipments. The first time I came across a flyer (advertising the *U.S. Code* on CDROM) sitting on a book truck with other new items to be shelved, I accused the head of cataloging of making a bad joke. She tried her best to assure me that the library had to shelve the flyer and maintain it for five years in accordance to the FDLP guidelines. It was not until after the government documents librarian confirmed the need to keep the flyer, and other ephemeral materials, that I realized it was not a joke.

CONCLUSION

Certainly, the FDLP offers a major advantage to participating libraries: free and uncomplicated acquisition of government materials. Fortunately, the budgetary issues associated with dropping the program were not difficult for GW to overcome. The law school supported the decision by increasing the library budget to accommodate purchasing of government documents previously obtained through the FDLP. For many institutions the budgetary issue may be a bigger hurdle to overcome.

A major concern of withdrawing from the FDLP was the potential public relations fall out. How would our decision be viewed by government documents patrons and the law library community? Surprisingly our most frequent and infamous depository patrons had little or no reaction when informed of the change during their last visit to the library. Even if public patrons had protested the withdrawal, the library had made a decision in the best interest of GW's law school community. As there are so many outlets for government information in Washington, D.C., in the end, the library's decision to fulfil its obligation to its primary patrons was the most balanced choice. ■

A MAJOR CONCERN OF WITHDRAWING FROM THE FDLP WAS THE POTENTIAL PUBLIC RELATIONS FALL OUT. HOW WOULD OUR DECISION BE VIEWED BY GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS PATRONS AND THE LAW LIBRARY COMMUNITY?

**ALERT PUBLICATIONS
AD**

FEDERAL AGENCY LIBRARIES AS FEDERAL DEPOSITORIES

Rick McKinney
Federal Reserve Board
Law Library

BECAUSE OF SECURITY ISSUES, PUBLIC ACCESS REPRESENTS ONE OF THE MAJOR CHALLENGES FACING FEDERAL AGENCY DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES.

A BRIEF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) had its beginnings in the congressional resolution of December 27, 1813, which provided not only for the printing of the House and Senate public journals, acts, and other documents, but also for their distribution to the library of the United States and to the executives, legislatures, universities, colleges, and state historical societies of every state and territory of the country.¹ Perhaps Congress was prescient; eight months later, the British burned down the U.S. Capitol building, thus giving the new nation first hand experience on the need to deposit its official documents in more than one place.

The depository library program continued to develop in the 19th century with the addition of various depositories designated by the Secretary of State and later by the Secretary of the Interior whose office also distributed the publications.² In 1859 U.S. senators and representatives were authorized to designate depositories to the Secretary;³ these and other provisions of the depository program were codified in the Revised Statutes of 1878.⁴

In the Act of January 12, 1895, the Government Printing Office (GPO) was established as a separate entity, within which, the Superintendent of Documents was granted authority to supervise the sale of government publications and to provide free distribution of the materials to depositories. The Act also provided that the libraries of the eight executive departments and two military academies be designated as depositories and receive one copy of each federal government publication.⁵

The Depository Library Act of 1962 expanded the number of agencies designated as depositories. Section 7 of that Act amended the 1895 law to provide that, after certification of need by the head of an independent agency or executive department, other libraries from those executive departments or independent agencies may be designated as depositories as long as the number did not exceed the number of major bureaus or divisions of those departments and agencies. The section also provided that, unlike other depositories (*i.e.*, state regional, state court, land-grant, law school, or those others designated by a U.S. representative or senator), depository libraries in agency or executive departments were authorized to dispose of unwanted government publications after first offering them to the Library of Congress and the Archivist of the United States.⁶

In 1968, the FDLP was codified via Public Law 90-620 as Chapter 19 of Title 44 of the *U.S. Code*. Section 1907, in particular, concerns agen-

cy libraries. Of the more than 1,300 federal depository libraries in the country today, approximately 62 of them are considered federal agency libraries including U.S. court libraries and military academy libraries; 37 of these federal depository agency libraries are in the Washington, D.C. area.

SECURITY AND ACCESS ISSUES

Because of security issues, public access represents one of the major challenges facing federal agency depository libraries. Participation in the depository library program entails allowing public access during the agency's regular business hours. If there is a conflict between that priority and the need for agency security (or for other reasons such as inconvenience, staffing shortages, etc.), agency libraries have been advised to reassess their depository status. Notably, a number of federal agency libraries have dropped out of the program in recent years. A less drastic measure is to restrict access to the depository collection only. If the library's access policy treats all outside patrons in the same manner, the library may apply additional constraints on access. Examples include requiring appointments in advance, requiring visitors to show proper identification, having visitors conform to standard entrance security procedures, having visitors physically accompanied to and from areas within the library, and charging for or placing limits on photocopying. Furthermore, the library may refuse access to persons if it is plain that the patron is using the library's depository status as a pretext to gain entrance, or if the patron violates a code of conduct established by the library.

ACQUISITION AND COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Although rarely done, an agency library that drops out of the FDLP can potentially be asked by the Library of Congress to give up all or part of its past depository collection to another or new agency depository library. Federal agencies facing this possibility are not completely at a loss. Aside from obtaining government documents via depository status or by purchasing titles, agency libraries can acquire GPO publications at a substantial discount through a procedure known as "riding the jacket." Riding the jacket provides agency libraries with the opportunity to submit one requisition for multiple copies of a forthcoming publication at a cost limited to the printing costs of the additional copies. Future publication jacket numbers can be obtained by contacting the GPO. Oddly enough, the GPO, itself, does not enjoy this same privilege.



Another important issue involves collection development policy. Each depository library should have a written collection development policy explaining such matters as to whom the library serves, the criteria for item selection, collection intensities, formats chosen, weeding schedule, disposal procedures, etc. A piece-level record is required such as is normal in shelf lists and other bibliographical controls. So long as items are available electronically on GPO Access, agency libraries can delete them from selection, even if they are part of the suggested basic collection for all depository libraries. GPO Access is required to maintain its own electronic material in perpetuity and it is working with various other agencies, including the National Library of Medicine, the Census Bureau, the U.S. Institute of Peace, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics to establish agreements stating that the respective agencies will provide permanent public access to agency electronic materials.

WEEDING AND DISPOSAL ISSUES

Another topic of concern to federal agency libraries is the disposal of depository material. Pursuant to Title 44, section 1907 of the *U.S. Code*, unlike all other federal depository libraries, depository libraries in executive departments and independent agencies may weed publications upon receipt. They are required neither to hold government publications for five years nor to offer their weeded collections to the regional library or other depository libraries. Instead, unwanted government publications are offered to the Exchange and Gifts Division of the Library of Congress and the Archivist of the United States. In all practicality, however, there are very few government publications that either institution is willing to take (certainly no unbound publications like congressional hearings). Thus, the disposal of weeded materials is generally left to the discretion of the agency library. Agency libraries are encouraged, however, to offer them to other area libraries, announce their availability on library listservs, and pursue other arrangements. It is noted by the author that similar exceptions for agency disposal procedures of library materials have not been placed in any proposed Title 44 reform legislation such as S. 2288, introduced and reported in the 105th Congress.

CONCLUSION

Federal agency depository libraries have been serving the information needs of the public and the staff at their agencies for over 100 years. Let us hope their service continues through the next century.

APPENDIX: DERIVATION OF CHAPTER 19 OF TITLE 44 OF THE U.S. CODE, THE FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Sec. 1901. Definition of Government publication. (Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 1, 76 Stat. 352).

Sec. 1902. Availability of Government publications through Superintendent of Documents; lists of publications not ordered from Government Printing Office. (Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 1, 76 Stat. 352).

Sec. 1903. Distribution of publications to depositories; notice to Government components; cost of printing and binding. (Mar. 1, 1907, ch. 2284, § 4, 34 Stat. 1014; June 25, 1938, ch. 708, 52 Stat. 1206; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 5, 76 Stat. 354).

Sec. 1904. Classified list of Government publications for selection by depositories. (R.S. § 502; Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, § 53, 61, 28 Stat. 608, 610; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 3, 76 Stat. 353).

Sec. 1905. Distribution to depositories; designation of additional libraries; justification; authorization for certain designations. (R.S. § 501; Mar. 1, 1907, ch. 2284, § 4, 34 Stat. 1014; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 2, 76 Stat. 353).

Sec. 1906. Land-grant colleges constituted depositories. (Mar. 1, 1907, ch. 2284, § 4, 34 Stat. 1014; June 25, 1938, ch. 708, 52 Stat. 1206; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, 76 Stat. 354).

Sec. 1907. Libraries of executive departments, service academies, and independent agencies constituted depositories; certifications of need; disposal of unwanted publications. (Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, § 98, 28 Stat. 624; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 7, 76 Stat. 355).

Sec. 1908. American Antiquarian Society to receive certain publications. (Dec. 1, 1814, No. 7, 3 Stat. 248).

Sec. 1909. Requirements of depository libraries; reports on conditions; investigations; termination; replacement. (Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, § 70, 28 Stat. 612; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 6, 76 Stat. 354).

Sec. 1910. Designations of replacement depositories; limitations on numbers; conditions. (June 23, 1913, ch. 3, § 5, 38 Stat. 75; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 4, 76 Stat. 353).

ASIDE FROM OBTAINING GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS VIA DEPOSITORY STATUS OR BY PURCHASING TITLES, AGENCY LIBRARIES CAN ACQUIRE GPO PUBLICATIONS AT A SUBSTANTIAL DISCOUNT THROUGH A PROCEDURE KNOWN AS 'RIDING THE JACKET.'

Sec. 1911. Free use of Government publications in depositories; disposal of unwanted publications. (Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, § 74, 28 Stat. 620; June 20, 1936, ch. 630, title VII, § 11, 49 Stat. 1552; Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 8, 76 Stat. 355).

Sec. 1912. Regional depositories; designation; functions; disposal of publications. (Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 9, 76 Stat. 355.).

Sec. 1913. Appropriations for supplying depository libraries; restriction. (June 27, 1956, ch. 453, § 101, 70 Stat. 369).

Sec. 1914. Implementation of depository library program by Public Printer. (Aug. 9, 1962, Pub. L. No. 87-579, § 10, 76 Stat. 356).

Sec. 1915. Highest State appellate court libraries as depository libraries. (Added Aug. 10, 1972, Pub. L. No. 92-368, § 1(a), 86 Stat. 507.)

Sec. 1916. Designation of libraries of accredited law schools as depository libraries. (Added Apr. 17, 1978, Pub. L. No. 95-261, § 1, 92 Stat. 199.)

ENDNOTES:

1 Resolution of Dec. 27, 1813, Res. 1, 13th Cong., 3 Stat. 140.

2 Act of Jan. 28, 1857, Res. No. 5, § 3, 34th Cong., 11 Stat. 253.

3 Act of Feb. 5, 1859, Ch. 22, § 5, 35th Cong., 11 Stat. 380.

4 Revised Statutes of 1878, §§ 501-511, 18 Stat. 82.

5 Act of Jan. 12, 1895, Ch. 23, § 98, 28 Stat. 624.

6 Depository Library Act of 1962, Pub. L. 87-579, § 7, 76 Stat. 355. ■

**LLSDC INTERNET
LISTSERV**

■ ■ ■ The LLSDC's listserv is offered to provide effective communication and resource sharing among members of the Law Librarians' Society of Washington D.C.

To subscribe, send a message to **listproc@gmu.edu**. Leave the subject line blank, and enter into the text of the message: *sub llsc* [First Name] [Last Name].

To post a message, send a message to **llsc@gmu.edu**.

To unsubscribe, send a message to **listproc@gmu.edu**. Leave the subject line blank, and enter into the text of the message: *unsubscribe llsc* [OR: *signoff llsc*].

For questions regarding a subscription or potential problems with receiving listserv messages, please send a message to **listadmin@llsc.org**.

WEST AD

Editor's Note: The following article summarizes a presentation by Francis J. Buckley, Jr., who participated in a panel program, entitled "New Agency Roles in Ensuring the Life Cycle of Electronic Government Information - Is the Federal Government Meeting Public Interest Needs?" at the 94th Annual Meeting and Conference of the American Association of Law Libraries in Minneapolis, MN in July 2001.

INTRODUCTION

The Government Printing Office (GPO) is viewed as a trustee for ensuring permanent public access to print and electronic government information. The Printing Act of 1895¹ codifying the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) in its present form, with some enhancements and additions over time, has been called the nation's first Freedom of Information act. It incorporates provisions for a cross-agency index and catalog of government publications, as well as for the collection and dissemination of government information products to libraries across the country to facilitate free public access to federal government publications. This article will outline initiatives and activities undertaken by the GPO to ensure permanent public access to government information through the FDLP and GPO Access.

Title 44, Section 1901 of the *U.S. Code* states: "Government publication," as used in this chapter, means informational matter which is published as an individual document at Government expense, or as required by law." Further, Title 44, Section 1902 states: "Government publications, except those determined by their issuing components to be required for official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security, shall be made available to depository libraries through the facilities of the Superintendent of Documents for public information." This is a very broad mandate. Historically, the GPO has distributed tangible publications to selective and regional depository libraries throughout the country for decentralized public access. The regional libraries have had permanent retention requirements for all materials not ephemeral or superseded. The mandate for disseminating government publications in online format has been reinforced by the Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993.²

ELECTRONIC TRANSITION

The depository program is currently undergoing the biggest transformation in its history. In only

a few short years, the GPO has moved from a late 19th/early 20th century model of printing and dissemination of government information to a 21st century model of mixed, albeit primarily electronic, media.

The move to microfiche in the 1970s was certainly significant, but does not compare with the electronic transition. This change has reflected legislative mandates to use new technology, primarily from an appropriations perspective. In 1994, it was suggested that the GPO convert the program to an entirely electronic format. Those proposals were a bit ahead of their time. In a subsequent study, the GPO proposed a five to seven year transition period to a more electronic depository library program in tandem with federal agencies' use of electronic formats and the ability of depository libraries and the public to use the information in those formats. Electronic publishing has grown at an enormous rate.

The electronic content in the FDLP is steadily rising. For the first six months of FY 2001, 62 percent of the new titles were electronic, compared to FY 2000 when 53 percent of the new FDLP titles made available were disseminated electronically.³ In this Internet environment, the GPO adds value to a wide range of electronic government publications through updated versions of its traditional functions; that is, the GPO continuously identifies, evaluates, selects, organizes and catalogs electronic government information products. Further, the GPO recognizes that it must assure that these government publications remain permanently accessible to the public since it no longer provides copies for library retention. The GPO is maintaining the electronic information products appropriate for the FDLP either on its servers, via agreements with the issuing agencies, or via partnership agreements with depository libraries or vendors/contractors. Indeed, the challenge is to replicate what works well from the older (depository library) model and make improvements based on what technology demands and allows.

LIBRARY DIRECTORS' SURVEY

Earlier this spring, members of the GPO's Library Programs Service (LPS) staff conducted an informal poll consisting of nine questions directed to library administrators in the FDLP. This survey was designed to provide feedback on the GPO's performance as well as to assess some common assumptions about participation in the depository program. Thirty depository libraries were contacted according to the proportional makeup of the program: 50 percent academic, 20 percent public, 12 percent law, and 18 percent other (which included community colleges, state libraries and courts).⁴ The survey also

THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE IN ENSURING THE LIFE CYCLE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

*Francis J. Buckley, Jr.,
& Sandy Morton-Schwalb,
U.S. Government
Printing Office*

IN ONLY A FEW SHORT YEARS, THE GPO HAS MOVED FROM A LATE 19TH/EARLY 20TH CENTURY MODEL OF PRINTING AND DISSEMINATION OF GOVERNMENT INFORMATION TO A 21ST CENTURY MODEL OF MIXED, ALBEIT PRIMARILY ELECTRONIC, MEDIA.

took into consideration geographic distribution.

The results indicated strong support among directors not only for the FDLP, but also for the GPO's electronic transition. The results supported the GPO's belief that libraries are remaining active in the program because it continues to provide value that would be difficult and costly to obtain otherwise. In particular, in response to the statement: "Depository designation provides a single channel for acquiring a body of resources, which would otherwise be difficult and/or time consuming for us to acquire," 69 percent strongly agreed and seventeen percent agreed. Likewise, in response to the statement: "Depository designation functions as a channel for us to acquire materials for the collection at low or no cost," 66 percent strongly agreed and 21 percent agreed. Finally, in response to the statement: "Because so much government information is available online, there is a diminished need for a depository program that discovers, catalogs and assures stable, ongoing access to Government information," 55 percent strongly disagreed and 21 percent disagreed.⁵

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM ELECTRONIC COLLECTION (FDLP/EC)⁶

In 1998, the GPO released "Managing the FDLP

Electronic Collection: A Policy and Planning Document" (FDLP/EC Plan), which applied traditional library principles to the creation of a comprehensive digital library of federal agency electronic publications. The document gave the FDLP/EC not only its name but also its basic structure. Collectively, the universe of federal government electronic publications in the FDLP/EC includes:

1. Core legislative and regulatory GPO Access products that reside permanently on the GPO servers (e.g., *Congressional Record*, bills, slip laws, House and Senate reports and documents);
2. Products which the GPO manages on the GPO Access site, and content partnerships;
3. Products that the GPO identifies, describes, and links to but which remain under the control of the originating agencies;
4. Tangible electronic government information products distributed to federal depository libraries (e.g., CDROM, DVD, floppy disk).

Key areas of activity that comprise the architecture for the FDLP/EC collection were identified as follows:

1. Intake, including discovery, evaluation, selection and acquisition;
2. Registry, including item number/classifica-

**AALL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP:
NEW PERSPECTIVES ON LAW LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS
AND COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT**



This two-day workshop examines the intricacies of selecting and purchasing legal information in an electronic world. Registration forms are available at <http://www.aallnet.org/prodev/> or call Mary Jawgiel, AALL Education Manager, at 312/939-4764 ext. 24.

DATES

November 2-3, 2001

LOCATION

American University, Washington College of Law, Washington, D.C.

REGISTRATION FEE*

\$619 for non-AALL members; \$495 for AALL members; \$415 for student, non-AALL members; \$329 for AALL student members.

* LLSDC is sponsoring a grant for this program; for details, contact Bill Ryan at wryan@wcl.american.edu or 202/247-4331. In addition, AALL will award free registration to one lucky LLSDC member registrant at the program.



tion assignment and a New Electronic Titles (NET) list;

3. Cataloging and Locators, including the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (CGP), the use of Persistent Uniform Resource Locators (PURLs), and the Browse Topics service made possible in partnership with University of Central Oklahoma Chambers Library;
4. Storage, including the FDLP/EC archive, partner archives, agency agreements, and vendors and contractors;
5. User Interface of GPO Access as described in Superintendent of Documents' "Dissemination/Distribution Policy for the FDLP" (SOD 71);⁷
6. Permanent Public Access, including agreements with agencies willing to guarantee that their publications will remain permanently available on the Web, from the agency server; agreements with partner sites such as the University of Illinois-Chicago and North Texas; archives of core legislative and regulatory material on GPO Access;⁸ and potential archives on servers operated by contractors/vendors.⁹

CONCLUSION

Notably, the concerns addressed in this article are not new but simply placed in a new context. There are many paths to explore when it comes to ensuring permanent public access to government information. The GPO plans to be there every step of the way.

ENDNOTES

- 1 An Act Providing for the Public Printing and Binding and the Distribution of Public Documents, ch. 23, 28 Stat. 601 (1895).
- 2 Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-40, 107 Stat. 112 (codified as amended at 44 U.S.C. §§ 4101-4104 (1994)).
- 3 *Prepared Statement Before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, on [the] GPO's Appropriations Request for Fiscal Year 2002*, ADMIN NOTES July 1, 2001, at 1,8.
- 4 Figures reported in *Depository Library Directors' Survey Results Summarized*, ADMIN NOTES, July 15, 2001, at 13.
- 5 *Id.* at 14.
- 6 Note that frequently asked questions and answers about the FDLP/EC can be found on the GPO's Web site at www.gpo.gov/fdlpdesktop.
- 7 SOD 71 emphasized that online electronic format is the preferred distribution medium for the FDLP, except when the online version is incomplete; the online version is not recognized as official by the issuing agency; the online version is unreliable (*i.e.*, the content is replaced without notice); the tangible product is of significant reference value; the online version poses a significant barrier to access; the tan-

gible product is intended to serve a special needs population; there is a legal requirement to distribute the product in a tangible format; or the costs exceed those for print versions.

- 8 The GPO's archiving effort is in full operation for publications that meet the following criteria: electronic only in the FDLP (*i.e.*, no paper distribution); not covered by an agency agreement; not included in a depository partnership; and available only in a proprietary format or with proprietary access software.

9 http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/ecplan.html, dated 10/1/98. ■

LLSDC PUBLICATIONS

■ ■ ■ The holidays are right around the corner. Send the perfect gift to your loved ones: a subscription to *Lights*! Order forms for *Lights* and other LLSDC publications are available at http://www.llsdc.org/committees/publications/publications_list.htm or by contacting the LLSDC Management Company at 703/619-5033.

INDEED, THE CHALLENGE IS TO REPLICATE WHAT WORKS WELL FROM THE OLDER (DEPOSITORY LIBRARY) MODEL AND MAKE IMPROVEMENTS BASED ON WHAT TECHNOLOGY DEMANDS AND ALLOWS.

TLC AD

FUGITIVE GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Jan Oberla
U.S. Department of
Justice Main Library

**AN ESTIMATED
HALF OF ALL
GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION,
HOWEVER, LACKS
THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC
CONTROL AND
DISTRIBUTION
MECHANISM
PROVIDED BY
THE FDLP.**

WHEN YOU HEAR THE WORD "FUGITIVE" WHAT IMAGE POPS INTO YOUR HEAD? A crook on the lam? Faces on the Post Office wall? Harrison Ford as Dr. Richard Kimball? Perhaps not as exciting, but nevertheless vital to librarians and seekers of government information are fugitive documents.

Veteran government documents librarians will recognize that term, which describes publications that have not been integrated into the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). As part of the Government Printing Office (GPO), the FDLP is a federally mandated program for distributing government information to a nationwide network of designated libraries.¹ For others unacquainted with fugitive documents, this article provides some background and explains why fugitive documents matter to law librarians

In the past, fugitive status usually implied inaccessibility to a print or tangible document. Some of these issues were described in testimony before Congress on S.2288, a 1998 bill calling for remedies. According to Dan O'Mahony, speaking in his capacity as chair of the Inter-Agency Working Group on Government Information Policy:

when a government publication is "fugitive" and thus not in the depository program, that publication is not cataloged, so the public does not know that it even exists. The publication is not disseminated to depository libraries, so it is not conveniently available to the public even if somehow they were to learn of its existence.²

Electronic publications can be just as elusive. By their very nature they often lack the same type of publication trail as print materials. Without a standard announcement mechanism, such as a publisher's catalog or publicity announcement, they can easily escape notice. Another concern is that after their first appearance, electronic publications are more likely to be transitory, disappearing as suddenly as they arrived with no notice or warning.

HOW MANY FUGITIVES ON THE LOOSE?

Are fugitive documents just a minor annoyance or a major void? Defining the problem is akin to the case of the dog that did not bark. How can one tell when something *isn't* there? Determining how many items have been missed is, at best, a guess. Clouding the issue are differing opinions as to what constitutes a "publication" or even "government information"; as such, the scope of the problem is hard to determine. An estimated half of all government information, however, lacks the bib-

liographic control and distribution mechanism provided by the FDLP. Scientific and technical reports seem to make up a large part of the total, but many other general interest or law-related items are involved, including Congressional Research reports and federal court publications.³

Regardless of format, government documents can escape the provisions of the law for a variety of reasons. In 1997, the FDLP itself identified several factors:

1. electronic information dissemination via agency Web sites without notification to the FDLP;
2. the decreasing compliance with statutory requirements for agencies to print through [the] GPO or to provide copies of publications not printed through [the] GPO to the FDLP;
3. the increasing trend for agencies to establish exclusive arrangements with private sector entities that place copyright or copyright-like restrictions on the products involved in such agreements; and
4. increasing use by agencies of language in 44 U.S.C. § 1903 that permits publications to be excluded if they are "so-called cooperative publications which must necessarily be sold in order to be self-sustaining."⁴

Thus, recognition of the situation traces back several years. Legislative proposals to add new language or improve enforcement of the existing law have never quite made it to that goal, despite the hard work of library organizations such as the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) and the American Library Association's Government Documents Roundtable (ALA GODORT). Members of these and other groups formed the abovementioned Inter-Association Working Group on Government Information Policy to coordinate the lobbying effort.⁵ Some of these concerns as they relate to electronic information are addressed in S.803, the E-Government Act of 2001, introduced in the 107th Congress. Nothing has been reintroduced that attempts to rectify the print problem. Realistically, in view of the increasingly online nature of our society, print fugitive documents will probably not be the focus of any new legislation.

TRACKING 'EM DOWN

Considering the difficulty in getting new legislation passed, what can be done now? For some time, small voluntary efforts have undoubtedly been taking place. At least in the arena of electronic publications, a new, more coordinated project is also underway. Library associations and groups are working systematically to identify fugitive documents by monitoring govern-



ment agency Web sites for new titles and submitting items to the GPO.

Within the AALL, the Government Documents Special Interest Section (GD-SIS) has formed a Fugitive and Electronic-Only Documents Committee. Volunteers and committee members track agency Web sites to determine if they include law-related documents that are not reflected in the GPO indexes. Likewise, the ALA's GODORT established a committee with a similar purpose composed of 30 members; leaders from this group met earlier this year with the GPO to iron out procedures and workflow.⁶ While some duplication between the two groups might exist, the focus of each is slightly different—general government documents for the GODORT versus law-related for the AALL. Coordination of efforts between them should assure coverage of important sites to identify relevant titles.

The GPO has developed a new tool to assist volunteers in monitoring agency Web sites, "Internet Information Product Notification Form" at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/forms/epubs/index.html. The form requests data on authorship, electronic access, characteristics and purpose of the publication, and contact details. The same form can also be used to correct or change URLs. Another mechanism is AskLPS at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/tools/asklpsin.html, which is used by depository libraries for these and other questions. Other efforts include an "Adopt an Agency" initiative in which library volunteers develop contacts within federal agencies to assist them in tracking down new titles. The ALA and AALL committees mentioned above are also leading this activity.

SO WHAT?

These projects demonstrate that many librarians are getting involved to solve the fugitive documents problem. Should law librarians worry about it? Robert Oakley, Washington Affairs Representative for the AALL, noted that fugitive documents represent:

a loss to the public of important government publications that have been created by agencies through taxpayer dollars. It nullifies the important principle to which each of us is committed—that our democracy is based on the right of all American citizens to be informed about their government and to participate in its activities.⁷

While a coordinated government-wide policy would be desirable, efforts among agencies, volunteer librarians, and the GPO can work towards bridging the gap that prevents citizens from finding the information they need.

ENDNOTES:

- 1 44 U.S.C. § 1902 (1994).
- 2 *Wendell H. Ford Government Publications Reform Act of 1998: Hearing on S.2288 Before the Senate Comm. on Rules and Administration*, 105th Cong.11 (1998) (statement of Daniel P. O'Mahony, Coordinator for Government Documents and Social Sciences Data Services, Brown University, and Chair, Inter-Association Working Group on Government Information Policy). Also at <http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/GODORT/980729dpo.html>.
- 3 *Title 44, U.S. Code — Proposals for Revision; Hearings Before the Committee on Rules and Administration of the United States Senate on Proposal for Revision of Title 44, U.S. Code, the Printing Statute*, 105th Cong. Appendix 3C, "Fugitive Documents: Scope and Solutions," 353-4 (1998).
- 4 *Id.* at 354.
- 5 Members include the American Association of Law Libraries, the American Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, the Medical Library Association, the Special Libraries Association and the Urban Libraries Council.
- 6 *GPO Update: Remarks by Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents, Before the Federal Documents Task Force*, ADMIN NOTES, July 15, 2001, at 19-20. Also at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/adnotes.pdf.
- 7 *Wendell H. Ford Government Publications Reform Act of 1998: Hearing on S.2288 Before the Senate Comm. on Rules and Administration*, 105th Cong.98 (1998) (response from Robert L. Oakley, Washington Affairs Representative for the American Association of Law Libraries, to question for the hearing record from Senator John Warner, Chair, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration). Also at <http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/GODORT/980729roqa.html>. ■

LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS AND GROUPS ARE WORKING SYSTEMATICALLY TO IDENTIFY FUGITIVE DOCUMENTS.

A REMINDER FOR ALL PLANNERS OF SOCIETY EVENTS



ALL MEETINGS, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS and other LLSDC events must be coordinated on the Society's master calendar. Each person who is planning a meeting must check with Susan Ryan, corresponding secretary, at 202/662-9142 or ryan@law.georgetown.edu, to ensure that the date is available, and that the function does not conflict with any other gathering. A current list of scheduled LLSDC activities is available at <http://www.llsdc.org/calendar.htm>.



A NEW HOME FOR THE HOWARD UNIVERSITY LAW LIBRARY

*Helane Davis
Howard University
Law Library*

THE HIGHLIGHT OF THE FIRST FLOOR IS THE LIBRARY'S ELEGANT, LIT MAIN STAIRCASE — A TRANSITION BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND FLOORS THAT IS BOTH STRIKING AND INVITING.

ON MAY 25, 2001, THE HOWARD UNIVERSITY LAW LIBRARY COMPLETED A MOVE INTO ITS NEW BUILDING. After years of planning and a two-week move, the new library — completed at an estimated cost of \$20 million — reopened on May 29.

THE NEW VERSUS THE OLD

The new building is located adjacent to the library's old home, and like that previous home, is a standalone structure from the other law school campus buildings. The positioning of the new crescent-shaped structure forms a courtyard between it and the other buildings on Howard's West Campus; students have already been spotted relaxing in this new space.

The new library building measures approximately 70,000 square feet, and comprises four floors and a basement. It features a computer lab, a Reserve Reading Room, study rooms, a Faculty Reading Room, a Special Collections suite, a classroom, and a terrace. The structure has two elevators, and all public entrances are fitted with automatic opening devices.

ALL THE AMENITIES

Upon entering the building, the first thing that catches the eye is the two-story entryway, proud home to the University's seal. This entryway, and the immediate area outside the main doors, will ultimately feature bricks inscribed with the names of donors, contributors, and friends of the law library and the law school. Once inside the foyer, visitors can enter the library, the computer lab, or the training classroom. The classroom is a "smart" room that allows professors to use a variety of media to enhance the learning experience. The computer lab contains both PCs and Macs from which students will be able to access a variety of software, university e-mail accounts, and the Internet.

At the library's entrance lies the circulation desk. Adjacent to the circulation area is the Reserve Reading Room — a self-contained research room for reserve materials that had been shelved behind the circulation desk in the old library. In addition to the reserve materials, this room contains an OPAC terminal, study tables and chairs, and a copier. Also located on the first floor are the Administration, Technical Services, A/V, and IT offices, and a staff lounge.

The highlight of the first floor is the library's elegant, lit main staircase — a transition between the first and second floors that is both striking and inviting. At the top of the staircase is the library's main reading room. With high windows that

extend all four floors to the ceiling, this room is the perfect setting for the library's largest seating area. The reference desk and local collections (District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia) are housed on this floor, as are the reference offices, a Popular Reading Room (outfitted with comfortable, overstuffed chairs), study rooms for individual and group study, and study carrels. To accommodate the growing demand for access to computer-assisted legal research sources, two small labs — one each dedicated to WESTLAW and LEXIS — have been created on this floor.

Additional group study rooms and study carrels are available on the third floor, as is the Faculty Reading Room. Faculty will be able to perform research in this room, and check out books to designated shelves.

The fourth floor houses an ample Special Collections area, complete with temperature-controlled rare book stacks. This space will be the site of future work on the library's extensive civil rights papers, including the papers of Phineas Indritz, a prominent civil rights attorney and Washingtonian. The library's formal conference room is also on the fourth floor, as are study carrels, and a terrace that runs along the northwest corner of the building.

As a private law library that is open to public patrons, the library is dedicated to providing patrons with easy and appropriate access to the collection. To that end, there are OPAC terminals available on each floor: one across from the circulation desk on the first floor, and two on each of the stack levels (second, third, and fourth floors).

Other conveniences include study carrels and tables equipped with data jacks and power outlets.

PART OF THE LEGACY

This significant addition to the law school campus will be part of the lasting legacy of not only the administrators whose vision inspired the conception, construction and inauguration of the new law library, but also every staff member involved in the planning, opening and operating of the new law library building. We invite you to come and visit us in our new home! ■

**WE APPRECIATE OUR ADVERTISERS ...
SO WHEN YOU USE THEIR SERVICES,
TELL THEM YOU SAW IT IN LAW
LIBRARY LIGHTS!**



BNA AD



HOT TOPIC: INCREDIBLE SHRINKING LIBRARY

Beth Langton
Buckingham,
Doolittle &
Burroughs, LLP
Akron, Ohio

THE LIBRARY ACCOMMODATED THE REDUCED BUDGET... BY REMOVING THOSE EXPENSES THAT DID NOT BELONG IN THE LIBRARY BUDGET....

Editor's Note: The following articles summarize a presentation by Beth Langton and Kate Kennedy for the program, "The Incredible Shrinking Library," which was presented to the Ohio Regional Association of Law Libraries in October, 2000 and the American Association of Law Libraries in Minneapolis in July, 2001.

True or false:

1. Books and subscriptions are perceived as being expensive.
2. Law firms look for ways to control costs.
3. When we grow, we typically need more space.
4. There is a perception that everything is online and that Web resources are always free.
5. Researchers seem to be spending more time researching at their desktops and less time actually inside the library.

If you responded "true" to these statements, then you probably agree that they are the reasons law firms are asking, *Do we really need the library?* In this article, I will share my experience with downsizing a law firm library. I will also share some tips intended to assist not only librarians who are currently in the process of downsizing, but also those who are facing a future reduction in their budget or physical space.

Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs began to consider downsizing the library in 1997. Since then most of the library downsizing issues have been related to the budget. It was important for the firm not only to balance the collection between print and electronic resources, but also to make sure that it was spending its money wisely.

GOING VIRTUAL

Some members of the firm desired moving to a completely virtual library. The Library Committee realized that with all the talk and press about virtual libraries, there were misperceptions in the firm. Some members pushed for a virtual library because they thought that everything was, or would soon be, online. Confusion about online costs, content, and the reliability of online resources added to the mix. After what was viewed as unsuccessful attempts to educate these members that not everything was online and that accessing some materials online was not economical or conducive to the legal research process, the Library Committee decided to move forward and migrate towards a virtual library. The committee did not have adequate time to evaluate the content or costs of print versus online resources. Because some members of the firm (although no one from the library staff or the

Library Committee) strongly believed that everything was online and that print was no longer needed, the Library Committee took a strict, neutral position. The committee decided that if a resource was online, the print would be eliminated. No consideration was given to practice areas, attorney status, office location, online skill level of the researchers, or costs of access.

The Library Committee knew this drastic approach would not work, but needed to gain some time and support to review this issue and "go virtual" in the right way. As a result of the committee's approach, the members of the firm who were initially pushing for a virtual library eventually realized that it would be better to maintain some of the titles in print instead of relying solely on the online services. Notably, some members of the firm had a change of heart once they realized that some of *their* frequently used print materials were subject to elimination under the "if it is online, then the print goes" plan of action.

SPENDING WISELY

When the library budget was cut in 1998, panic struck. In hindsight, however, it was not that bad. Some members of the firm who thought LEXIS and WESTLAW provided the same information, proposed eliminating one or the other. The Library Committee successfully convinced the firm that it needed access to both services. The library accommodated the reduced budget not so much by canceling subscriptions, but by removing those expenses that did not belong in the library budget, namely, seminar materials, secretarial items (*e.g.*, legal directories, dictionaries, etc.), and copies of reference materials ordered for personal use by the attorneys (*e.g.*, *Income Tax Regulations*, *Ohio Rules of Court*, individual *Revised Code* titles, etc.). These items would no longer be purchased from the library budget, but instead from a non-library general ledger account (*i.e.*, seminar allowance, supply room, or business expense accounts). Removal of these items, together with a few cancellations of print and CDROM products, permitted the library to stay within the established 1998 budget.

The year 1999 brought a bigger budgetary challenge. Cuts were significant and led the library to review, among other things, the way the firm billed for online services. As a result, the firm changed its billing method and recovered costs. This recovery not only helped to offset the cost for online research services, but also contributed to meeting the library budget. Moreover, some savings (*i.e.*, subscription cancellations) were, unfortunately, due in part to turnover of legal personnel in the fourth quarter of that year.



In 2000, a comprehensive review of the firm-wide operating budget was conducted. The library budget, like other departmental budgets, was approved for much less than the amount proposed for the year. The library staff looked aggressively for areas where flexibility to control costs could be realized; the staff checked for duplication and overlap, online availability at an economical cost, and frequency of use. Purchase requests were scrutinized and duplicate resources (available throughout the firm's six offices) were canceled.

One final cost-cutting measure involved a review of computer assisted legal research, namely, LEXIS and WESTLAW. At the time, one of the library's contracts was due for renewal and was essentially the pocket where the library could recoup additional savings. The contract was renegotiated, and in the end, the firm was able to keep both online services.

The downsizing in 2000 resulted in many changes in the library. The print collection, while it may still resemble a full service library, actually has fewer ongoing subscriptions, and users rely more on LEXIS, WESTLAW, and the Internet. At year's end, the library had been able to maintain a balance of print and electronic resources needed by the firm, and to top it all, everything was accomplished under budget.

The library budget for 2001 was approved as proposed much to the relief of the library staff. A few concerns resurfaced about the costs for maintaining both LEXIS and WESTLAW as well as Web-based alternatives for online research. Efforts were made to further educate the attorneys as to the content and economics of not only LEXIS and WESTLAW, but also Internet sources. So far, 2001 is rolling along smoothly.

COPING STRATEGIES

Suggested, below, are tips on how to cope with downsizing a law firm library and how librarians can position themselves in the event that future adjustments in the budget or space are necessary in their firms.

- 1. KEEP A POSITIVE ATTITUDE.** Remember, the decision to downsize is about adjusting the budget or space; although it is easier said than done, try not to take it personally.
- 2. KEEP OPEN THE LINES OF COMMUNICATION.** Be certain to keep users informed. Listen to their comments and concerns. Let users know that you empathize with them when the print collection is being reduced. After all, it is an adjustment for everyone.
- 3. PAY ATTENTION TO THE AFTER-EFFECTS OF STAFF TURNOVER.** If any legal personnel leave

the firm, quickly determine whether or not the departing person's subscriptions can be used by someone else. If not, cancel them.

- 4. NOTICE WHAT IS VISIBLE – THE BOOKS AND YOU.** Do not leave gaps on the shelves in the library when you eliminate materials; be sure to shift things around a bit. Gaps immediately draw attention and remind users, once again, that something has been taken away. Keep yourself visible. Conduct presentations explaining the economics of computer assisted legal research and how to use all online services (e.g., LEXIS, WESTLAW, and Internet sources) effectively. Doing so will illustrate to attorneys that you are staying on top of the cost issues and the changes in the online research industry. Be ready, willing and able to help when you are needed and let users know that even though what is needed may no longer be right there on the shelf, it is usually just a quick phone call or click of a mouse away.
- 5. WEED TO CUT COSTS AND SAVE SPACE.** Discard outdated materials. Cancel duplicate resources and copies. Cancel CDROMs. Cancel law reviews.
- 6. REVIEW SOURCES ON THE INTERNET.** Consider switching to Web versions of print materials. Find out more about other Web-based alternatives and compare them to each other, as well as to the traditional online services.

In keeping with a positive attitude and focusing on a librarian's abilities to get the job done right, consider this thought for the day: *The library may be shrinking, however, with a good mix of print and electronic resources that survive the cutbacks, together with an experienced and resourceful library staff, it will remain an "incredible" library.*

© 2001 Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLP. Reprinted with permission by Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLP. ■

AT YEAR'S END, THE LIBRARY HAD BEEN ABLE TO MAINTAIN A BALANCE OF PRINT AND ELECTRONIC RESOURCES NEEDED BY THE FIRM, AND TO TOP IT ALL, EVERYTHING WAS ACCOMPLISHED UNDER BUDGET.

SEE YOUR NAME IN LIGHTS!

■ ■ ■ *Law Library Lights* welcomes submissions of feature and hot topic articles for publication. Authors whose articles are selected for publication will receive a gift compliments of the *Lights* Committee. Editorial inquiries or requests for additional information should be addressed to Leslie A. Lee, editor, at lights@llsdc.org or 202/994-2385.

HOT TOPIC: THE INCREDIBLE SHRINKING LIBRARY

Kate Kennedy
Squire, Sanders &
Dempsey, LLP
Cleveland, OH

MY STORY – THE SITUATION

The situation at Squire, Sanders & Dempsey began with the need for more office space. The building did not have any office space available for lease, nor did the firm have extra room on its existing floors. As a result, the library was deemed expendable. This decision was not based on library costs or any other objective analysis; no one actually asked, *Do we really need all of those books?* The single driving force was the firm's need for more offices, and the library seemed to be taking up too much real estate. The time frame was very short. The final decision to downsize was made in March 2000. Construction was to begin in May.

How did I make this work? I will explain by way of my state of mind during the process. With apologies to Elizabeth Kubler-Ross,¹ I went through five stages: denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance.

1. **DENIAL.** Since its construction in 1992, the library, with its impressive collection in excess of 45,000 volumes, had been the firm's showpiece. Attorneys often proudly pointed it out to clients. Under the circumstances, I had difficulty accepting that something so cherished could lose its value so quickly and easily.
2. **ANGER.** I wondered, *Why the library? What about the lunchroom? Why did I not have more input on the decision? How was I supposed to do this?*
3. **BARGAINING.** I lobbied for less dramatic options. I made space saving suggestions and pointed out areas where shelves could be installed along the hallways; I tried to limit the loss by prioritizing and specifying certain sections as more eligible than others.
4. **DEPRESSION.** This dismal thought kept running through my mind, *They are ruining a sanctuary for attorneys seeking a quiet place to think and write; it will never be the same.*
5. **ACCEPTANCE.** In time, I adapted to the inevitable. I told myself, *They are going to do this with or without my support, so fish or cut bait...Resign immediately or get with the program...Take the bull by the horns, start planning, visualizing, preparing, doing!*

PHOENIX RISING FROM THE ASHES

Having accepted the situation that had befallen the library, I began to plan. First, I evaluated the collection and made numerous lists comprising materials that could be discontinued, discarded, donated, moved, stored, and converted to electronic subscriptions. I checked LEXIS and WESTLAW for coverage. I checked vendor Web sites and spoke with our vendors about electronic subscriptions. Most of our form books were already

available on CDRom. I kept as many looseleaf services as possible. Law reviews and regional reporters were obvious shelf hogs; they were marked for elimination.

Second, I contacted attorneys in the various practice areas to determine which titles to keep and which titles to discard. I knew attorneys would not want to see certain sets removed even though they required significant shelf space (e.g., *Tax Management Portfolios* – about sixteen shelves; *Tax Institute Proceedings* – 25 shelves; and current and outdated municipal codes – six shelves). In the end, the attorneys and I mutually agreed to shift some of these materials to the practice floors.

Third, I kept open lines of communication by sending a series of e-mails to all attorneys and staff. The first e-mail notified everyone to plan for and expect major changes in the library with respect to the physical space and content of the collection. I attached lists of outdated materials slated for elimination; to keep panic and protest to a minimum, I emphasized the fact that the materials were outdated. I offered everyone an opportunity to add to their own personal libraries. The next few e-mails kept everyone updated on the progress of the weeding and alerted all to the temporary relocation of various materials. I reassured everyone that even though the library looked (and sounded) like a construction zone, they could use the library as long as common sense and caution were employed. For the library staff, I made weekly action lists outlining the things that we had to do each week to make sure that we were on the same page as the construction team (i.e., shifting books, clearing out cabinets and shelves, and relocating materials). As a bottom line, the idea was to inform and involve everyone in the process.

Fourth, I attempted to find a home for our discarded items. I contacted used law book dealers and quickly discovered that there was no market for entire sets of regional reporters, law reviews, etc. I advertised "books for the cost of postage" on the Law-Lib and Ohio Regional Association of Law Libraries (ORALL) electronic discussion lists. Altogether, I donated our entire set of law reviews to a new law school library, delivered one set of the U.S.C.A. and all of our *California Reporters* to our growing Phoenix office, and distributed portions of the rest of the regional reporters to several other law firms and sole practitioners around the country. All in all, the process is much easier described than done; the logistics of packing, labeling, and shipping boxes upon boxes of books to five different states

WITH APOLOGIES
TO ELIZABETH
KUBLER-ROSS,
I WENT THROUGH
FIVE STAGES:
DENIAL, ANGER,
BARGAINING,
DEPRESSION AND
ACCEPTANCE.



became extremely burdensome. Clearly, the advantages of finding a home for discarded materials (versus throwing them away) must be weighed against the disadvantages. In retrospect, with regard to my situation, I am not sure it was worth the aggravation. If I had to do it all again, one option worth exploring would be the use of commercial recycling services.

TIME TO ROLL UP OUR SLEEVES

Prior to downsizing, the library was shaped like a horseshoe and took up about 75 percent of the building's 44th floor. The plan was to convert the two legs of the horseshoe into office space. Construction, according to the original strategy, was to take place one leg at a time so as to minimize overall inconvenience. Unfortunately, this idea quickly went by the wayside when the firm mapped out the construction schedule. Everything was cast for completion by Labor Day for the arrival of the new fall associates. In short, construction would take place simultaneously on both legs of the horseshoe. In the remaining area, high density shelving units were to be installed. The original plan called for six double-sided units comprising 576 shelves, which was later reduced to five double-sided units comprising 480 shelves. We called it the "57 percent solution"; that is, the library retained 57 percent of its shelf space (or for those people who see the glass as half empty, the library lost 43 percent of its shelf space).

In terms of the nitty gritty, we shifted everything that could fit onto the stationary shelves that was not going to be affected by the construction. Second, we gathered and organized all of the books from the areas where construction was to take place (*i.e.*, the horseshoe legs) so that everything would remain in call number order. Third, we shifted the books that would be shelved in the yet-to-be-installed high density shelving area to the soon-to-be office space shelves. Fourth, after the high density shelves were in place, we shifted the entire collection to the new shelves. Our time table was so tight that we literally followed the shelving installers around with book trucks. As soon as they had a unit in place, bam!, we shelved. (Note: This process was delayed only by the workers' insistence on taking breaks and lunch. I exercised restraint in not clamoring, *Breaks, lunch—hey we have a deadline here!*)

FALLOUT, BACKLASH, AND LIVING TO TELL

Not surprisingly, when the dust of the downsizing settled, we received comments from the attorneys on the state of the library's collection. Some

remarks were fairly predictable, including:

"This is really inconvenient."

"I can't find anything."

"Do we still have...?"

"Every time I come in here something is different...".

"Before you threw it out, we used to have...".

(Note: Sometimes this phrase prefaced references to titles that we never had in the first place.)

"Where is ... [pick one: book, photocopier, microfiche reader, regional reporter, law review...]"

One year later, when conducting library orientations for new attorneys, I have finally stopped referring to the size of the original library or the former breadth of the collection. All things considered, what at first seemed like a disaster turned out relatively well. Luckily, we suffered no staff reductions and overall have a leaner, meaner library. We continue to weed the collection and plan for growth; it is business as usual. Naturally, there have been some adjustments not only to the character of the collection, itself, but also to the physical space. Regardless, our incredible shrunken library (emphasis is on the incredible) survived and will no doubt continue to flourish.

© 2001 Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, LLP. Reprinted with permission by Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, LLP.

ENDNOTE:

1 Dr. Kubler-Ross authored *On Death and Dying: What the Dying have to Teach Doctors, Nurses, Clergy, and Their Own Families*. In her book, Dr. Kubler-Ross outlines five stages of death: denial and isolation, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance. ■

DATES TO REMEMBER

Dates to Remember (DTR) is a monthly (September - May) newsletter designed to keep the membership informed of current Society events. If you would like to plan an event, please contact Susan Ryan, corresponding secretary at 202/662-9142 or ryan@law.georgetown.edu, to make sure that your event does not conflict with any other Society events. Once your date has been cleared, to publicize your event, please submit information to Jan Oberla, *DTR* editor, at dates@llsdc.org.

**AS A BOTTOM LINE,
THE IDEA WAS TO
INFORM AND
INVOLVE EVERYONE
IN THE PROCESS.**

LEXIS AD

Columnist's Note: Welcome to "Tech Talk," a new column in Law Library Lights in which we will strive to bring readers an insightful review of products, Web sites, or issues relevant to law library technology. Chip Tomek, who spends most of his working days immersed in Web development projects at The George Washington University Law School, launches this column with an informative evaluation of Web authoring software.

THE INTERNET HAS BECOME A UBIQUITOUS PART OF OUR EVERYDAY LIVES. We use the Internet for research, entertainment, and communication on a daily basis. Providing information via the Internet can be quite a daunting proposition for the casual computer user. Creating and managing an entire Web site can be a challenge even for the most experienced information professional. Luckily there are powerful Web authoring tools available that make the task much easier. This article will compare and contrast selected features of two popular Web authoring tools: Macromedia's Dreamweaver 4 and Microsoft's FrontPage 2002.

GETTING STARTED

Cost

Software packages can be expensive. Despite the expense, anyone who plans to create Web pages or manage a Web site will find an authoring tool invaluable. A commercial version of FrontPage 2002 costs approximately \$169 while a commercial version of Dreamweaver 4 is nearly twice as much at \$299. Academic pricing is significantly less for both products (with FrontPage costing approximately \$89 and Dreamweaver at \$99). Bottom line, neither one of the two products is inexpensive, but FrontPage is a more viable option for those with a more limited budget.

Installation and Configuration

Installation is relatively straightforward for both products. Dreamweaver prompts the user to register the product (which is highly recommended); FrontPage requires activation either online or by telephone. Of the two products, FrontPage is a little easier to get started with right out of the box; with Dreamweaver some of the default configuration options can make the product seem initially a bit overwhelming. Both products are easily customized according to a user's personal preferences.

General Interface

Users comfortable with the Microsoft Office environment (or any modern word processor)

will feel right at home using FrontPage. Alternatively, the Dreamweaver interface has more in common with graphical programs such as PhotoShop or FireWorks. Whereas FrontPage has a plethora of fairly well organized menu options and tool bar icons, the Dreamweaver interface is more focused on floating pallets for inserting page elements and modifying attributes. Moreover, Dreamweaver's Properties Inspector and the Objects pallet are very elegant and extremely useful. In sum, although both products can be configured to the user's personal preferences, Dreamweaver has a much more graceful interface overall.

Customization

As mentioned above, the interface for both products can be easily customized for individual work habits and preferences. Dreamweaver can also be customized by adding new commands and features called "Dreamweaver Extensions." Extensions are abundantly available for free on the Internet; moreover, with a little knowledge of JavaScript, developers can create extensions or modify existing ones. When it comes to customization, Dreamweaver is king.

Learning to Use the Tool

The academic version of Dreamweaver includes a fairly comprehensive user manual and is loaded with various lessons and tutorials that walk the user through many of the application's features. Many of the tutorials are geared towards designers who wish to create dynamic page elements such as roll-overs and moving layers. Casual users will not find these tutorials very useful (at least not at first) and are advised to focus their attention on the basic tools. By contrast, the academic version of FrontPage ships with very little printed documentation and no tutorials. Users can purchase additional comprehensive manuals and find free tutorials and lessons on the Web. Overall, both products are relatively intuitive and are easily learned through a combination of using the help feature and by trial and error.

CREATING WEB PAGES

The WYSIWYG Editor

Web authoring tools are made easy to use via an interface known as a WYSIWYG ("What You See Is What You Get") editor. Both products have good WYSIWYG editors that make creating pages a snap. Both editors display page elements relatively accurately. Dreamweaver has a few extra features worth mentioning,

TECH TALK: TOOLS OF THE TRADE: DREAMWEAVER 4 AND FRONTPAGE 2002

*Lawrence "Chip" Tomek
The George Washington
University Law School*

**PROVIDING
INFORMATION
VIA THE INTERNET
CAN BE QUITE A
DAUNTING
PROPOSITION
FOR THE CASUAL
COMPUTER USER.**

WHEN IT COMES TO CUSTOMIZATION, DREAMWEAVER IS KING.

such as the ability to hide visual aids (so the page looks almost exactly as it will in a browser); the option to display rulers and grids for page layout; and the availability of the Quick Tag Editor, which allows you to insert HTML tags without opening the code. Dreamweaver also has another handy feature that shows tag nesting for the current element; this feature is very useful for selecting the proper location to insert or modify tags during production of a Web page. By contrast, FrontPage toolbars can be undocked and used as floating pallets. Unlike Dreamweaver's Property Inspector, FrontPage unfortunately lacks a feature that displays all the attributes of the currently selected page element. One very cool FrontPage option, however, is the ability to graphically reveal tags while in the WYSIWYG mode. This option is very useful when searching for redundant or unnecessary code.

What I found most surprising is that the FrontPage WYSIWYG does not display what are known as Active Server Pages (ASP) "includes," which I find difficult to understand considering that ASP is a Microsoft technology. (Note: An ASP include is a method of including elements in a page that are stored in a separate file. For instance, the header for most pages in a Web site can be an include, which allows developers to change only one file – the include file – in order to change the header on all the pages.) Since many Web sites are heavily dependent on ASP includes I find this oversight to be problematic.

The Code Editor

Both products have excellent code editors. Both use color-coded page elements to make the code easier to read. FrontPage allows the user to toggle between the WYSIWYG and HTML environments with tabs located at the bottom of the document; Dreamweaver allows users to open an independent code editor simultaneously on top of the WYSIWYG editor. Both provide easy line selection. Whereas FrontPage displays the current line number only in the lower left hand corner of the page, Dreamweaver displays line numbering in the area to the left of the page (*i.e.*, along the gutter).

Other noteworthy features of Dreamweaver include its built-in O'Reilly reference manual for HTML, JavaScript, and CSS, and an intuitive Find and Replace feature that supports Regular Expressions. One downside to the Dreamweaver code editor is that the cursor is not very responsive to keyboard navigation.

Keyboard jockeys will quickly be pulling their hair out trying to navigate with the arrow keys.

Other Features

Clipboard: The FrontPage clipboard is far superior to Dreamweaver's clipboard. In FrontPage 2002, users can have multiple items in the clipboard and toggle between them using the Office Clipboard viewer. This feature is very useful and could potentially save a lot of time and effort with certain tasks. The clipboard is definitely one of the better features of FrontPage.

Themes vs. Templates: As with so many FrontPage features, the use of Themes is a double-edged sword. Although casual users will find Themes very easy to apply, the junk code that is automatically inserted into the file when it is published is unacceptable, especially to code junkies. Dreamweaver, on the other hand, uses Templates that allow you to create pages that have a region into which content can be inserted and edited. Unfortunately, Dreamweaver Templates also insert junk code in the form of specialized comments that are recognized by Dreamweaver. All in all, Dreamweaver Templates are far more flexible while FrontPage Themes are much easier to use.

Inserting Internal Links: One of the shortcomings of Dreamweaver is the difficulty in managing internal links. Although it is fairly simple to create named anchors within the document, linking the anchors to text is cumbersome. Users must either remember the name of the anchor and type it in with the # symbol in the hyperlink box or use the less than intuitive "pointer" feature. Once users become accustomed to this practice, managing internal links – although still clumsy – is a little less difficult. FrontPage, on the other hand, shines when it comes to creating internal links. Using the menu option to insert a hyperlink, users can select "Place in This Document" and be presented with a list of all the named anchors in the current document. I love this feature and hope to see it in the next build of Dreamweaver.

Extensible Markup Language (XML) Formatting Rules: FrontPage has an option to apply XML formatting rules to convert a hypertext markup language (HTML) document into an XHTML compliant document. On the one hand, this feature provides an avenue for those who are interested in writing code that is compliant with the most current World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) standards. On the other hand, a better feature would allow developers to write XHTML compliant code from the outset



(without having to take the extra conversion step with XML) — this is a feature that I hope to see in the next version of both products.

PUBLISHING AND MANAGING THE SITE

Once a Web site has been created, the next task is to publish the files. In terms of publishing options, users are limited by the type of server hosting the site. In order to use the FrontPage Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) method of publishing, the server must support FrontPage Server Extensions 2002. It should also be noted that a number of other FrontPage features, such as form handlers, search forms, and hit counters require a server that supports FrontPage Extensions.

A more common and universal way to publish a site is through File Transfer Protocol (FTP). Both FrontPage and Dreamweaver have built-in FTP interfaces that are easy to configure and use. FrontPage sites are easy to publish through the Publish menu option; likewise, the Dreamweaver Site Manager is straightforward, displaying all the local files for the site on the left and all of the live server files on the right. Both products allow the user not only to choose which portions of the site to publish, but also to synchronize the local site with the server. I prefer the Dreamweaver Site Manager with its easy to use drag-and-drop interface much like Windows Explorer. Ultimately, with this interface, I feel as though I have more control when uploading information to the server.

One of the most impressive built-in features of FrontPage is the Usage Analysis Reports tool that allows users not only to analyze their server log files, but also to generate traffic reports for the entire site. This feature is not available unless your server has FrontPage Extensions enabled. Unfortunately, my server does not support FrontPage Extensions; I was very disappointed that I could not review this tool.

CONCLUSION

Those users who are more comfortable in a familiar Microsoft Office-like environment, and who have a limited budget may wish explore FrontPage as the more viable option; it is a fine product for most users. Keep in mind that FrontPage is designed for creating Web sites that run on Microsoft Web servers. Many of the features are based on FrontPage Extensions which must be enabled on the Web server. A word to the wise: users who do not administer their own server are encouraged to consult their IT staff to find out if FrontPage Extensions are available. Notably, without the Extensions, FrontPage loses many of its more impressive features such as the Usage Analysis Reports and form handling.

Unless the cost is a prohibitive factor, Dreamweaver is my Web authoring tool of choice. Dreamweaver's powerful features, easy customization, and elegant interface are definitely worth the extra money for anyone who spends any time creating and managing Web sites. ■

**FRONTPAGE . . .
SHINES WHEN IT
COMES TO CREATING
INTERNAL LINKS.**

TECHNOLOGY DAY 2001



Join MD-SLA and other local library organizations for Technology Day 2001. LLSDC members can register at the rate of \$175.00 (registration forms must be postmarked on or before October 8 to receive this rate). The keynote speaker is Jean Mayhew from United Technology Research Center and Mary Ellen Bates from Bates Information Services. For more information, contact Sandy Levy at sandy.levy@baltsun.com or 410/332-6256.

LLSDC SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRANTS



The LLSDC Scholarships and Grants Committee provides awards for registration fees to professional meetings, seminars, workshops, classes, and other forms of continuing education. Application deadlines are August 1, December 1, and May 1. For more information, contact William T. Ryan, chair of the Scholarship and Grants Committee, at wryan@wcl.american.edu or 202/274-4331. Application forms are available on the LLSDC Web site at www.llsdc.org/committees/scholarships/.



PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

Ann C. Green
Sonnenschein, Nath
& Rosenthal

LLSDC GOES TO AALL

It was great to see so many of you "up north" at the AALL Annual Meeting in July. I would like to thank Jeff Bowen for setting up and tearing down our LLSDC booth in the Chapter Exhibits area and those who staffed our table. We raffled a copy of Mindy Klasky's novel, *The Glasswrights' Apprentice*, and displayed some new photos of LLSDC members. Vice President Lisa Harrington and I attended the Council of Chapter Presidents meeting. Each AALL chapter sends delegates to this annual gathering which gives chapter leaders an opportunity to network and to reflect on chapter hot topics of the past and future. I was not surprised to learn that many chapters share concerns similar to our own. I was amazed at the ambitiousness of some of the smaller chapters! Many chapters, especially the regional chapters, which cover several states, like SEALL and NOCALL, host annual one or two day meetings. We will consider this in the future, if there is sufficient interest. Look for these and more chapter ideas in *Dates to Remember* and *Lights* and at the Town Meeting.

THANK YOU, BOB BERRING

Many of us enjoyed the August 15 and 16 visit with Professor Bob Berring. Thanks to West Group/Westlaw for inviting LLSDC to hear Bob speak about the revolution in legal research. Bob's comments on the transitions we are all facing and what to watch for in the future were insightful and timely, but as always, it was his wit and anecdotes that stole the show.

YOUR NAME IN LIGHTS

Our newsletter, *Law Library Lights*, continues to be held up as a "standard" in the field of chapter newsletters. Under the new leadership of Leslie Lee, editor, and Barbara DesRosiers, assistant editor, the new *Lights* year is well under way. Please contact them with your ideas and submissions at lights@llsdc.org or bed3@law.georgetown.edu, respectively. Authors whose articles are published in *Lights* qualify for a surprise gift courtesy of the editors. Keep those article submissions coming! Ellen Feldman serves as ad manager this year. Thanks to Ellen and all of our vendor sponsors for helping to keep production costs down.

MARK YOUR CALENDARS

The three society-wide meetings of the year are as follows: October 2, 2001, Opening Reception/Breakfast; March 27, 2002, Town Meeting/Luncheon; and May 14, 2002, Closing Reception/Dinner. In addition, the SISs and committees are all planning their own events.

Please contact your SIS and committee chairs with your ideas. Please contact Susan Ryan, corresponding secretary, at ryan@law.georgetown.edu, first, to check the availability of a date and to schedule a meeting, then contact Jan Oberla, editor of *Dates to Remember* at dates@llsdc.org to publicize your event

LLSDC IS YOUR SOCIETY

The "S" in our association acronym stands for Society and that means you! LLSDC is only as strong, vibrant, and FUN as members want it to be. We are in the process of developing an e-mail list of those who would like to volunteer. Thanks to Joan Marshman for organizing the list. Please contact Joan with any questions or suggestions at 202/383-7089 or marshmanj@howrey.com. This year, the Executive Board meetings will be held during the lunch hour. If you have items for Board discussion, please let me or another Board member know. Members are welcome to attend the Board meetings, as necessary, but issues should be approved and placed on the agenda prior to attendance. Along these lines, the Board will be renegotiating the contract with the LLSDC Management Company, which expires in spring 2002. If there are things you would like to see done differently in LLSDC, I would like to hear from you.

I look forward to working with all of you this year! ■

UPCOMING ISSUES OF LIGHTS

■ ■ ■ Themes for this year's upcoming issues of *Lights* are as follows:

**VOLUME 45, NUMBER 2 (WINTER 2001):
SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRANTS**

**VOLUME 45, NUMBER 3 (SPRING 2002):
SUMMER ASSOCIATES**

**VOLUME 45, NUMBER 4 (SUMMER 2002):
LIBRARY MANAGEMENT/
FUTURE OF LAW LIBRARIANSHIP**

Each issue of *Lights* will contain feature articles on the designated theme as well as the slate of regular columns. New to *Lights* this year: a hot topic article (or articles) that will cover a topic of current interest which may not fit neatly into the issue's designated theme, and the Tech Talk column, which will focus on issues relevant to law library technology. If you are interested in writing for *Lights*, please contact Leslie A. Lee, editor, at lights@llsdc.org or 202/994-2385.

I WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN THIS YEAR WITH NEWS ABOUT THE END OF LAST YEAR.

On April 24, there was a joint brown bag lunch sponsored by the PLL SIS and Academic SIS entitled "Skills for Summer Associates." It was held at Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky—a gracious thanks to Rachel Jones for the arrangements. About a dozen librarians came; at the top of the wish list were good questions and good manners from summer associates.

On June 1, we had a great dinner at the Baysox stadium. We were supposed to have dinner and see a game but Mother Nature decided Bowie needed a bath. On August 15, we are going to try again to see a game.

GREETINGS AND HAPPY NEW YEAR (SO TO SPEAK)! I am pleased to bring you news about the Private Law Libraries SIS and its recent activities.

The 2001-2002 PLL SIS board has met twice since the April elections. Our first meeting was held in May and it brought the members of the 2000-2001 PLL SIS board (Maureen Stellino, president; Lisa Harrington, secretary; and Andrea Bender, treasurer) together with the members of this year's board (Pete Vay, vice president/president-elect; Adeen Postar, secretary; and Steve Mellin, treasurer). During the meeting, we reviewed the past year's PLL activities and discussed highlights from various events presented by the PLL's Education and Social committees. The results of a recent survey sent to the PLL members in April were also discussed at the meeting. A summary of the responses to the entire survey will be posted on the LLSDC Web site; an announcement will be sent to the LLSDC list-serv when it is online. Members of both boards wish to thank Mindy Klasky for her work as chair of the PLL Nominations Committee. Within the space of several weeks, in addition to performing her regular duties at Arent, Fox, Mindy efficiently completed all of the tasks involved with this year's PLL election, mailed and collected the PLL survey, and managed to add the finishing touches to her second novel, *The Glasswrights' Progress*.

The board members met again in June. At this meeting Pete Vay and Steve Mellin volunteered to chair the Education and Social committees (see below) and Adeen Postar volunteered to assist with various *Law Library Lights* editorial duties. LLSDC President, Ann Green,

We plan to have our opening picnic at Howard; Rhea Ballard is as anxious to show Howard's beautiful, new law library as we are to see it. Dates and details will be forthcoming.

The officers for 2001-2002 are as follows: Nancy Crossed, American University, president; Kristina Kuhlmann Tryon, Georgetown University, vice president; Lynn Monkres, Catholic University, treasurer.

We are working on programs for the upcoming year so please feel free to offer suggestions on activities or issues of interest, including programs, tours, or social events that would be fun for the group. Contact Nancy Crossed at 202/274-4344 or crossed@wcl.american.edu. ■

joined us for this meeting and informed us about areas of LLSDC (such as *Lights*, LLSDC's Education Committee, and the Publications Committee) that need volunteer support from members of the PLL.

Is there a research or library management subject that you would like to discuss with colleagues? Do you have suggestions about social events that would be perfect for the PLL gatherings? If you are interested in becoming more involved in the PLL SIS, the Education and Social committees are looking for you. Both committees need volunteers who would like to plan and participate in this year's programs. Please contact Pete Vay at 202/434-5303 or pvay@wc.com, or Steve Mellin at 202/639-6012 or smellin@jenner.com if you would like to be a member of the Education or Social committees. Volunteers are welcome at any time! I am also interested in hearing from members who have suggestions about other types of events that the PLL SIS can present. I would particularly like to hear your suggestions about public outreach projects that will offer opportunities for PLL members to help individuals outside of the law library community. If you have suggestions or comments concerning any type of PLL event, please contact me at 202/789-6166 or slarson@bdlaw.com. ■

ACADEMIC SIS NEWS

Nancy Crossed
American University
Washington College of
Law Library

PRIVATE LAW LIBRARIES SIS NEWS

Scott Larson
Beveridge & Diamond,
P.C.

MARK YOUR CALENDARS

Opening Reception/Breakfast: Oct. 2, 2001
Town Meeting/Luncheon: March 27, 2002
Closing Reception/Dinner: May 14, 2002

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SIS NEWS

Julia Taylor
Dickstein Shapiro Morin
& Oshinsky, L.L.P.

I WOULD LIKE TO WELCOME ALL NEW AND RETURNING MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SIS! I will be serving as president this year and Lorelle Anderson, with Crowell & Moring, will be vice president/president-elect. I am sure it will be a year filled with fun and informative activities.

I could not begin discussing the future without taking a moment to look back at the year before. We had a number of business meetings, focused primarily around the then new *Union List of Legislative Histories*, which was finally completed late last summer/early last fall. One of our most enjoyable meetings was a joint Legislative/Interlibrary Loan brownbag to discuss the finer points of finding and borrowing legislative documents. We also had a number of educational programs, including primers on Virginia and Maryland legislative histories, a demonstration of GalleryWatch.com, and a seminar on creating legislative histories from PDF files courtesy of Mike Welsh. It was a great year for the SIS and we owe a good measure of our success to David Mao, last year's president. Thank you David! We wish you all the best in your new role at Covington & Burling.

As I write this column, there is no telling what the next year will bring, though I have

begun putting together a few ideas. We will follow up on some of the old business and programs from last year. At the top of the agenda will be compiling the first supplement to the *Union List of Legislative Histories*. It was such a difficult task getting it together, that thinking about supplementing it was just too much to take on last year. There was so much interest in the PDF program that Mike has agreed to repeat the course again for us at some point during the year. I am also working on scheduling a program on District of Columbia legislative histories to complete the series on state legislative histories in our area.

Of course, there will be new activities this year as well. We have tentatively planned to have a seminar on the Law Revision Counsel to learn more about the office and have all of our U.S. Code codification questions answered. We also plan to have another vendor demonstration to keep our members abreast of the latest legislative research products on the market.

Lest you think the Legislative Research SIS is all learning and seriousness, we will have our annual holiday party sometime in December.

I hope you have the opportunity to join in on some of the activities we have this year and I look forward to meeting you at some future event! ■

INTERLIBRARY LOAN SIS NEWS

Michelle Wollmann
Sonnenschein, Nath &
Rosenthal

AT THE BEGINNING OF A NEW LLSDC YEAR I WOULD LIKE TO START BY THANKING OUTGOING ILL SIS PRESIDENT, PETE VAY.

Under his leadership, the Interlibrary Loan Special Interest Section had a great year. I would like to welcome Patrick Hawkins, Interlibrary Loan Specialist from Howrey Simon, as the new president-elect this year. I look forward to working with him.

The ILL SIS hosts monthly brown bag lunch meetings at members' libraries. We welcome new LLSDC members, especially those who are involved with interlibrary loans. We have been fortunate enough to be invited to tour two libraries at the start of the year. I would like to thank Felicia Ayanbiola from Howard University Law Library and Eloise McDowell from the U.S. Department of Justice Law Library for giving us this opportunity. That takes care of our first two meetings in September and October. We plan to spend our November meeting revisiting the topic of getting a master's degree and focusing on obtaining grants and scholarships. Our annual holiday party will be in December, hosted at Shaw Pittman, thanks to Dannie Young. I look forward to working with

all of you this year and welcome suggestions for future meetings. Please e-mail me at mwollmann@sonnenschein.com. ■

OPPORTUNITIES TO VOLUNTEER

Aside from needing volunteers for Society activities, LLSDC has been involved in a number of volunteer efforts with other groups, including regular support for membership drives at WETA, a local independent, non-profit television station. LLSDC welcomes members to volunteer time for committee work or various Society projects and tasks as needed. If you are interested in volunteering, please contact Joan Marshman at marshmanj@howrey.com or 202/383-7089.

WHAT IS IT LIKE TO BE THE ONLY PROFESSIONAL LAW LIBRARIAN IN AN ORGANIZATION? Although it can certainly have its frustrating aspects, it can also give the solo librarian not only a certain freedom, but also a chance to prove the library's value and to seek opportunities for professional growth.

So say the three guest speakers who participated in the July 24, 2001 educational program on solo librarianship sponsored by the Federal Law Librarians SIS at the U.S. Department of Education. Leslie Zampetti (chair), Sabra Breslin (secretary), and Jane Butler (membership chair) from the Solo Librarians Division of the Special Libraries Association (SLA) joined an enthusiastic and motivated group of attendees composed of both federal and private firm law librarians to discuss the unique problems faced by the solo librarian. Leslie, Sabra, and Jane have worked in a variety of different types of libraries, and all of them, if given the choice, would prefer working as a solo librarian.

As the program attendees shared their particular situations and challenges, certain themes emerged. First, all solo librarians must deal with a sense of isolation and lack of peer

support. The guest speakers all stressed the importance of getting out of the library, not only to interact with other librarians at professional meetings and educational programs, but also with library customers. Librarians should be sure to promote the benefits of participation in professional activities to their supervisors, and to explain that librarians who are aware of current trends in library management and technology can better serve the organization. Even if professional association dues must come out of the library's budget, supervisors should be made aware that it is worth the cost.

The SLA Solo Librarians Division manages a listserv for its members, but SLA membership is not required to post messages. Leslie stressed that if solo librarians need help, either with a reference question or with a library management issue, the listserv is a great way to get help and to network with other solo librarians. For more information about this 1,000+ member group, please visit its Web page at <http://www.sla.org/division/dsol/>. Addresses and phone numbers for Leslie, Sabra, and Jane are provided, as well as instructions for subscribing to the listserv.

Another challenge faced by the solo

FEDERAL LAW LIBRARIANS SIS NEWS

Mary K. Grady
U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency
Law Library

WHERE IS COUNSEL?

SUSAN LEWIS-SOMERS, CHAIR, LLSDC PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LAW LIBRARY



The LLSDC Board has deferred publication of the 15th edition of *COUNSEL (Consolidated Union Serials List)* for one year. LLSDC and the previous publisher, CAPCON, have decided not to publish it this year because of staffing and technical difficulties. LLSDC will, therefore, use this as a golden opportunity to assess other publishers and to consider the possibility of an electronic publication, in addition to the paper edition.

LLSDC will, of course, continue its relationship with CAPCON, the Washington-area OCLC library network. CAPCON will continue to publish the *SULOPS (Serials Union List Offline Products)*, the individual library holding lists for Washington-area libraries. In addition, LLSDC hopes to work with CAPCON to produce one or more sessions for LLSDC members about CAPCON, its services and LLSDC's future relationships with OCLC and CAPCON.

The LLSDC Board encourages member input to President Ann Green and other Board members about *COUNSEL* and how it might be published. Would you like to have an electronic version of *COUNSEL*? Would you also like to retain the paper edition? If you have been receiving the *SULOPS* listing for your library, would you like to continue receiving it?

When the Board has selected a new publisher and is ready to begin the publication process for the 15th edition of *COUNSEL* next year, Editor Laurie Green will notify *COUNSEL* participants to update their listings. We appreciate your patience as we work to improve *COUNSEL* for the LLSDC membership. In the meantime, hang on to your current edition of *COUNSEL*!

librarian is having a non-librarian supervisor who may not have the time or motivation to learn about library issues; therefore, the librarian must use every opportunity to educate the supervisor about the library's value. Sabra talked about spending time at meetings or during her performance evaluation to brief her supervisor about her goals and objectives for the library. Moreover, whenever possible, librarians should provide as much in the way of library service as possible to their supervisors, or to other staff members within the immediate organization. Marketing library services to a supervisor is a time-honored way to highlight the library's importance. The meeting attendees agreed at this point that a separate FLL SIS program about marketing strategies would be helpful.

For those librarians who face the challenge of convincing their supervisors to see them as professionals (since solo librarians must frequently perform clerical tasks), there are ways to put a positive spin on things. Leslie talked about always presenting oneself in a professional manner, particularly in the way one dresses. She noted that even if a librarian is occasionally

asked to assist, for example, with a photocopying project, to use the opportunity to pitch in as a team player. In turn, the librarian may be able to get assistance more easily for future library projects. Likewise, if a supervisor asks a librarian to deliver the daily newspapers, the librarian could scan the paper beforehand and point out an article of interest to the recipient. In other words, try to turn what may be non-professional duties into a marketing opportunity.

Time management is always a concern for the solo librarian, particularly one who has no assistant(s). Leslie talked about the importance of carefully examining the various tasks the librarian performs. That is, just because certain tasks have been done a certain way in the past does not mean that the status quo must be maintained. For example, is it really necessary to continue to maintain a particular collection (*e.g.*, a depository collection) if it is not regularly used? Leslie also pointed out that if one cannot face a particular task on a given day, there are always alternative tasks that one *can* face!

Finally, other topics included taking on additional tasks without additional help and dealing with a library advisory committee. One law firm librarian mentioned that she had been asked to assume supervision of a second library in a different city. The librarian's supervisor also informed her that she would serve on a library committee, the members of which were appointed by the supervisor. It was suggested that the librarian use this opportunity to request additional administrative assistance in the library, and to recognize that library committees can be valuable when trying to get additional resources. Further, she was advised to ask attorneys with whom she is friendly or who frequently use library services to serve on her committee.

The program ended with a tour of the National Library of Education (NLE) conducted by Director Sheila McGarr. Sheila hopes to remodel the current library space and improve the library's Web page content. Thank you to Ellen Sweet, government documents librarian at the NLE, for hosting this event and providing homemade treats for the participants. ■

NICHE PUBLISHERS AD

WWW.LLSDC.ORG

For up-to-date information about the Society and its activities, visit the Web site at www.llsdc.org.



2000/2001 WAS AN ACTIVE YEAR FOR THE FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW SIS.

In cooperation with the Law Library of Congress, the SIS sponsored three programs offering instruction in the fundamentals of foreign legal research for the following jurisdictions: Greece and the European Union (with Theresa Papademetriou); Russia (with Peter Roudik); and Canada (with Stephen Clarke). Thanks to the continuing support of the Law Library of Congress, Society members will again have the opportunity to tap into the expertise of the Library's foreign legal specialists with a new series of programs which will be offered in the coming year. Details will be announced in future issues of *Dates to Remember*, on the LLSDC list-serve, and at the Foreign/International SIS's page on the Society's Web site at <http://www.llsdc.org/sis/forint>.

As this issue of *Law Library Lights* deals with Federal Depository Libraries, I thought it might be interesting to provide a sampling of depository libraries and information centers for selected international organizations in the District.

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

For a listing of Depository Libraries receiving United Nations material, visit the Web site of the Dag Hammarsköld Library at <http://www.un.org/MoreInfo/Deplib/index.html>. In the District, the Library of Congress is the repository for UN materials. A second source for assistance with UN materials is the United Nations Information Centre at 1775 K Street, NW, Suite 400. Visit its Web site at <http://www.unicwash.org/> for more information about its collection and services.

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union has established a series of European Union Depositories in the United States. For a listing, visit its Web site at <http://www.eurunion.org/infores/libmap.htm>. In the District, both the Library of Congress and American University are participating libraries. The European Union has also established ten "European Union Centers" at universities throughout the United States. A listing of these Centers is at <http://www.eurunion.org/infores/eucenter.htm>.

According to its Web site, the Public Inquiries Section of the Delegation of the European Commission to the United States "answers mail, fax, email and telephone inquiries about the EU, its legislation, statistics and publications. The delegation Library has

the most complete collection of official EU publications in the United States. Many of these are available on interlibrary loan, following standard American Library Association procedures. In addition, the Library maintains around 1,000 chronological subject files on EU activities and policies. A typical file contains the laws, proposals for legislation, opinions of advisory bodies and interest groups, relevant speeches and articles from selected American and European sources. The Library is open to the public by appointment only. To contact the Public Inquiries Section and Library, telephone 202/862-9539, fax 202/429-1766, or email help@eurunion.org."

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

According to its Web site, the Columbus Memorial Library "houses the world's most complete collection of unique photographs, maps, commemorative stamps, archives, and records documenting the history of the Organization of American States and its predecessor agencies from 1889 to the present. The extensive collection of books and periodicals dates back to 1535. The library holds one of the richest repositories for material on the Inter-American system in the world." The library is also responsible for the Archives and Records Management Program of the OAS General Secretariat, as well as preserving and indexing OAS official documents. For more information about the Library's collections and services, visit its Web site at <http://tlc.library.net/columbus/default.asp>. ■

FOREIGN & INTERNATIONAL LAW SIS NEWS

Herb Somers

The George Washington University Law Library

TELL US WHAT YOU THINK!



How interesting did you find this issue of *Lights*? Were the articles informative and relevant to you or someone you know? What topics would you like *Lights* to cover? Are there other new features that you would like to see in *Lights* (such as the new hot topic section and the new Tech Talk column)? How can we improve future issues? Will these questions never end? Please send feedback, comments, and suggestions to lights@llsdc.org. We value your input!

NEWS OF MEMBERS

*Hillary C. Rubin
Hogan & Hartson*

Cindy Curling has taken over writing LLRX's "Notes from the Technology Trenches" from **Roger Skalbeck**. After years of doing a great job with the column, Roger has decided to pursue other interests, but plans to write occasionally for LLRX.com. Cindy would like to see the column become more of a public forum, so please contact her with your ideas and issues. The columns are published mid-month. Archives are available at <http://www.llrx.com/library/index.htm#Trenches>.

Abigail Ellsworth has left Wilkes, Artis, Chartered to become a reference librarian at Howrey Simon Arnold & White. She also received the AALL/West Excellence in Marketing Award for Best Newsletter at the Annual Conference for the work she did at Wilkes, Artis.

LaGina Gross reports that after working two years as a legislative librarian for the ALA's Washington Office, she has returned to work as a law librarian. In May, she replaced Michael McHenry at Troutman Sanders.

Tina Kelley and **John Winterson** have joined the Information Resource Center at Hogan & Hartson as research analysts. Tina, formerly of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, can be reached at 202/637-8704 and John, formerly of Shea & Gardner, can be reached at 202/637-8727.

Judy Manion, billed as the congressional procedure expert, was one of four panelists at Workshop W-4 on Legislative Histories at the AALL convention.

Tom Pulver is a part-time library consultant and Learning Resources Center Director of the relatively new University of Northern Virginia.

Gail Solomon left the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Library in April 2000 to stay home with her children, Eli and Nathan. She sometimes substitutes for Susan Quinn at Seyfarth Shaw, and hopes to find some regular part-time hours in the near future.

Allen Story has retired after more than 25 years in law libraries. For the last five years, Allen was the U.S. Courts Librarian at the Alexandria, VA courthouse. His prior posts have included law libraries in other government agencies and in law firms. Allen has also held various elected and appointed posts in LLSDC. He can be reached by e-mail at astory@cox.rr.com.

Jim Walther is now the manager of library services at Bryan Cave. He was formerly a reference librarian.

Laura Whitbeck has left Bryan Cave to become the technical services manager at Nixon Peabody LLP. She can be reached at 202/508-6058.

WELCOME TO:

Annalise Anderson – library project development assistant at Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson

Shamah R. Andrews – library assistant at Williams & Connolly

Clarissa Avis – librarian at Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth

Rhea Ballard Thrower – director at Howard University School of Law, Allen Mercer Daniel Law Library

Michael Bizik – research assistant at Cahill, Gordon & Reindel

Phyllis D. Callahan – assistant librarian at Jackson & Campbell

Leslie M. Campbell – library program administrator at the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

Liz Carll – librarian at Dombroff & Gilmore

Susan E. Crowley – reference specialist at Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky

Kevin Matthew Dames – resident librarian at Georgetown University Law Center, Edward Bennett Williams Law Library

Lorraine Deremer – library clerk at Latham & Watkins

Kevin Dula – technical services specialist at Hale and Dorr

Sophia Fajardo – knowledge management assistant at Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer

Darla Haney – librarian at McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe

Jacqueline Henderson – reference librarian at Morgan, Lewis & Bockius

Yvonne Herrera – law firm sales representative at West Group

William H. Heyser – library technician at Morrison & Foerster

M. Elizabeth Hill – assistant director of technical services at Howard University School of Law, Allen Mercer Daniel Law Library

Leah Hilton – conflicts coordinator/business reference librarian at Covington & Burling

Hong Hu – research librarian at Steptoe & Johnson

Alan B. Johns – catalog/collection management librarian at Covington & Burling

James A. Keeling – library assistant at Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison

Lynda L. Kennedy – reference librarian at the Pentagon Library

Thomas K. King – library assistant at Fried,



Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson

William Kirchoff II – reference librarian at Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan

Aaron Klefferman – library clerk at Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld

Christopher J. Larkin – reference librarian at Covington & Burling

Valorie Lee – reference librarian at Howrey Simon Arnold & White

Ethel Leslie – interlibrary loan coordinator at The George Washington University, Jacob Burns Law Library

Monica L. Luciano — acquisitions/serials librarian at Covington & Burling

Matthew Mantel – reference librarian at The George Washington University, Jacob Burns Law Library

Emily Marsh – research librarian at Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan

Edward M. McClure – of counsel at Brincefield Hartnett Maloof & Paleos

Meloni McDougal – technical services/reference librarian at O'Melveny & Myers

Hakim Muhammad – acquisitions assistant at Howard University School of Law, Allen Mer-

cer Daniel Law Library

Irina Ortiz – librarian at Burt, Maner & Miller

J. Leon Parrott, Esq. – law firm sales representative at West Group

Debbie Petro – circulation desk assistant at Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld

Jennifer Preston – assistant librarian at the U.S. Sentencing Commission

Janice Richardson – librarian assistant at Kenyon & Kenyon

Eileen Santos – cataloging librarian at Howard University School of Law, Allen Mercer Daniel Law Library

Dawn Sobol – interlibrary loan/circulation librarian at Catholic University of America, Judge Katherine DuFour Law Library

Judy Stark — librarian at Jenkins & Gilchrist

Xin Wang – computer services librarian at Catholic University of America, Judge Katherine DuFour Law Library

Dara L. Ward – BIA Financial Network

James M. Wasicek – interlibrary loan librarian at Dewey Ballantine

Maria Zehren – research librarian at Winston & Strawn ■

GLOBAL SECURITIES AD

EYE ON SERIALS

Susan Ryan
Georgetown University
Law Library

PRINT PUBLICATIONS

Digital Discovery and e-Evidence, 2001-

Published monthly by Pike & Fischer, Inc., 1010 Wayne Avenue, Suite 1400, Silver Spring, MD 20910-9674; 800/255-8131; Fax: 301/562-1521; E-mail: pike@pf.com; Web site: www.pf.com.

Price: \$649.00 per year.

This newsletter features guides for both litigators and in-house counsel, updates on new cases and rules in the area, as well as reports on new technology that can be used to find or conceal digital information.

Federal Procurement Regulations, 2001-

Updated weekly by CCH Incorporated, P.O. Box 5490, Chicago, IL 60646-6085; 800/449-6435; Fax: 773/866-3095; Web site: online.store.cch.com.

Price: \$895.00 per year.

This looseleaf service contains the complete text of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, along with the major military and civilian supplements. It also provides weekly updates to ensure accurate coverage. A free copy of the CCH *Government Contracts Reports* letter is

part of the annual subscription to *Federal Procurement Regulations*.

ON-LINE SUBSCRIPTION

Securities and the Internet: A Compliance Guide, 2000-

Published both in print and online by Thompson Publishing Group, Inc., Subscription Service Center, P.O. Box 26185, Tampa, FL 33623-6185; 800/964-5815; Fax: 800/999-5661; Web site: www.thompson.com

Price: \$549.00 per year for either print or online, \$648.00 per year for both formats.

This publication, available online and in print, provides coverage of SEC no-action letters, Internet-related securities regulations and interpretations from the SEC and information on how attorneys and compliance officers are responding to issues not yet addressed by regulatory organizations.

TITLE CHANGE

Family court review, 2001-

Published quarterly by Sage Publications Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320; Phone: 805/499-0721; Fax: 805/499-0871; E-mail: info@sagepub.com; Web site: www.sagepub.com

Price: \$295.00 per year.

Formerly, *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, this new publication began with volume 39, number 1, dated January 2001. The last issue of the previous title was volume 38, number 4, dated October 2000. ■

CAL INFO AD

LLSDC JOBLINE

The LLSDC JobLine, maintained by the Placement Committee, has expanded to include announcements posted on the LLSDC listserv as well as helpful links to other job resources such as the AALLNET Career Hotline, WashingtonJobs.com, etc. Job listings may be viewed at <http://www.llsdc.org/committees/placement/jobline.htm>. E-mail jobline@llsdc.org for information on how to place an ad.

LLSDC OPENING RECEPTION/BREAKFAST

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2001

8:30 AM TO 11:00 AM

MARRIOTT AT METRO CENTER , 775 12TH ST, NW,

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

METRO REDLINE: METRO CENTER STOP

Breakfast includes: Freshly Cut Seasonal Melons and Berries Served with Honey Yogurt, English Muffin with Scrambled Eggs and Cheddar Cheese, Assorted Fruit & Nut Breads, Croissants and Bagels; Coffee, Tea, Cappuccino, Espresso and a Selection of Orange, Apple and Cranberry Juices.

\$5/PERSON

Enjoy breakfast while you

- Meet the 2001-2002 LLSDC Executive Board members, Special Interest Section (SIS) Presidents and Committee Chairs;
- Join a Committee or SIS;
- Find out how you can get "Your Name in Lights"

NAME _____

FIRM OR INSTITUTION NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE NUMBER _____ E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

AMOUNT ENCLOSED _____

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO LLSDC (\$5/person) and mail to Keith Gabel, c/o Thompson Coburn Library, 1909 K St, NW, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20006. For more info, please contact Ann Green at 202-408-6452 or president@llsdc.org. **RSVP by September 24, 2001.**

Thanks to the Lexis-Nexis Librarian Relations Group
for sponsoring the LLSDC Opening Reception/Breakfast!

