

MINUTES

November 18-19, 1976
Los Angeles, California

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Joseph Becker; Daniel Casey; Carlos Cuadra; Martin Goland; Marian Leith; Louis Lerner; Bessie Moore; Ralph Renick; John E. Velde, Jr.; Mildred Younger; and Frederick Burkhardt, Presiding

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Alphonse F. Trezza; Mary Alice Reszetar; Ruth Tighe; Barbara Cranwell; and Carl Thompson

OBSERVERS PRESENT : Catherine Chadwick, Librarian, Ventura County Library; Phyllis Maggeroli and Dixie Adeniram, Ventura County Library Services Agency

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted as written.

Annual Report

Mr. Trezza reported that Mr. Price, who was not present, was busily working on the Annual Report and preparing a supplemental budget request for salary adjustment which had been requested by the Office of Management and Budget. Completion of the Annual Report is expected by December 1, 1976. Plans are to deliver the Annual Report to the President and Congress before January 20, 1977.

Status ReportsTask Force on the Role of School Libraries in the National Network--

Mr. Trezza distributed a statement of purpose and work description and suggested task force members. The task force, previously authorized by NCLIS, in cooperation with the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), is desirous of substantiating the extent of the involvement of the school library/media specialist in the total framework of networking. NCLIS is anxious to determine the role of the school/library media specialist and the school/media program in the NCLIS National Program. The task force will review the state of networking in school library/media programs nationwide and develop a position paper which will clarify, delineate, and describe the role of the school library/media program within the national program of libraries and information science.

The task force will consist of eighteen members, staff, and two Commissioners representing NCLIS. Nominations of persons to serve on the task force should be forwarded to Mr. Trezza by the end of November.

Dr. Burkhardt stated, "Am I wrong in thinking in developing the position of the relationship of the school library program to the National Program, you ought to have somewhat clearer ideas about what the National Program is--a more detailed idea than we now have? What I am saying is that it may be a little early to get moving on this before we have the structure of the national network and the National Program really clear."

Mr. Trezza stated that he feels this study is an integral part of our efforts in working toward implementing the National Program.

Ms. Tighe responded, "To what extent the school libraries should be encouraged, or opportunity provided to them, to contribute bibliographic records, or whether they will only derive data from them, is something that you can look at now. There is a great deal that can validly be analyzed, determined and identified now."

After extensive discussion on this topic, Dr. Burkhardt stated, "The general thing that came out of this discussion was that we have to keep an eye on our National Program and see to it that we make progress with it in a kind of tandem, and not let this thing develop either too abstractly or, for that matter, get into a state of commitment as to just exactly what their relationship has to be. The second thing is that the broader relationship of the school libraries, once defined, to sharing their own resources in different communities with one another is to be part of the task force's study."

Mrs. Leith stressed that the term "school" be clearly defined in the national program. The Commission was in agreement with this suggestion. Mrs. Moore stressed the need to address the importance of using the resources we now have more efficiently, and in particular, "Is it worth sharing, or not?" It was agreed that the task force should address "sharing." If we pool our resources, everybody will have better services. The Commission needs to give leadership in efficient use of services.

National Periodicals System

In reporting the progress of the task force, Mr. Trezza stated that it has been concluded by the task force advisory committee that a three-level system will best meet the needs of the library community. Initial services will come at the state and regional level. It is estimated that between 75-80 percent of the requests can be filled at this level. The resources of last resort--little used titles--will be a combination of existing strong collections (i.e., the Library of Congress and major research libraries) with a bibliographic system such as CONSER (Conversion of Serials) to provide location data. It is estimated that between 5-8 percent of the requests

will be filled at this level. The level between the state and regional levels and the level of last resort will be a dedicated National Periodicals Center managed by the Library of Congress, probably initially located in rented quarters in the Washington, D.C., area and consisting of 45,000 titles. This level is expected to fill the remaining 15-20 percent of the requests (although it can also supply the first 80 percent, if they are not available at the state level) generated through the system. The Center would be phased in over a period of time, with the assembly of dedicated collection starting on a given date and service starting approximately one year later. Within five years, this system is expected to effectively remove almost all of the burden from the heavy net lenders, leaving them free to cope more efficiently with requests for the more esoteric and little used materials.

Implementation will start when the recommendations of the final report are approved by the NCLIS and the community at large. The final report of the task force is being prepared by Vernon E. Palmour and should be available for public distribution in the spring of 1977. A small work force will then be formed to begin the technical design necessary for the Library of Congress to establish the National Periodicals Center. Strategies for seeking funding will also be considered. The work force will consist of a subcommittee of the NCLIS task force, NCLIS staff, and representatives from the Library of Congress. The present NCLIS task force on a National Periodicals System will monitor developments as they occur, until such time as the formal advisory group to NCLIS for the governance of the national periodicals program is established.

Mr. Trezza reported that a meeting between Dr. Burkhardt, Douglas Bryant, John Lorenz, Fred Cole, Warren Haas, Gene Palmour, and himself has been called to discuss the periodical access program.

Mr. Trezza stated that there are two major actions which must still occur. The first is the acceptance of the idea that the Library of Congress will assume the role of manager of the National Periodicals System and, secondly, definition of the near term steps involved. Details should be developed in 1977 so that the system can, hopefully, begin in 1978.

Mr. Goland observed, "The Commission is not an operating agency, and as soon as we can get a reputable group in whom we have confidence to take over one portion of this national plan, we should drop back to a monitoring role. We should not be involved to the point of being an operating agency." Mr. Trezza agreed with Mr. Goland's statement and added, "The Commission will continue to keep its liaison and monitoring role as our responsibility."

National Inventory of Library Needs

Mr. Trezza reported that the final document of this study should be available by the February 1977 meeting. This will be a very important document for the coming legislative program of the profession as it spells out in detail where we are, where the "indicators of needs" say we ought to be, and, therefore, what the gaps are. The report is encouraging in that it shows that financial support of libraries--in the last ten years--has increased and that they are real increases over and above inflation and population growth. However, it also shows the gaps, which, unfortunately, are still as big--and in some cases bigger. The data used were taken from the National Center for Education Statistics. The latest official data available was used--1975 data for academic libraries; 1974 data for public libraries; and 1972-73 data for school libraries.

Effectiveness of Federal Funding of Public Libraries

Mr. Lerner expressed his opinion that this is a first-class study. The general conclusion of the study is that the Federal funding effort under LSCA and under the general revenue sharing program have been only moderately effective in assuring the development of public library services throughout the nation adequate to meet present and future needs.

Dr. Burkhardt reported that a National Emergency Committee to save the Public Libraries, headed by Whitney North Seymour, Jr., whose specific purpose is to call the attention of Congress to the public library's troubles, the rising costs, etc., has been established. Dr. Burkhardt said that he sees this report as having major impact on Mr. Seymour's campaign.

Mr. Lerner recommended that: (1) the Executive Committee be empowered to approve the report before it is presented to the entire Commission so that it can be released instantly; and (2) a press conference be called to announce its findings. The press conference could also cover several other areas--the report of the Domestic Council's Committee on the Right to Privacy--which we hope to publish--the Urban Library Council companion study to our report, and the activity of the Commission.

On motion by Mr. Velde, and seconded by Mr. Lerner, VOTED, That the Executive Committee be empowered to take appropriate action on the decision to release and/or publish the "National Inventory of Library Needs," and the "Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Federal Funding of Public Libraries."

The "Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Federal Funding of Public Libraries" report will be submitted to Congressman Brademas, as he has previously requested. It is expected that he will call a hearing on the findings and recommendations contained in the report.

Photocopy Study

Two of the three questionnaires have now been approved by the Office of Management and Budget. The biggest problem encountered has been in getting people to cooperate and participate in the survey. In an attempt to solve this problem, a staff member from King Research called hundreds of libraries, adding a personal touch in the hope of improving the possibilities of cooperation. Dr. Cuadra asked the question, "Will the libraries be collecting all the data? Will there be any independent assessment or validation of the accuracy of the data being provided by the libraries? There is a definite problem of credibility." Dr. Burkhardt responded by saying: "This is a good point. Unless you have some kind of validation, the 'opposition' is going to object. We have got to build credibility into the survey." Mr. Trezza stated that this problem will be presented to King Research but pointed out that the advisory committee to the study includes three industry representatives who have approved the questionnaires and the methodology.

Management Institute for State Library Agencies

Mr. Trezza reported that the Institute will hold its first meeting on December 5-7 in Seven Springs, Pennsylvania; both Mrs. Moore and Mrs. Leith expect to attend. This particular session--the first of two--will be restricted exclusively to the head of the state agency. Mr. Trezza said it is imperative that the person in attendance be the decision-maker.

Forty-five states have agreed to this stipulation. The purpose of this first session is to train the decision-maker; the second meeting will involve the chief officer and one key staff member.

Project Mediabase

Ms. Tighe reported that the advisory committee has held one meeting with the authors in an attempt to begin outlining the objectives, purposes, and goals of a national media data base. A draft of these points (which will be contained in the final position paper) was presented to that advisory panel for discussion. Ms. Tighe stated that the specific purpose of this study will be to define the functional specifications for an ideal national data base.

Dr. Burkhardt asked, "Is there going to be a 'national' data base? If so, what do you mean by that?" In reply, Ms. Tighe stated, "It is now being discussed by the NBS Protocol task force, by Mrs. Avram's advisory committee, and the Committee for the Coordination for Bibliographic Control. There has not yet been an agreement on how it should be

conceptualized and whether or not there ought to be one single data base. Somewhere there must be an authoritative bibliographic record of all material processed and whether you maintain this at one place or distribute it, has not yet been answered. A single national source record, stored somewhere, is what this national data base, conceptually, would contain."

The inclusion of the work "bibliographic" before "data base" was recommended by Dr. Burkhardt for clarity.

NBS Task Force on Computer Protocols

(Information Science & Automation Division)

This project involves the ALA's ISAD, the Library of Congress, and the National Bureau of Standards. Participation has been broadened to include other communities to obtain their expertise, input, and cooperation. The next meeting is scheduled for January. There is an urgency among the computer people to have this developed as soon as possible so that connections can be made.

Dr. Cuadra stated his interest in having wide dissemination of any interim reports. Ms. Tighe replied that the meetings are announced in the Federal Register, and there has been a wide range of persons in attendance. Minutes of the meeting appeared in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin. Mr. Becker is one Commissioner on the task force. Mr. Trezza suggested former Commissioner Aines or Dr. Cuadra serve as substitutes when needed.

Copies of minutes, or summaries, if possible, of all task force meetings should be sent to each Commissioner.

Role of Authority File in a National Network

Ms. Tighe reported that the evaluation team of this project met for the first time on November 15 to outline the methodology necessary to define the role of an authority file in a national network context. If the role of an authority file is to provide for the establishment of an authoritative record, one must then ask the question, "When is an authoritative record needed, and for what purpose?" The purpose of an authority file is to control a national union catalog.

The proposal has been divided into two parts; the first part is to determine how to look at the situation and the second part is the implementation of the study. The principle investigator for the first half is Edwin Buchinski, Head of the MARC Development Office at the National Library of Canada. The final report on the first half of the study is due on January 25.

The work being done by the Committee for the Coordination of National Bibliographic Control (CoCoNaBiC), subcommittee on name authorities, will be integrated with the work of this project.

Dr. Burkhardt expressed his concern for a need for informing the Commissioners of this type of highly technical matters. We need an opportunity to become better informed on computer protocols, telecommunications, etc. Only two members really understand this area, and there is a communications and educational problem.

As orientation is definitely needed, Ms. Tighe suggested that they could be made by the principle investigators of the projects concerned. It was agreed that approximately one hour could be set aside at each meeting to discuss technical terminology and, hopefully, educate Commissioners in this area. Mr. Casey suggested this orientation be held the day before the Commission meetings, when committee meetings are scheduled.

It was generally agreed that when orientation in specific areas is needed, the staff would arrange for either the principle investigator of a task force or an outside consultant to present the briefings.

Role of Library of Congress in a National Network

The final report on this project has not been received as yet. The study is for the purpose of reviewing the Library of Congress' progress in and plans for providing a national bibliographic service and the major characteristics of existing or planned networks elsewhere in the country. The review, which will summarize network experiences and results, where appropriate, will assist the Library of Congress in identifying the major components necessary for successful network development and will provide guidelines for assimilation of independent networks in the national system.

Mr. Trezza discussed his very tentative thoughts for a network conference which would involve several outside agencies, such as OE's Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, Council on Library Resources, National Science Foundation, BALLOTS, National Endowment for the Humanities, etc. A Commission Committee could be formed to decide on the specifics of such a conference. The Network Conference idea has to do primarily with the structure of automated bibliographic networks. There are questions related to: whether you separate them geographically; whether you set up a separate one for the medical needs; how the medical library network relates to other automation files and bibliographic controls; is a separate one needed for the legal community; do you need to distinguish between the needs of the research community and the needs of the public library sector?

The Conference would be exclusively within the area of computer hook-up of bibliographic services. Mr. Goland stated, "If the Library of Congress has agreed to the role of a National Library, many of the things we are talking about are things the Library of Congress has to do in implementing its role. The Commission should drop back to a monitoring stance--not an active stance, because it becomes fixed."

Mr. Becker stated, "We need, ourselves--perhaps with a small group--to detail the big picture. We have to know that we are going to have a National Periodicals Center, a National Audiovisual Center, etc., and then assign responsibility or obtain commitments from institutions to support each of those commitments. It is the collection of these commitments that can lead to legislation or an identification of new money that may be required or better relationship of old money to this program. I do not see this as a big conference--rather a small group." No action was proposed at this time.

Meeting Dates

Because of a conflict in Mr. Renick's schedule, it was agreed that the February meeting date be changed to one day later--Friday, February 18 and, Saturday, February 19. Committee meetings will be held on the Thursday before the meeting. The November meeting will be held on the 10th and 11th, not the 17th and 18th.

Committee Reports

American Indians--Mrs. Moore issued the following statement outlining the responsibility of the Committee:

Committee on American Indians

This committee was set up as a result of the testimony of Indians at the San Antonio hearing and at the Albuquerque mini-hearing on the paucity of library service on reservations. NCLIS employed Virginia Mathews as a consultant; she prepared a paper with significant recommendations. Among these was a recommendation that NCLIS look at basic legislation dealing with Indian education and libraries, with a view toward needed amendments.

The purposes of this Committee are as follows:

- (1) To determine whether the present needs require revised or new legislation, and if so, to work with the appropriate agency in developing such legislation. This can be done through giving advice informally to members of Congress and their staffs and offering testimony before Congressional committees where needed.

- (2) To develop closer working relationships with government agencies having responsibility for Indian education on a working level and with organizations such as the Indian Education Association.

(Staff

Action) As a result of directions to the committee at the last Commission meeting, the staff of NCLIS will set up a task force composed of Indians and representatives of agencies providing service to Indians.

After meetings of such a group, the Committee should be able to further clarify its objectives and agree on activities necessary to achieve the objectives of NCLIS.

(Action) Recommendations for persons to serve on such an Indian Task Force should be submitted to Mrs. Moore.

Copyright

Mr. Goland suggested that with the work of the ad hoc committee completed and the submission of their report, that the committee be disbanded. There was general agreement to this suggestion.

Massive errors are contained in the House report published in the Congressional Record. Mr. Trezza stated that he offered NCLIS' assistance in making the corrections. The Congressional House Committee will not issue a corrected version. Dr. Burkhardt offered his opinion, "If nobody else makes the necessary corrections, and the library community ought to have this, then let's do it for them--if we can. It is cleaning something up that is a useful instrument. It is our work and our business." Final corrected proofs should be cleared with Congressman Kastenmeier.

Public Information

Mr. Lerner described a symposium which is being planned by the Public Information Committee within the next year for the general and library press regarding the work of the Commission. The Committee also saw the need for more impact by more press releases on contract's results and study reports. More publicity is needed so there will be more information about what the Commission is actually doing. The Committee also discussed a focus for the Commission--where we are now; which way we are going; what should we do between now and the White House Conference. The Committee agreed to produce ideas for a logo for the White House Conference. Mr. Lerner hopes to have specific ideas on the logo by the next Commission meeting.

(Action-
Lerner)

Urban Public Libraries

Mr. Lerner expressed his concern for the plight of the urban public libraries. To this end, he proposed a resolution supporting the Urban Library Council's new proposed LSCA, Title V. Mr. Trezza drafted such a resolution--which he read to the Commission. After discussion of the drafted resolution, Mr. Lerner moved, and Mrs. Leith seconded, that NCLIS issue a resolution advising the President and the Congress of its concern for the financial plight of the large public library and strongly urging that LSCA be amended by the addition of a new title that would provide the necessary financial assistance. (See Attachment #1.)

White House Conference

Mr. Velde reported that the President is expected to appoint 15 members to the Advisory Committee, as provided for in the law. Names, however, have not been released as yet. The \$3.5 million has been included in the fiscal year 1977 supplemental budget. Hopefully, money could be available by mid-March. Mr. Velde sees the White House Conference Committee as responsible for providing informational and orientation material to the Advisory Committee. Mr. Velde proposed that an initial meeting be held for the main purpose of becoming acquainted. An approximate cost (estimated by Mr. Trezza) for such a meeting is \$10,000. After discussion, on motion by Mr. Velde, and seconded by Mrs. Wu, VOTED That upon announcement by the President of his appointments to the White House Conference Advisory Committee, NCLIS conduct, as soon as practicable, a meeting composed of the full 28-member Advisory Committee, the NCLIS White House Committee, and NCLIS staff. Approximate amount authorized is \$10,000.

Letter of Thanks to the President

Mr. Trezza expressed his desire to send a letter expressing sincere appreciation for the Administration's support of the Commission's recommendations; its budget request; revision of the Administration's library policy; and support for the White House Conference. There was some opposition to this idea; however, Dr. Burkhardt requested Mr. Trezza to prepare the letter for his signature.

Government in the Sunshine Act

The Government in the Sunshine Act was signed by the President on September 13, 1976. Agencies are charged with the issuance of rules implementing the Act by March 12, 1977, 180 days after the date of the enactment. Copies of the Act were distributed to each Commissioner.

Mrs. Reszetar stated that there are ten ways to hold a closed meeting. Staff in consultation with the Department of Justice will draft proposed rules, send copies of them to each Commissioners, and publish the draft in the Federal Register, as required by law.

Executive Session

On motion by the Chairman, and seconded by Mr. Goland, VOTED, That, as a matter of routine procedure, an Executive Session be scheduled during each Commission meeting. Thirty minutes will be scheduled on each agenda.

Fee vs. Free Library Services

Articles on "Double Taxation" and "Pay Libraries and User Charges" were distributed. Mr. Trezza said the Commission must be prepared to develop a reasonable position on the matter of "when fee; when free library services." Frank and full discussion is necessary to help arrive at answers to questions such as: (1) How can a fee system be developed that will not deprive those that can't afford the cost? (2) What effect will a fee system have on the traditional philosophy of public libraries? (3) Is a basic change in the service philosophy of public libraries inevitable?

Mr. Trezza asked for reaction from each Commissioner for input in taking a position.

Mr. Casey recommended, in light of the Commission being involved with the funding of libraries, that a study be made outlining pros and cons of charging for public and academic library services, and the legal implications.

Dr. Cuadra stated that he does not agree with point of view of the article on on-line bibliographic services written by John Berry in the Library Journal. He will submit a letter citing the various inaccuracies and indicating another point of view. Hopefully, this exchange will increase consideration and discussion of the matter of fee service.

(Action) It was the general consensus that the staff try to produce a checklist of the variables and list issues involved. Dr. Burkhardt expressed his concern that the Commission not take a specific side or position.

Proposed Review Procedures

A draft of proposed review procedures used by the staff of NCLIS was distributed. Mr. Goland stated that the present policy is that the Commission does not give grants for projects, and it is clearly understood that the Commission is not a grant-giving or funding agency and does not encourage unsolicited proposals. Mr. Trezza stated that the Commission staff, however, does seek ideas and assistance from individuals and institutions for research and studies. Staff develops ideas, presents them to the Commission for approval and then determines a method for undertaking the activity, research, or study. Methods currently used to undertake areas for activities and studies are by Requests for Proposals (RFP's), consultant contracts, interagency agreements, and task force studies.

The staff may develop a more detailed paper on the "unsolicited proposals" policy as it now stands and include possible recommended changes for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Trezza described a proposal received entitled, "The Regional Medical Library Network." This proposal is to conduct a critical analysis of the regional medical library network, developed by the National Library of Medicine under the authority of the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. No action was requested.

National Program Document Implementation

Mr. Becker discussed in detail his ideas on implementing the National Program Document and, in particular, drafting legislation. The entire transcript of that discussion is Attachment #2.

AT&T

Ms. Tighe discussed the implications of the AT&T Bill. In particular, the bill calls for state jurisdiction over terminal hook-ups; and the concerns of the individual telephone user are addressed while the concerns of the library network user are not. Ms. Tighe stated, "There could be a clearly adverse impact on libraries if this Bill succeeds." Mr. Trezza suggested that NCLIS take a position in this matter. Two suggestions of persons who could assist in the development of a briefing document outlining the implications and consequences of this Bill were Messrs. Donald Dunn and Edwin Parker, both of Stanford University in California.

Mrs. Younger suggested that Dr. Burkhardt write a letter--as a matter of formality--to the Chairman of the Communications Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expressing our interest. Dr. Burkhardt agreed to this suggestion.

On motion by Mrs. Moore, and seconded by Mr. Becker, VOTED, That the Commission express its interest and concern that all parties--not only the computer manufacturers--be represented and views fairly heard in testimony being given in hearings held by the Communications Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In this effort, the Executive Director is authorized to let personal contracts for an indepth study of the "Consumer Protection Bill" proposed by AT&T. Amount of contracts are subject to approval by the Executive Committee. It was further voted that a letter expressing our intent be sent by Chairman Burkhardt to Mr. Lionel Van Deerlin, Chairman of the hearings.

International Library Symbol

Mr. Trezza reported that a letter received by the staff from Ms. Mary Gaver, Past President of ALA, solicited support for the development of an international symbol for libraries. After Commission discussion, the members agreed not to take initiative in this area.

Housekeeping

Red stamp all material needing response.

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT DURING DISCUSSION
OF DRAFTING LEGISLATION FOR THE
NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

November 19, 1976
Los Angeles, California

Burkhardt: We need to get on with an overall examination of the National Program and concentrate our energies and funds in this area. I have asked Joe Becker to do a little thinking in advance of this meeting since he has been the prime mover of the whole thing all along. Joe, can you take over?

Becker: By way of introduction--when we look back over what we did with our National Program we see that it gave us--as has been pointed out--a focus for our activities over a two-year period which included hearings; which led to individual and group contributions on the part of the Commissioners and staff and gave us the chance, meeting by meeting, to improve upon something that would lead somewhere. I sense that what you are asking me is to see if we can identify some other vehicle for essentially doing that same thing. If we look at the program, it provided a framework, I think, for the profession and has also provided a sense of direction for the profession, whether it is being recognized or not. Since we have issued the National Program Document, it has been endorsed by every major library organization with only minor revisions, i.e., school libraries and the private sector.

Trezza: The concept and the principle have been accepted, and now we have to work on the implementation.

Becker: During this past year and a half we have used the matrix to identify particular areas that seem to deserve research, task force and/or committee treatment, or the development of additional information which would assist us in funding the program. I guess that was the main purpose. In every case these were support projects and our particular objectives, as described in the National Program. The program, I think, has created some momentum among the different activities in the country, and they are moving more now, it seems to me, toward things national than they did before our program was available. It is quite obvious when you see the accelerated activity in the area of networks and inter-institutional cooperation, for example. By the same token, it has led to a degree of confusion because we have not taken it the next step, and there is a good bit of jockeying for leadership positions among organizations. The Library of Congress is still a little uncertain as to what its role is. OCLC, Fred Kilgour, is trying to interpret his own governing structure and whether or not he will become what he calls a major node in the national network. There are other bubblings of this type going on in the country, and it seems that we need an adjusted focus now--a second step after the program document.

There have also been new developments since our program document was issued. The problem, of course, is the White House Conference. All along we have said that the National Program Document would form a

NEWS RELEASE

From: National Commission on Libraries
and Information Science
Telephone: (202) 653-6252

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 22, 1976

URBAN PUBLIC LIBRARIES
AND
THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, taking note of the critically important role the urban public libraries play in meeting the informational, educational, and cultural needs of people and recognizing that the large urban public libraries are in serious financial distress, adopted a resolution recommending an amendment to the Library Services and Construction Act.

In its resolution, the Commission stresses the need for balanced intergovernmental funding from local, state and Federal sources if library services adequate to meet the needs of the people are to be provided.

Financial assistance to the urban public libraries from Federal sources is essential and can be achieved through a new Title V to the Library Services and Construction Act proposed by the Urban Library Council and the American Library Association.

Attachment

URBAN PUBLIC LIBRARIES
AND
THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

For Immediate Release

WHEREAS, large urban public libraries are a critical part of the Nation's information and cultural resources, and

WHEREAS, the large urban public libraries are vital for the educational and economic development of the United States, and

WHEREAS, the large urban public libraries are in serious financial distress, and

WHEREAS, balanced intergovernmental funding from local, state and Federal sources is essential to achieve services at a level that will assure optimum content and quality, and

WHEREAS, the American Library Association, a national library and information services organization representing over 35,000 institutional and personnel members, and the Urban Library Council, a national organization representing approximately fifty of the Nation's largest urban libraries, have proposed an amendment to the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) by adding a new Title V which would provide assistance to large urban public libraries serving cities of over 100,000 population for the purpose of purchasing books and other library materials.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science advise the President and the Congress of its concern for the financial plight of the large urban public library and strongly urge that LSCA be amended by the addition of a new title that would provide the necessary financial assistance.

very important part of the discussions for the national conference and for the state conferences before it.

Another development is the new Administration and an awareness, at least in the press, that they intend to reorganize and look at new projects with more plagiary than perhaps the last Administration did. These are two, I think, significant developments since our program document came out.

The suggestion I would like to make is that we bend our efforts toward developing draft legislation--not because I think it can be done overnight--it is something we will have to do eventually, but because it will give us an opportunity to create a document which we can then improve upon just as we did the program document all along, and share, as a group, in its development and evolution. It is within our charter to do this. The program document can go only so far and, at some point, we will have to look at what the Federal Government should do to promote it and that means, eventually, some kind of legislation. I think it is timely to do it--given the new Administration. I think it would mobilize professional interest for sure in it because there will be a lot of controversy attached to it and a lot of discussion. I think it will bring together both the library science and information science communities. I think it is the kind of thing that is going to surface, anyway. We have seen it just in this Commission meeting alone; in the area of the public libraries there is a suggestion for new legislation as a result of our studies. The urban public libraries

have suggested new legislation--in each case the need for money. In the area of Indian service, there was a suggestion yesterday by Bessie Moore that new legislation might be needed. But, I think development of draft legislation would prepare us for the White House Conference, and I think it is time for something like that to be done.

Now, what would such a document contain? It would have to specify a Washington operating agency. We said one was necessary in the program document, and we have been waiting for John Bystrom for a year and a half now to produce something for us that would suggest different alternatives. Whether he does or not, I think the time has come to say something about that. The confusion of leadership in the country, I believe, is a result of the fact that we just don't have such an agency in Washington that has assumed responsibility for it all. I think in the process of drafting legislation we, ourselves, will clarify the structure of the national network and that needs clarification. People see it differently and, somehow or other, it has to be defined in greater detail than we have up to now. That does not mean that it is a fixed kind of thing, but I believe the process of writing out your right language in draft legislation is going to lead to people talking about it and agreeing as to what it should be over time. I think it would help us define the roles of the principle

institutions, such as the Library of Congress, the other national libraries, OCLC, BALLOTS, etc. I think if we tackle it we will have to show the relationship of what we propose to existing legislation and begin to consider whether that deserves revision and amendment in order to discover those things which are directly a part of new legislation without affecting all of the other components. I think it would give us an opportunity to develop a dollar estimate of the magnitude of what we are proposing, which we have not done before. So, the process of developing a document for draft legislation, I think, has a number of useful things attached to it. From our point of view, in terms of contributions as a group, we could get involved just as we did on the program document. It is something we will need to do for the White House Conference and for moving the program itself, anyway. How shall we do that? I think we might proceed just the way we did with the program document, and that is to do a first approximation inhouse with as much help as we can get of the "Georgette" variety, if necessary. I haven't discussed this with Al or with you, Fred, and I don't know what the procedure would be or the mechanics of it.

Burkhardt: Joe, I think what I would like to have is a kind of analysis of what in the National Program Document, in fact, does require new legislation; what can be covered with existing legislation; what existing legislation needs to be amended or added in order to get

this or that objective accomplished; what new legislation really is needed to set up a new agency or institution; and, finally, what appropriation legislation is needed? For example, the American Indian project will probably require money but not any new legislation because the basic law is there. There are responsible agencies, but what they need are ideas and an appropriation for implementation.

Moore: It may not even require additional money. It may be a reallocation.

Burkhardt: The point is that there are at least four or five different kinds of things that we ought to have analyzed for us, work on them, and make it clear to ourselves what they are. I agree with you that the new legislation drafting might very well be an overall bill--"A National Library and Information Act."

Again, we need to set up the whole thing in a comprehensive way, pull together legislation that already exist, add the new stuff, and put a cost on it. But, whether or not this is needed and whether or not it is strategically sound is something we ought to examine because it might be that the thing to do is to let other agencies pick up parts and not try to make a central, single new National Library and Information Act.

Cuadra: I mentioned this to Joe yesterday, and it might be worth repeating and see what Joe's comment is. I have the impression that some of the activity that we are seeing in the library information science community has been triggered by the National Program but is not necessarily in support of it. It is almost, in a sense, against it. There are people who are really concerned about a certain kind of government monopoly, bit daddy kind of system, and I suspect that some of the activities at OCLC in the interest of becoming a better, more complete system to serve libraries is partly motivated by wanting to have that service and not have it invented and imposed by the government. I don't think that is bad. I think it is fine that the National Program is stimulating some interest on the part of many organizations to do something instead of relying on us to come up with a grand design for a grand Federally-sponsored program. I am interested in whether the people agree with me.

Becker: Yes.

Velde: Weren't we also told by England that the only way to get something like this done is to grab the pieces that you can and not try to do it all at one time?

Burkhardt: Yes. That is what the British Library does. This is more easily understood. Don't try for a single act that incorporates

everything in one blow. You never get it through.

Trezza: This is the philosophy that I have been following. I have resisted what Joe just suggested--to write broad legislation. I think it could be dangerous and controversial, and that we could have much opposition. There are people who maintain that drawing up library legislation like this is really their role and not ours. I don't think this is true, we do have a role and responsibility as stated in our law.

Burkhardt: But, you are not opposing piecemeal legislation?

Trezza: No. I am talking about the overall approach. For example, our Public Library Study that we discussed yesterday is going to recommend new ideas for legislation. And, in fact, it recommends as a follow-up--just what Joe said--that we sit down and develop a piece of legislation and it is more comprehensive than just public libraries. In some regards, it is the sort of thing that Joe is saying only in a slightly narrower fashion, but broader than public libraries. It says that LSCA was great, but it is not longer valid today and must be changed. This might give us the handle to do what Joe was just suggesting. The national periodicals system, for example, might be developed in two ways. One with the Library of Congress as manager--this would not need legislation. But it may necessitate legislation to organize

the overall structure and provide the appropriation.

Burkhardt: The actual, central library might be an independent non-profit organization.

Trezza: Yes, with a separate board or committee you might have to do that in legislation. There are at least two pieces here which fit Joe's suggestion. The one in the area of public libraries and multilibrary, cooperation, and the other national periodicals system.

Burkhardt: Shouldn't we go over the National Program sort of systematically and analyze it and say this doesn't require legislation, this should be an amendment to this, tell OE they ought to get on with this, etc? The whole thing ought to be broken down.

Becker: I think the process of doing what you described and of trying to draft something new is going to sort out the pieces. It is that process that I am suggesting that we engage in.

Burkhardt: I think we should do it inhouse. Maybe get some good advice. It will get us in the practice of thinking out "how will the Senate or House Committee respond to this or that notion? "What would Brademas or Magnuson say about this?" It is good practice for us.

Trezza: Another temptation that I have resisted has been to try to put a total dollar amount on the program. I think it is dangerous because any dollar amount that you suggest is going to be awful big. I think this would kill it. I would much prefer seeing us develop a one piece at a time approach and put a dollar value on each piece. OMB said to me recently, "you must have some idea what the whole program is going to cost." I said, "isn't it better to say to you this portion is going to cost so and so." You say "great" or "no thanks," and you only support those parts of the program which makes sense at the Federal level. In other words, it seems to me that there is a danger on placing overall dollar value to this program. I don't think we can, frankly.

Becker: I don't want to attach a dollar value, but I would like to have some appreciation of what it is going to cost.

Burkhardt: You have to know whether it is feasible. You take the periodical bank, it is not difficult to figure out what 50,000 periodical subscriptions will cost you. This is a figurable item.

Trezza: How do we merge two things now, Joe? We are talking about our matrix idea which we are still using--at least I use it--as a guide to what we do. Every time an idea comes up, I always look at

our objectives because that is the policy under which we are operating. Now, what you are saying is, "Can we look at this overall and work towards resolving the problems?"

Becker: Yes. We essentially ask the public library people to suggest to us what they thought should be included in the legislation, which they had done. I think each of these activities, the conclusions that are reached by the various projects, will impact on what it is we write.

Trezza: Recently I had the opportunity to suggest to ALA and the State Librarians that we were moving in the direction of trying to draft legislation based on the Lane study. In the past, in almost every case, it was ALA who has drafted library legislation--there is not a piece of library legislation that was not started by ALA. We have a sensitive political problem here because, obviously, if ALA is not involved in the drafting and if they are not behind it, it is not going to go anywhere because they control the lobbying. So, obviously, I was interested in getting the reaction of the head of the Washington Office, and it was positive. Eileen Cooke looks on us as part of the process instead of a competitor. I think that is the important thing.

Younger: May I just caution against at any time risking eliminating the master legislation and opt for amendments. You do not dare take a

change on losing the whole existence because then you are through. Our Senator Cranston from California has been intensely interested in library matters and extremely cooperative in the past. This is not to be overlooked by any means and could be a help in this direction. Of course, Senator Hayakawa is a totally unknown quantity at this point, but he is from the field of education and this is the kind of thing that they are looking for that they can, maybe, cooperate. We need nonpartisan cooperation.

Trezza: The other day one of the things I drafted on my flight to California was a statement which I briefly discussed at the PR meeting the other day. (Trezza reads the resolution). It so happens it fits to a large extent to what we are saying.

Burkhardt: What I suggest, and I think this is an important suggestion, is why don't we, for the February meeting, get the analysis of the National Program done along the lines we have been talking about. What can be done by existing agencies, without any new legislation? What can be done by amending existing legislation? What really requires new legislation? What appropriation legislation would be needed? For this frame--Al, you reframe your statement--fill it out--and we will discuss it as a major item for the February meeting. This is too important for us to try to get our bearings on

in five or ten minutes now. Do you agree?

Trezza: Yes. The only thing I was looking toward is the new Administration. I was trying to get a statement such as I suggested released for us with the new Administration. It is the timing that is such a problem.

Burkhardt: The President is not going to have that much time in his first few days.

Velde: I don't think we lose too much having it a little later.

Trezza: What do you think, Joe, from your position about my suggestions?

Becker: I think we have to go through this analysis because if we are speaking to people like Senator Cranston or Hayakawa, or anyone else in the Administration and they start pressing us for specifics, unless we have done our homework, we won't have the answers.

Burkhardt: Clearly, what we have been doing with our task forces is developing the facts and the data in order to see where we stand. Some of it we already know is going to require legislation.

Trezza: Of course we have one official opportunity waiting for us and that is to follow through on Representative Brademas' request that we testify on the recommendations of the Lane study. He said that he would hold a hearing for us to talk about that study. We can use the study as a base and discuss our program as a whole. We already have a built-in opportunity to meet with a key Committee in the House, the Education Committee. Mr. Brademas is a very powerful man now, more so than ever.

Becker: First, start drafting something inhouse for discussion among ourselves; secondly, exposure to small groups--people who are interested in legislation, both in the library community and the information community. Third, exposure to select Congressmen. Perhaps then it will take the form of hearings before the White House Conference. I don't know. I think the question of time is important--whether we want to do this before the White House Conference or have it coincide with it and have it endorsed by them, somehow. I think this is all part of strategy which we haven't thought through.

Burkhardt: If we get our ducks in order and our own minds cleared up by the February meeting of the Commission, we will be well on the road for having a program for the next year and a half. By that time the White House Conference Advisory Committee, presumably, will have met.

All sorts of things will be new in the organization. In the early days of this, as soon as the appropriation comes through, there is not escaping the fact that the Washington staff is going to be up to its ears in organizing the conferences. Hopefully, it is not going to garble up its time for very long, but until we get an Conference Coordinator and staff, I don't see any way of escaping full time, go ahead work, on your part, Al, and the rest of the staff.

Trezza: It will take a fair amount of time to get the White House Conference planning started.

Burkhardt: So, there is going to be a good gap. Let's use February and get this thing behind us so that we are at least clear about next steps.

Velde: I just wonder, Al, in that statement can you incorporate some more private sector participation someplace?

Trezza: Yes. Where we talk about libraries and information centers, we can work in the words, "public and private sector."

Becker: Does the rest of the Commission feel this is the desirable next step to take?

Goland: Yes. My view is that the national plan is kind of a guideline, a philosophic guideline, and obviously it has to be revolutionary and highly optimistic. We need to seize every circumstance that we can to advance it. I don;t believe that a frontal attack on the library system will every get anywhere. As a political reality, the fact is that libraries don't have that much of a constituency. About all we can do is use this as a plan and then watch for the opportunity such as the national periodicals study. I think what Fred has suggested, which is to keep very clearly in our own minds what opportunities we are watching for, is worthwhile. But, I think, any frontal attack, except in a revolutionary sense, is not going to succeed.

Trezza: I think you would be surprised just how much and how often library and information journals cite our document, our objectives, or our goals. They will say, "In accordance with the recommendations of the National Commission's proposal..." If we made a copy everytime one appeared, you would receive a lot of paper. The other day I heard a comment that there are some who do not know we exist. That's the exception. The ALA Yearbook mentions the NCLIS at least 20 times. There is no question about the impact of the Commission and its document. I think, sometimes, we just don't fully understand just how important we have become. We really don't understand what has

happened in the last two years. I have been visiting, and speaking throughout the country, and I can tell you that the Commission has really gotten attention. Even those who are not happy with everything we do are not fearful. One of our real critics in a lot of things is Paul Zurkowski, but he is not fearful of us at all. We have the creditability at the moment, and we have the attention. I really do think that we are moving in the right direction.

Burkhardt: Suppose, if you agree, we make that one of our major February discussions. Have the kind of paper drafted with this analysis so we can discuss it, and get it to us ahead of time. You may need some expert advice on some of it. You may have to talk to the USOE people and not only technical people, but legislative people who know what's in the works and what could be done and what isn't.

Moore: There is a man who works with us on legislative matters, isn't there?

Reszetar: Yes. Richard Smith.

Trezza: He is very expensive and I don't want to use him until I really need him. At this point he really can't do anything for us.

Becker: Are you going to consider the "Georgette" type format like we had the last time? Someone I can work with because I can't devote all of my time to it.

Trezza: Do you want this to be a staff job?

Burkhardt: Let's try to get it done in Washington, first--the outline and the analysis--then for the next step we might do something different.

Cuadra: I don't see how you can. If Joe is responsible and he needs some help, it has got to be here in California where he is and not in Washington.

Burkhardt: This analysis of what can be done and what needs to be done, what I was thinking was that Joe gets into the act much more as an expert sense after this analysis. Do you see it differently?

Becker: Well, I see myself actually assisting in the analysis.

Burkhardt: I don't know how to do it.

Trezza: I don't know either.

Becker: We will have to discuss it and see. There must be a way of doing it.

Burkhardt: In any case, we are clear about what we want, and we will get that paper done.

Moore: The details can be worked out with the Chairman.

Burkhardt: The February agenda will have on it the next step in the National Program which will be a paper analyzing our present program in terms of what can be done now by existing agencies, what needs amended new legislation, etc. This will be sent to us ahead of time. Who prepares it and how it is being prepared is up to Al to work out.