

**NATIONAL COMMISSION ON  
LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE**

--

NCLIS  
1110 Vermont Avenue, NW; Suite 820  
WASHINGTON, DC

December 5, 2001

## PROCEEDINGS

(2:00 p.m.)

MS. GOULD: I'm here. Welcome. I would like to call the meeting of the National Commission on Libraries Information Science to order, and it's Wednesday, December 5th, and we are a few minutes after 2:00 p.m. And first I would like to go around the table and have everyone introduce themselves, and we will start with Commissioner Mason.

MS. MASON: Marilyn Mason.

MR. ROBINSON: Don Robinson.

MS. GRIFFITHS: (Indiscernible) Griffiths.

MS. CHALLINOR: (Indiscernible) Challinor.

MS. GOULD: Martha Gould.

MR. WILLARD: Ron Willard.

MS. RUSSELL: Judy Russell.

MR. HORTON: Woody Horton.

MS. BINGHAM: Rebecca Bingham.

MR. MARTIN: Bob Martin.

MR. DAVENPORT: Nancy Davenport for the librarian of Congress.

MS. GOULD: And we also have with us Paulette Holahan who is with us by telephone, and, Paulette, speak up.

MS. HOLAHAN: I'm here.

MS. GOULD: Thank you.

MS. HOLAHAN: I'm here.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. HOLAHAN: (Indiscernible).

MS. GOULD: And we're delighted you're here with us. I would like for people to quickly look at the agenda.

MR. WILLARD: I think as a technicality because we're under the government and the Sunshine Act and we're having just a very short personnel issues closed session, we have to take a vote on adopting the agenda which includes a closed session.

MS. GOULD: Yes. My only comment on the agenda is that tomorrow morning at 8:30 I'm going up on the hill with Bob. We will be meeting with Senator Reid for just a few moments. So Commission Challinor will be chairing the meeting until Mr. Willard and I get back from the hill.

MS. CHALLINOR: You have no idea what we're going to do?

MS. GOULD: Oh, yes, I do. However, what I would appreciate, although I think we'll be back before we get to the item on the roll-up libraries and emergency preparedness and disaster recovery. So with that, are there any other comments on the agenda?

MS. GRIFFITHS: Did we want to add system libraries in that? It's not new business really. Could we add that somewhere?

MR. WILLARD: It will be reported on if there is an action that you have in mind.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I would like to hear the report first.

MS. CHALLINOR: Where does that fit in?

MR. WILLARD: We could add it under other new business if whatever the issue is hasn't been addressed.

MS. GOULD: And system libraries is under the executive director's report.

MR. ROBINSON: I will move we accept the agenda.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I'll second.

MS. GOULD: Any further discussion?

MALE VOICE: No response.

MS. GOULD: Okay. I'm told that we have to speak into the microphone. I thought I was speaking loudly enough but evidently I'm not. It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor of accepting the agenda.

MALE VOICE: A course of ayes.

MS. GOULD: Opposed?

MALE VOICE: No response.

MS. GOULD: The agenda with the comments has been adopted. The next is the chairperson's report. And to be very honest with you, I've had a rather busy year and until I worked on my report, I didn't know how busy it was. Very quickly, of course, I went to mid-winter meeting in January. I also went to the Nevada Native American Convocation in January. This was part of the IMLS Native American Project and it was each state has its own convocation, and I attended the one and did a program for libraries as I was requested to do. I was in Washington in February to work in the office and to meet with OMB on our budget. I also met with Senators Ensign and Reid and Congresswoman Berkeley, and then with Senator Lieberman on the study that we have done on permanent access to public information. I was in Chicago in March for the PLA spring symposium, and then in March I went to Seaside, Oregon, to do a keynote address for the Oregon Library Association. And then in April I was in Cincinnati for the hearing on the status of school libraries, as other commissioners were, and I went on to Washington for legislative day and meetings on the hill regarding the NCR's budget. I was at the LSG Reauthorization Task Force. In June, of course, was the annual conference. In July I was in Washington to attend the IMLS Patterson (phonetic) Leadership grants. I also again met with Senator Reid and with Anita Horne who, at that time, was his legislative director. She has since moved on. I met with Congressman David Vitter along with our Commissioner Challinor, and then, of course, almost every time I'm in Washington, I do meet with Jim Gibbons who is my congressman. In August I did two programs for the PMLA meeting in Corvallis, Washington. I was at IFLA in Boston. In September I went to Elko to attend again the state meeting on the Native American Library Project as part of a project that was funded by IMLS. And in between times, I usually confer with Bob and Judy almost every morning at 6:30 in the morning Reno time. They either call me or I call them just to do whatever has to be done in terms of their office. I also keep in touch with Senator Reid's office and Ensign and Gibbons offices in Reno. We're very lucky in Nevada in that we're small enough that we have personal contacts with many of these people and the people who are on -- in the offices in Northern Nevada all are long -- have been long-time personal friends before they ended up running these offices. I've also been appointed by Governor Gwynn to the Committee on Holocaust Education and I served on the task force on school library standards which now have been passed into law by the Nevada State Legislature and they are now part of the state administrative code and attached directly to the new standards for math, science, social studies, and English. They're excellent and I will make copies of these standards available just as soon as they have been printed.

And the only other thing is that next week I go back to New Jersey. I've been asked to do a keynote for -- I just went blank. It's the New Jersey Library Network meeting. And that pretty much takes care of what I've been doing over this past year. As I said, it's been an interesting year. And with that, we're now down to the executive director's report.

MR. WILLARD: With your permission, although I have slides, I will stay here. But before I go with the slides, let me just make an overall comment. As you realize, this meeting is being held because it is the one that is in conjunction with the National Museum Services Board, and it is almost immediately, in terms of the way time is flying these days, immediate on the heels of the meeting we had on October 26th which was rather rapidly put together also. The reason I say this is there's no doubt that the meeting support materials that you have are woefully inadequate, and I want you to understand that that is solely my fault. The staff kept coming to me and saying, "Well, should we do this; should we do that?" I was simply unable to make evaluations on what should be included for your advance reading, so we just didn't do the typical meeting packet that you would expect to get before one of these events. And, as I say, I take complete responsibility for that. I felt that the issues we had before us are such that the real value is just in what each one of you individually brings to the conversation, and, although it would have been good to perhaps read a couple of chronicle articles or something out of Info World on the issues that we're dealing with, it just seemed not to be the time to put it together.

I have a prepared briefing of -- Rosalie, would you hit the light?

MALE VOICE: Operator slide.

MR. WILLARD: The topics that I'm going to deal with, first and foremost, obviously is the appropriate battle we've had. Secondly a couple of personnel items just to bring to your attention, a couple of administrative issues, review of our publications, and then normally in one of these meetings you would have an agenda item for various projects and the individual staff member would report on it. Because of the coincidence of timing of this meeting, our major workshop in the statistical area is taking place right now. Both the FSCS's training program and the State Library Advisory Committee are meeting this week so Denise and Kim are both out of pocket up in Bethesda carrying forth on those meetings. So I will review all of the projects or many of the projects we have got going on.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

This slide may look familiar. This basically tells where we are now. The only difference between now and October 26th is that the appropriation bill did pass the senate, so we now have two different bills, both named HR3016. One is passed by the house; one is passed by the senate, and they are in a Conference Committee. The difference is that the house only passed a million dollars or approved a million dollars for us and gave rather vague language that says we should utilize this year's funding to complete ongoing projects. In other words, be ready to go out of business. Whereas, on the senate side, they approved the amount of funding that we are at -- where we were at in the last fiscal year and used language that actually was brought to the attention of the committee in a letter by Senator Reid who was quoting from the 1985 Senate Report, and they picked it up almost word for word where they said they're considerably disturbed over the

administrative request to terminate us, and the funding they provided would allow us to play an important role.

Next step's the Conference Committee has been identified. As late as 6:00 last night, I got an e-mail from a principle member of the staff on the Appropriations Committee saying that levels have just not been agreed to yet. Therefore, she couldn't tell me what our situation was. We are operating under a continuing resolution that funds us at last year's level which, of course, is the same as this year's proposed level in the senate until December 7th. We expect another continuing resolution, and the media is reporting that the Conference Committee will submit its results to the house and senate early next week. The big problem is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which authorizes a lot of money out of the 123,000,000 that is included in the overall appropriation.

There are significant differences between the house and senate versions of that. They have an active Conference Committee that is trying to iron that out. But until that authorization has been established, the Appropriations Committee can't explicitly say what is being funded to have earmarked money to go ASEA, but exactly how it will be applied can't be known until that bill passes.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: As I mentioned at our last meeting, we also are faced with the issue of dealing with the next year's budget. The guidance we received from OMB said that submit the budget based upon whatever the President requested in FY 2002 and, of course, that was zero. At the last commission meeting, the commission authorized us to go ahead and submit a budget that was not the full 3,000,000 we sought last year but was more than the 1.5 and reflected the projects that we are involved in and a reasonable amount of growth. So Judy and I will be working on that actually in the days ahead because it has to be submitted fairly quickly.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: This is the consolidated budget that we showed you in October, and that brings together the various programs, so it gives you a flavor for how our budget is distributed, essentially about a fifth in government information, about 23 percent in our international activities. In our statistics and research areas, 37 percent, and administration, 21 percent. Much of that was because of the extraordinary efforts of the appropriations that the appropriations battle cost us. We do anticipate in a normal year appropriations would be much less. We also believe that the annual report which it was basically Rosalie's first round on it and took probably longer than it would under normal circumstances, so we anticipate that the administrative expenses will go down appreciably, and it will be up to the direction of the commission where the additional funds will be applied. We will be talking about one of those areas later this afternoon in terms of the disabilities project but also the task force that we've just concluded will need funding for its activities. Let me turn to personnel.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: We did experience changes in the permanent staff and when you -- I've said, when we have every single consultant who does even a little bit of work for us show up, we finally get into double digits. We get ten. Normally we're down around seven or so. Also we'll review where we stand on commissioner appointments. That will be a reprise of things you've seen earlier, but I think that is good to keep that foremost in our mind.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: In terms of the permanent staff, we lost Barbara Whiteleather who had been -- actually she worked for the commission as early as 1971, worked until about 1985 or '86 or thereabouts and then left us for about seven or eight years and then came back into a consultant's role and was full-time for a while, and finally went back into a consultant's role part-time. But she decided to simplify her life, so she is not commuting to Washington anymore. As you may recall, Suzanne left us because of the uncertainty about the budget. And Lakeshia also was more or less in that category. Also we have wrapped up the aspect of sister libraries that Beth Bingham was helping us, and so she is no longer technically part of the staff. But she has indicated to me she continues to plan to attend our meetings. And maybe the only reason we didn't see her at this particular meeting is she has an ear infection and can't fly.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: We have added two people, one, Lisa Sparger who is taking over Sue Randazzo's (phonetic) responsibilities, and although she is currently a temporary, we're talking to her about whether or not she would like to stay here, and I think it's fair to say she would. Rachel Patricca is a temporary who is filling in for Lakeshia's job as a receptionist. She is not planning to stay. She wants to go into the meeting/planning area. That is not a responsibility that we have enough work to have a full-time job, and so we are tremendously pleased with the work she is doing for us now. Unfortunately I can't entice her to stay here.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Let's quickly review the commission appointments. This is a slide or set of slides you first saw in April when we had our commission meeting, and this was the condition in April. We basically had only two vacancies, Jean Simon and Frank Lucchino. Because of the extension of terms of Abe and Walter and Levar (phonetic), they were still, even though their terms technically expired July 19th, 2000, they were still on board until July 19th, 2001.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: But when July 20th came around, they were no longer commissioners. And also, Rebecca and Jose were in that one-year extension period. So while they continued to serve as commissioners, the President could, at any moment, appoint someone in their stead.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Finally, when the senate leaves, whether they adjourn sine die before the first -- before January 2nd or 3rd, whatever the first day of the next session is, or if it goes all the way till the end of -- till January 2nd, we unfortunately at that time no longer have as members of the commission Robbie (phonetic) and Marilyn (phonetic) and Olette (phonetic), so -- yes?

MR. MARTIN: I'm just curious about the graphic. Can you explain to me why the IMLS permanent is up at the top?

MS. GOULD: Your mike may not be turned on.

MR. MARTIN: Sorry.

MS. GOULD: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Can you explain why on the graphic the IMLS permanent slide is at the top and the Library of Congress permanent is down with the rest of them? Not that it's important. I'm just curious.

MR. WILLARD: That's one of the limitations of the Power Point.

MALE VOICE: A bit of laughter.

MR. ROBINSON: You don't have a vote.

MR. WILLARD: The Library of Congress actually is slotting into what I call the class of the one sixes, terms ending one or six. We only have two appointments that year because the Librarian of Congress is also in that, quote, class, closed quote, which was the first class in 1971. But, no, there's no significance. I couldn't figure out another way to do it.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Actually that is the job organization template. It just seemed to work.

MR. MARTIN: That is Microsoft for you.

MALE VOICE: A bit of laughter.

MR. WILLARD: So that is where we are today. That is where we will be at the end of this senate session. And, of course, anytime between now and July of 2002, Rebecca and Jose could be replaced.

Now, the White House personnel office is doing absolutely nothing in terms of moving forward with those replacements because, obviously, the White House has recommended that there not be a commission. So it would be inconsistent for them to be appointing people to something that they didn't believe would be continuing.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide. We do have a problem, as I pointed out at the last meeting, that once the three recess appointees are no longer members, the commission only has seven members and statutorily our quorum is eight. The commission did empower the executive committee to do much of the work of the commission in the absence of a quorum, and we also have as two to-dos, as soon as we know that, yes, there will be a commission because the budget has been approved, there will be a letter to the President encouraging him to move expeditiously on appointing members, and also we want to ask Congress for amendments to the commission that will extend terms and/or I guess it should be redefine a quorum. It would be best to do both just so that individuals who are members of the commission continue in their job until a replacement has actually been named.

MS. HOLAHAN: Didn't we decide that and/or is not a good idea, that it should be and, and no or?

MR. WILLARD: In terms of what, I can't recall?

MS. GOULD: Yes, we did.

MS. HOLAHAN: Because they might do the or.

MS. GOULD: No, we did do that in the last -- at our last meeting, so it will be extend terms and redefine quorum.

MS. HOLAHAN: That gave us too many options.

MS. CHALLINOR: And the dues is D-O-E-S. Perhaps we could change that.

MR. WILLARD: Why don't we submit that to a subcommittee.

MALE VOICE: A bit of laughter.

MS. CHALLINOR: Instead of to dos.

MR. WILLARD: I apologize for forgetting that, but we do have the entire meeting on transcript, so when we send the letter to Congress, it will be done correctly.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: In terms of administrative, any questions with regard --

MS. GOULD: I do have a question and I am concerned. I do know that we were waiting on approval from OMB to finalize the survey so that we could finalize the report on the system library project. What is the status of that? You will get to that? Thank you.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Let me turn now to some administrative developments. Office space, the support we're getting from the Department of Education, and NCLIS archives are some things I want to talk to you about. You may notice a new look as you arrived to the office. We're delighted with the changes that have taken place as a result, the vacating of this space we are in now and our being able to take it over and give up some of our old space. And, as a result, we not only have a good looking entrance, we also have this conference room, which, even if all 16 members of the commission were here, we could still hold the commission meeting here. The work flow is so much better. And we also have our server in a secure room, and we do have room for expansion. We've got some spaces now that are used for sort of group activities, but they are designed in mind so, if we ever did get an increase in our budget and started doing some of the projects we have talked about in the past that we aren't able to fund now, we would have work space for that.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide. MR. WILLARD: I do want to let you know about some problems we're encountering with the Department of Education. You have probably encountered the ripple effect of it. I really think we have taken a giant step backward because of concerns over auditability. Some of the things we used to be able to do ourselves, for example, issuing a check or approving credit card transactions, they were very simple. Now they aren't anymore. I had to go through three hours of training on how to approve the credit card bill because it's all done on computer. And whereas in the past I would get a printout of the bills and go through it and we would maybe do 50 transactions a month, and it took me five minutes, ten minutes to review them. If I had a question, I would ask. Now I have to look at all those things on line when I can get on line. And it is quite annoying. We have to cope with it because we are not big enough to handle our own administrative activities. We have to go to someone else or we go to the Department of Education. If it does not approve -- improve, we may have to start shopping around and go to some of the other agencies that also provide service for the smaller agencies like us. The travel support, and I know some of you had first-hand experience with the difficulties we are encountering. Sometimes it takes up to ten minutes between the time you dial and when you can finally talk to somebody in the travel agency. I, quite frankly, do everything myself. I just don't even go to the travel agency anymore. I'll make my own reservations and go to the city ticket office and pick up the authorization because it just -- they are not staffed to deliver the service level they should. But we will continue to fight the good fight. I hope we're able to do a better job of supporting your travel as we move forward.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: In the area of the archives, I will just remind you that this is one of those issues that it seemed to me that we should be exemplar of how government agencies manage their information. And we were exemplar all right, but we were a bad example, and so we have taken I would say significant strides forward. We have trained all of the staff on their responsibilities to maintain the records of this agency. We have, through the consultant, Kathleen Lannon, we've done an extensive review of our existing records. We are in the process of establishing record schedules which is just basically a listing of the various types of information we keep and how long we keep it and what goes to the archives and what you can discard, et cetera. None of that existed before, so it certainly isn't the sort of activity that would make the headline of any newspaper anywhere, but it clearly is something that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should be doing.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Let me just quickly go through the publications we have been dealing with this year. You know about the Comprehensive Assessment on Government

\_\_\_\_\_ Information. The first two volumes of that are actually \_\_\_\_\_ in hard copy, tradition ink on paper. The latter two volumes are available on the Web. It was interesting, I was talking to a professor of information science last week, and he was extremely commendatory about the latter two - the last two volumes, and he was going to actually use them as course -- in his course work because essentially they provide a map of all of the salient documents that pertain to federal information policy.

You know that we reproduced the Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force, a source of some pride that -- institutional pride because none of us actually were responsible, but in 1981, '82, a commission task force did some work that almost two decades later still held up. And when it was reproduced and shared with people around the country, it was well received. The disability hearing you know has come out. We have sent it to some leaders but I confess we have a lot more distribution to do on that. We do plan to send it to every member of Congress. One of the hang-ups on not distributing it more quickly was that we thought on September 13th we would have a commission meeting that would talk about what we were going to do next in the area of disability, and then we would send both the hearing and that new release, but things changed.

The annual report, as you know, the last year's was very late, extraordinarily late. But it did get out. I think it looked good. We are working assiduously, and I've already seen the first draft. It still is not ready for prime time, but it's getting there. The law requires us to issue the annual report by January 31st. I don't think ever in the history of the commission have we exactly hit that date. We will this year. You heard it here.

And finally the school libraries hearing record, you know this took almost two years to get the disability hearing record out. It'll take about a third of that time to get the school libraries hearing out. All of the material is in the hands of a contract editor, and we are expecting it --

MS. RUSSELL: Sometime this month.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible).

MR. WILLARD: I'm going to go through projects. I put the first two here because I'm not going to talk about them. Emergency preparedness and disaster recovery is a topic that we will, as a group, discuss tomorrow morning. And library services for individuals with disabilities is on the agenda for this afternoon, so let me talk about the other things that are not on the agenda.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: A group goes into three areas; government information, the statistics, and the international.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Government information, the attacks of September 11th completely changed what we were able to do on that. We have this marvelous report on information as a strategic resource and recommendations for how the government should organize itself to handle that resource more effectively. And there is absolutely no interest on Capital Hill in listening to that topic right now. Fortunately and equally, the whole area of e-government which Senator Lieberman was actively championing have fallen by the wayside. There's still pockets of activity. There is, for example, an official in LMB who carries that portfolio now, and it's not something that has gone away, but it certainly is a topic that does not have the same level of interest that existed I would say four months ago. However, I do believe strongly that the work that went into the assessment carries over well into what we are talking about in the emergency preparedness and disaster recovery initiative which, by the way, I guess we changed the name of as a result of the task force. But I think the new name, which is information as a strategic resource really carries forward both the message of the original assessment and the specific post-9-1-1 message that we want to convey.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Library statistics I still think we are just tremendously well served by having Denise in that job. She has, in the past year, gotten out on the Hustings (phonetic) a lot. She's representing the commission in a number of meetings. Her presentations, by the way, are on the NCLIS website. I encourage you to take a look at them. The first two are very interesting topic area, essentially dealing with how do libraries measure service delivery in an electronic world. How do you count? It was fairly easy, let's say, to have a

gate count and you'd say, "How many people came in and went out of the library; how many books were borrowed; how many times did you retrieve something and have to reshelve it again," those facts. Those things could be measured, and they could serve as a rough indicator of how much the library is being used. It is a lot different when you're talking about downloaded documents and views or retrievals, and even the vocabulary has not been standardized yet. But there is action going on to standardize that, and Denise is playing a key role in all of that. She's spoken at the first two sessions and also had network performance measures that she's involved in a couple of advisory committees on that topic. She also went out and spoke to a conference about rural libraries and was able to carry a message about a long history of a commission being involved in examining that issue. It's not something that we're dealing with currently except in only the most remote ways. But we certainly have in the past and it is something that the law continues to require us to pay attention to.

The National Center of Education Statistics Coordination is the lion share of her effort. As I explained, that's why she's not here. We have meetings going on out at Bethesda. We continue -- there was a moment early in the summer when, just as many others were looking at the proposal of the White House to not fund the commission NCES was seriously considering looking for alternative ways to administer the library statistics program. But thankfully Denise's negotiation, we've got them to contingently approve staying with us because we were pretty sure that we were going to stay in existence. But it did take a little bit of effort because they were ready to have somebody else to carry forward the work.

The National Information Standards Organization is something the commission has been a member of for a long time, but I would say the membership was essentially writing a dues check. We were not an effective member. Frequently standards would be submitted to us for a vote and we had no real expertise on which to cast a vote. That has all changed. Denise is a regular participant in those activities. I should point out Jose is also now on the board of NISO. So that is a significant improvement in our relationship and our standing in that community.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I was also going to mention that I'm meeting on Monday if people are going to be around,

MR. WILLARD: And finally consistent -- this could go under either the library statistics title or the international title, but since Denise is carrying the water on this, I put it here. She has become very involved in a multi-nation effort to collect library statistics and to compare them nation to nation. She attended her first meeting of that group I guess it was in Paris a couple of months ago. So, as you see, she's got a quite full plate.

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: In the international area, first thing I wanted to discuss is the sister libraries project. AS you know, the White House Millennium Project Office disappeared on January 20th this year. The millennium had been defined -- millennium period had

been defined as the two-year period starting January 1st, 2000, so it continues until December 31st of this year. We had always recognized the involvement of the commission was for that limited period and that we would conclude the program. But it had also been an absolute commitment that the program would not end without an evaluation so that we could pass along to others who may be interested in replicating this sort of activity information on what worked and what didn't work. Because of the legacy of the Commission on Federal Paperwork -- I don't know if there's anyone on the room who knows about the Commission on Federal Paperwork. The concept of paperwork burden or that is how much time is spent by the citizens filling out forms was introduced into our government system, and the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 implemented a requirement that says you cannot submit a questionnaire to citizens without getting it formally approved. And they actually keep track of the hours that is estimated will be used to fill out paperwork. It's something -- it's in the billions of hours. I get a report each month that says what the total is. Was funny. It was -- let me grab a number out of the air and say it was 500,000,000,000 and then they recorded the earlier survey that we were doing on representation in international library and information science activities was at 200 hours, so 200 hours of the 150,000,000,000 was helpful. The reason I mention it is, before we can do the survey to participants in the sister library program, we have to get it approved. It is being handled by an individual staffer in the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as her first approval. So we've had some contact with her and it's moving along, but it is not a quick process.

MS. CHALLINOR: What happens when we get that approval; do we ask about the back?

MR. WILLARD: That is a decision to be made, but I think Beth and Rosalie work very closely together in putting it in place, and I think we may be able to just move forward.

MS. CHALLINOR: Would you let me know when that happens because I'm still responsible to the people from whom I raise the private money, and then, you know, I want to tell them what's going on.

MR. WILLARD: Oh, certainly. Certainly. The other issue connected with sister libraries is looking for an institutional mechanism to continue it. We have had preliminary discussions as we reported in August in Boston with UNESCO. I don't think any significant progress has been made from that time, but I can tell you that the relationship with UNESCO is excellent, and I hope we will have good news to report in the future.

FEMALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) evaluation.

MR. WILLARD: Yeah, I think that's true. The evaluation is a key component before their action. I just put ICSECA up here. That's the International Contributions to Scientific, Educational, and Cultural Activities. That is the money that we traditionally have received from the State Department and distributed. Used some of it for our own international activities, a small portion, and distributed the bulk of it to other organizations that were doing UNESCO-type activities in the library and information area. We have already had preliminary communication with the Department of State and,

with regard to the next point, I'll get into more detail, but we have told them that it is our expectation and hope that we will continue to receive the funding that we traditionally do, as well as some additional funding for the next topic. I'll turn to that.

The International Leadership Conference on information literacy --

MALE VOICE: (Indiscernible) slide.

MR. WILLARD: Yes, that grows out of our relationships with two different organizations, UNESCO and National Forum on Information Literacy. We talked about this also in Boston. The objective is to have a worldwide conference in 2003, probably registration 500 plus or minus with a strong emphasis on developing country participation to explore the role of information literacy.

MS. CHALLINOR: We're on the same thing, okay. I just missed 202. I saw 203 but didn't see --

MR. WILLARD: Right. I think it's important to keep in mind the end game is a worldwide conference that involves the lesser developed countries because they can really benefit from what information literacy is all about.

MS. CHALLINOR: That's the 203.

MR. WILLARD: That's 203. But to get there, we've got to do some planning and some activities. We've already taken the first step, and that was a meeting that Woody facilitated with Richard Broderick who is the head of National Forum on Information Literacy, and that was here in early October. That was the time at which the budget crisis had just raised its ugly head and I regretfully did not attend, and I mean that regretfully because the activity was tremendously productive. One of the issues that came out of it was a recognition that we don't have money in our budget, although we are estimating, of the 150,000 that we think the next step requires, we are putting, through staff efforts and others, about 35,000 toward that. But we need to get money from all source. So we have sent letters to the State Department. We've said, in addition to the ICSECA money that we traditionally want, we also want 75,000 from them to run the next step. We've asked the Department of Education for 25,000 and also the Agency for International Development, USAID, for 25,000. Those letters are in process right now. You all know that, when Woody is involved in something, he doesn't leave anything to chance, so before the letters were even submitted to the principals, it goes to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Education and the head of AID. It was staffed at the appropriate level and the drafts of the letters were worked on, so we are now allowing about two to three weeks from the time they receive the letter till when we think it's appropriate to start saying, "Is there an answer?" But, in the meantime, Woody stays in contact at the appropriate staff level.

What we are asking for money to do is to hold an experts meeting. This would be a two, two-and-a-half-day conference in Prague where we've got a great deal on meeting space,

in April of about 30 invited participants plus ten participants from sponsoring organizations. We are going -- we have actually -- there's been an informal contact with all of the people that are on the invite list, and that invite list was developed at the October meeting subsequently. Everyone who is invited is also requested to prepare a paper on some aspect of information literacy, and that -- those papers will all be submitted quickly and then distributed to all of the people who will be attending the experts meeting. That is in process. Now, a formal invitation is also in the works. It's a little ticklish because we are telling everybody, "We're inviting you but it's contingent on our being successful in the fund-raising." But this is on such a fast track though, we thought that was the only reasonable thing to do. People need advance time to prepare for international travel. And I think it also expresses a modicum of confidence that we will, in fact, be able to raise that money.

MS. CHALLINOR: And, Bob, have we asked the people for the papers?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MS. CHALLINOR: And these people are willing to write papers for things they don't know whether it'll come on or not?

MR. HORTON: Well, even if the conference is delayed or deferred, the papers are still going to be required. And secondly, we're paying a \$500 stipend for doing the papers, so we're committed to that much of the deal.

MS. CHALLINOR: So if it -- if we don't get the money, we put it off from April --

MR. HORTON: We will have to defer from April; that's correct.

MS. CHALLINOR: And that would bump the 2003?

MR. HORTON: That is correct.

MS. GOULD: Bob, I have a question on the fund-raising letters. Explain again the in process. Are you saying the letters haven't been sent out or they're in process at the agencies?

MR. WILLARD: They're very much in process at the agencies.

MS. GOULD: So they've already been sent out from here?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MS. GOULD: Thank you.

MR. WILLARD: Which in itself was quite a challenge because government agencies aren't especially happy to receive mail these days. We had one that bounced back and we had to --

MALE VOICE: Who was the carrier?

MR. WILLARD: We didn't send it by mail. We sent it by messenger.

MS. HOLAHAN: I have a question. Did any other members of the commission receive (indiscernible) mail postmarked Washington, D.C.?

MS. GOULD: No.

MS. HOLAHAN: I did.

MR. WILLARD: I think I got one.

MS. GOULD: What did the letter say?

MS. HOLAHAN: I didn't open it.

MR. WILLARD: It was a brochure on the recognizing that there is a problem with the image right now. I will try to find that during a break and pass it around. I think they just used government mailing list.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Can I ask a question? What is your drop-dead date for proceeding with the meeting; when do you need to have funding lined up?

MR. HORTON: I would say by the end of January. That's when we will have to make the go/no-go decision.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Is the funding coming from all of these sources or would we be able to go ahead with some -- you know, supposing two of the three come forward?

MR. WILLARD: We have worked out a budget that is conservative in recognizing that -- I think it assumes we cover travel for everyone and yet we are also in all of our letters of invitation suggesting that, if the individual's own institution can support the travel, that would be preferable. Obviously to the extent that if we are unsuccessful in getting the 21 or the \$25,000 grants, then we would push harder on that. Our objective is to have the meeting.

MS. CHALLINOR: The question is how many of the three do we actually need?

MR. WILLARD: It's a dynamic answer because, if we were 100 percent successful, then we don't have to work hard with the invited participants in asking them to support themselves. We can take care of that. If we aren't successful, if we only raise 75 or we

only raise 50 or we only raise 100, then we have to tailor our invitations differently. So we might say to somebody that, "Yes, we'll give you the \$500 stipend for writing a paper, but it applies to your -- we can apply it to your travel, but that's all. If you can't cover your travel, you can't participate,"

MS. CHALLINOR: But we have already invited people to write the papers.

MR. HORTON: We have informally solicited their interest to write a paper and attend the conference. In some cases, they have come back and said, yes, they are interested, they would like to, and so they are on a stand-by waiting for us to send the official letter. MS. GOULD: That's one of the reasons that we can't do too much until our budget is closed and we know what is being appropriated.

MS. RUSSELL: But this past year, for example, in our research budget, we spent more than \$25,000 on the Berthold-McLure study. We're not doing that study again this year, so that's 25,000 that can be used for something else. It doesn't necessarily have to be used for this. But, I mean, there are other projects that we have funded. The sister libraries project in the past years took a fair amount of money. We still have some time, some expenses to finish the report and print it, but they're relatively little compared to the amounts that we've been spending. So there are other activities that have been completed for which we have made substantial investments, and that money can be realigned if that's the priority set by the commission.

MS. CHALLINOR: Do we have a forward-looking budget; do we have a budget already to show how much we're going to spend on the international, the Prague thing, how much we're going to spend on this, how much we're going to spend on that?

MS. RUSSELL: It's sort of a chicken and egg thing. As Bob said, we sat down and did a budget for the Prague meeting, and we determined that about \$30,000 of commission funds would be necessary for that over and above what we were requesting. If we have to spend all of the money, that it's in the budget and we budgeted conservatively. So we might not need all that much, but worst case scenario, we would put 30,000 into that meeting.

MR. ROBINSON: Bob, can you pull up that sort of \$90,000 page that was on the board before, page 10 of 10?

MS. RUSSELL: And that's -- Howard's straw man of those numbers. We haven't gone back and taken those apart and validated them.

MS. GOULD: So they're ballpark figures at this point. Yes, Bob Martin?

MR. MARTIN: It seems to me we can't do anything definite at this stage anyway since we have no idea what the overall budget situation is. What would be an appropriate action to take today, to support this in concept and ask staff to develop the budget further once the budget is --

MS. GOULD: I would appreciate a motion to support this in concept and that we would go ahead and look at hard budget figures once we have our appropriation.

MR. MARTIN: So moved.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Nancy.

MS. DAVENPORT: I'm probably out of order now.

MS. RUSSELL: Now we need a second and then further discussion.

MS. DAVENPORT: I will second your motion so I can discuss it.

MS. GOULD: All right. You must made a motion?

MR. MARTIN: I did.

MS. GOULD: Would you like to repeat the motion?

MR. MARTIN: I move we endorse this in concept and ask the staff to come back with hard budget figures as soon as we have an appropriation.

MR. WILLARD: Right now we have --

MS. GOULD: We have to have a second.

MS. DAVENPORT: I second.

MS. GOULD: I has been seconded by Nancy Davenport. Discussion?

MR. WILLARD: We have a budget for \$3,000,000. That is what -- that is the forward-looking budget that is before Congress. Now, we know that they're going to come back with a number less than that. So at that time is when we do the fine-tuning. Here --

MR. MARTIN: My motion was to bring back a firm budget on that -- this project.

MR. WILLARD: Right. Which we will have to do as a part of the overall budget anyhow.

MS. GOULD: Robbie, you had something you wanted to say?

MR. ROBINSON: You were talking about some purchase orders floating around that were used. Do the top two things, have they already been done?

MR. WILLARD: They have been begun.

MR. ROBINSON: It says 2002.

MS. RUSSELL: That is when completed. That is the target date for completion.

MR. ROBINSON: So, in other words, the \$18,200 is already expended and in motion?

MR. WILLARD: Part of it.

MR. ROBINSON: So what we're really looking at --

MS. RUSSELL: At this point, the work that Howard has done to date and there's still some money left on his purchase orders is all prior year money.

MR. ROBINSON: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: Some money from 2001, and some money from 1998. We have not spent a single penny of 2002 money on this project yet.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. But --

MS. RUSSELL: And he can complete a substantial part of those tasks. I think the funding that we had with him was all the way through the development of the document to present at the first public program, as I recall. So we're funded.

MS. GOULD: Yes. Paulette, will you repeat your question?

MS. HOLAHAN: How much more does it require?

MS. GOULD: Paulette wants to know how much more this will require out of the 2002 money. I think the answer is we're not sure.

MR. ROBINSON: But it seems to me though that, if you look at what is up there and you're telling me that we can get all the way down to above surveys or including surveys --

MS. GOULD: No, public programs.

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, public programs. There we're already talking about expending \$32,000 on this project, not necessarily from this budget but the cost is 32,000 bucks that we have in reserve or what --

MS. GOULD: Part of which is carry-over money.

MS. RUSSELL: There's something less than \$30,000 of money from prior years, 2000 and 1998, that has been committed to get through the first stage of Howard's work.

MR. ROBINSON: How long is that going to take?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, he stopped doing forward motion on it pretty much after the conference call until we got commission approval to move forward.

MR. ROBINSON: But if he owes us \$30,000 worth of work --

MS. RUSSELL: He's already done some of it.

MR. ROBINSON: Why don't we see what the result of this \$30,000 is before we go on? There must be something we will find out from \$30,000 before we spend 60 more thousand dollars.

MS. GOULD: But if you remember, we have to approve going forward. Everything is in hiatus after the conference call.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. But it seems to me you could approved going forward to the category above public policy without expending any new money.

MS. GOULD: Well, I think that was the gist of the motion that is currently on the table and being discussed.

MR. ROBINSON: I don't think so. Bob says --

MR. MARTIN: What I would like to do is for us first of all to say this is a good project; we ought to move forward with it as we can judge the resources that are needed. And then the second part of it is come back and show us what has already been done and paid for, what has not yet been done but we already have the money to pay for, and what needs to be done that we will have to find additional funds or allocate additional funds for.

MS. GOULD: I guess that was my understanding.

MR. MARTIN: Those are things that aren't clear to me.

MS. GOULD: Nancy?

MS. DAVENPORT: And I seconding this motion, not necessarily because I completely support what Bob has said. I think that we've got some other things that are going to be talked about tomorrow, this project, on post 9/11 opportunities --

MS. GOULD: Right.

MS. DAVENPORT: -- that may also require funding, and I think the commission really ought to see the whole package in front of itself and perhaps at the conclusion of

tomorrow, then address which ought to go forward with what level of potential funding for it. But let us see the whole picture before you ask us to vote on a piece of that picture.

MS. GOULD: All right. Yes, Commissioner Mason?

MS. MASON: I have a question and a comment.

MS. GOULD: Would you speak into the microphone?

MS. MASON: Sorry, sorry, sorry. I have a question and a comment. My question is exactly what is conduct ongoing NCLIS public program; what exactly does that mean?

MS. GOULD: Marilyn asked what we mean by conduction ongoing NCLIS public program.

MS. MASON: The concept that Howard and Denise and I had come up with when we structured the early stages of the first stage of work for him. Was that, in anything that NCLIS did, there would need to be substantial communication with the library community as well as with the community of people who represent -- yeah, you want to put that slide up? So what the intent was to try to have a program, which it may already be too late to do now at ALA Midwinter, which might push it back then to the summer meeting, where we would bring together representatives of, as it says, interested and affected organizations, primarily library communities, but ask individuals representing the disabled community to come there because it would be a forum where a lot of library community representatives would already be present, to present the early stages of the report which would have already had -- have already been reviewed by a technical review panel, so we would have had a first stage consultant report followed by further input and advice from the technical review panel. And at that point, we would have a document that we were ready to take more public, if you will, not as a final report but more public as a way then of being ready to reach out for broader public comment. And that if this is, as Bob talked about, a long-term initiative -- in other words, if it becomes like public libraries and the Internet where we do a survey and we get a baseline, and then we monitor this over time by every year or every other year kind of following on. Or if we try to get it folded into other library surveys so we can follow on. Having a series of recurring meetings that keep people informed and that engage other people in being aware of what we're doing so that it's not a process simply of printing a piece of paper and hoping somebody reads it, but that there -- that the process involves actually, on a recurring basis, having presentations -- not even so much presentations, but meetings and dialogue at venues like ALA conferences.

MR. MASON: Thank you. My comment is I think my concern is similar to what I've heard from other people around the table. This is a good thing. There are many good things we could do. There are probably thousands of good things we could do. I suspect we could come up with tens of them in a few minutes. And so it's a matter of setting priorities. And it's not clear to me if this should be our priority. It seems to me we backed into it because we had some open purchase orders rather than affirmatively going into it.

MS. RUSSELL: Let me clarify that we have identified this as an issue we needed to do. We needed to follow on activity to implement and work with what we had learned in the disabilities hearing. Denise had already identified. And, in fact, in our last survey done by Bertot and McClure, we had added and worked a special question on this issue because the prior surveys had indicated it was a problem area. But she did not have the ability to do it herself because her time was so tight. And so when the opportunity came, because Howard left Maryland and he was available as a consultant, we talked about using him. And when that came up, I went back because I remembered there was some money. I didn't realize it was going to be as much as it was. But -- so I went back and found the existing money, and then we found money out of this year's budget. So it's not that we did the initiative because we had the purchase orders. It's that the purchase orders made it possible, otherwise this whole initiative would have had to have been on hold until this year's budget.

MS. MASON: That is helpful. I would go along with what Nancy suggested, that we hear everything and then make some decisions.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I would endorse that also. I think that it probably should be the approach we take to all of our projects so that we look at new projects in the context of possible projects and ask the question what would we do with these resources if we weren't to do this project; what else is there that we might do? Would allow us from time to time to reallocate funding from areas of commission activity that, from one to another, that we may not otherwise do.

MS. GOULD: I think also, because I tend to make leaps of faith, I think, in the post 9/11, we do have to go back and take a look at our priorities. But I saw this as a logical part of our disabilities hearing, and I felt very strongly -- have I just lost my microphone? No. Okay. But I'm losing my hearing. I felt this was a logical follow up.

MR. MARTIN: You're just differently abled.

MS. GOULD: I'm differently abled. There are people who believe this, believe me. But I agree, we're going to have to look at priorities and we really can't do that until we know what kind of money we have. Yes, Joan?

MS. CHALLINOR: I would absolutely support what Nancy says. And I believe with Marilyn that there are ten different wonderful things we could do, and that this is one of the ten wonderful things we could do. But I don't think that it should take precedence over the 9/11 project or these other projects, and I think we ought to wait until we see and put it on hold for the moment until we see what the budget is and see closer budget figures.

MS. GOULD: Bob Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Just for clarification, since we're still discussing a motion that I made, I thought implicit in my motion was the fact that staff would come back with firm figures, and at that time we would make that priority assessment when we knew what the overall budget situation was.

MS. GRIFFITHS: But you have to have firm figures for other elements as well.

MS. GOULD: But we would because you can't do firm figures for all of the other things we have to do as well as this until we know what our appropriation is. That was my leap of faith. On the other hand, we do have this left-over money that has to be expended, and so I -- and it can only be expended on the open contract.

MS. DAVENPORT: Has all of it been obligated now?

MS. RUSSELL: Everything is obligated up to, as I said, when we looked at that other slide, we have something under \$30,000 obligated between the two different years to carry Howard's work forward, and I believe that that was to take us forward until -- through the planning for the first public meeting.

MS. MASON: Can we go back to that other slide?

MS. CHALLINOR: Could Howard work on something else or can he only work on this?

MS. RUSSELL: No. I mean, originally -- his original contracts were to work on other aspects of library statistics, and we redefined the tasks to be working on the disabilities project. So we have ability within his skill set to redefine it.

MS. CHALLINOR: Could there be other work that he could do for us on, for instance, the 9-1-1 project?

MS. DAVENPORT: Or this component of the 9-1-1 project.

MS. GOULD: Which might be very interesting.

MS. DAVENPORT: Or this component of the 9-1-1 project.

MS. RUSSELL: At this point, the 9-1-1 project is to develop a brochure and hold public meetings. It's not something that is extremely resource intensive, and it's not something that this would knock out of the ballpark. That is why I asked Bob to back up to the other slide that you all had looked at at the last meeting showing all the different projects we were working on last year. As Bob said, the government information thing is right now fallow. Well, last year we spent \$350,000 on government information.

MR. WILLARD: That's where I see a lot of the money for the 9-1-1 project.

MS. GOULD: Paulette has a question.

MS. HOLAHAN: Is there a time limitation? I wasn't able to hear everything that's being said so this may be a stupid question, but is there a time limitation on when we have to utilize these funds or can they be held over for a given length of time?

MS. GOULD: The question from Paulette is is there a time limitation or can we continue to carry the money over?

MS. RUSSELL: The part of the money that we committed in 2001 has a five-year life cycle, so it has to be fully expended by 2005.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, is it not possible then that all of our debate could be redefining what this gentleman does in having him perhaps allocate his services to a project that we may later define, that it could be held in abeyance for the time being until we do know what our budget is? It seems to me we're talking about various things and it all comes back to we don't know what our budget is and we don't know, therefore, what our priorities will have to be.

MS. RUSSELL: If we get a million-dollar budget --

MS. HOLAHAN: Do we not have something that is mandatory at the moment?

MS. GOULD: May I make a suggestion at this point to the mover of the motion? Would you perhaps like to redefine your motion as a friendly amendment that would allow us to understand that we need to know what our budget is, what money can be held over, and set the priorities before we go any farther with what is being committed?

MR. MARTIN: Certainly. I will take that as a friendly amendment.

MS. HOLAHAN: I can't hear him.

MS. GOULD: He's agreed. We all agree.

MS. HOLAHAN: Is this subject to amendment?

MS. GOULD: He considers that to be a friendly amendment. Yes, Robbie?

MR. ROBINSON: Have we actually signed -- he is doing some of this work right now, correct?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MR. ROBINSON: And to what extent is there a commitment on the part of the commission staff on the use of this money as of right now?

MR. WILLARD: Actually we can go into the purchase orders and the payments and find out. It was 12,000 or so and --

MS. RUSSELL: We're less than halfway through the money.

MR. WILLARD: That's, in my opinion, not really the issue and Howard Harris is not the issue, and \$12,000 is not the issue. The issue is whether or not this is a topic that the commission thinks worth investing in, and it may well be. But as we move forward, Howard Harris has nothing to do with it. He's got lots of clients. He's very employable.

MR. ROBINSON: This doesn't have to do with Howard Harris. It has to do with the budget.

MR. WILLARD: There may be \$6,000 still in play from the prior year.

MS. GOULD: That's peanuts.

MR. ROBINSON: I'm not trying to stop him from getting paid his \$6,000. I just wondered how we were dealing with that money and should we have him have a report on the results of the expenditures of that money before we then go further on into this operation?

MS. GOULD: You also have to understand that once we have published the disabilities report, it is incumbent upon the commission to follow up with policy recommendations. We have to do that. That is part of why we hold these hearings, and there are people waiting for us to come forth with policy recommendations. So we have two hearings that are outstanding that are waiting for us to, you know, look at the proceedings, to evaluate the proceeding, and to, you know, bring forth some policy recommendations. One is a disabilities; the other school libraries. But in the meantime, we have post 9/11 which I think is very important.

MR. ROBINSON: What you're saying is, as a result of our studies on disabilities, we should be using -- we should be going forward with policy recommendations?

MS. GOULD: That's what we're supposed to do.

MR. ROBINSON: I'm saying, if that's the case, before we go onto a side bar issue or a continuation of this, it seems we ought to do the policy recommendations first on the two-year-old disability report.

MS. MASON: No, I better --

MS. RUSSELL: That is what this was intended and the first step he took was to do an in-depth analysis of what had come out of the hearing and to look at the existing circumstances in terms of, since it's been two years since the hearing, what is the Council on Disability doing, what are other people doing. There's some -- like the 508 statute has

passed since the time of the hearing. What do those things mean? An the whole point of this was to develop things to bring back to the commission for the commission to then make policy based on that. But we could go to the hill with a lot of anecdotes, and the hearing brought out a lot of anecdotes about issues and problems and opportunities. What we found with the public libraries and the Internet was that, until you could say, "Yes, here's ten anecdotes and, oh, by the way, here's also some statistics that say that these anecdotes really are representative of a broad issue," then it's very hard to go to Congress and say to them, "Gee, you should be putting more money into LSTA to be allocated out to libraries to bring up their services for people with disabilities." For example, if that might come out as a policy recommendation. Until you can say, "Here's a benchmark of where they are," and without doing the survey, you have -- you don't have data. So the logical steps in this process were gathering, through a hearing, reports. Then, based on the kinds of issues that we saw evolving, doing some statistical analysis to document how widespread it was, and then -- I mean, you see what I'm saying?

MR. ROBINSON: What I think has happened is none of that really came. I mean, this was presented as a almost a freestanding project without any -- if you look at the stuff from Sturbridge, the Sturbridge folder, there doesn't seem to be anything in there that says, "Oh, and by the way, we want to do this because we need to do that, and if we do this, this will fulfill our obligation to provide the policy issues that we are going to take to Congress." I think that's where the thing got goofy because it looked like it was a freestanding project.

MS. GOULD: No, it is a continuation. Joan Challinor?

MS. CHALLINOR: Do we have -- do I understand then that we have two things outstanding that need this follow on?

MS. GOULD: That is correct.

MS. CHALLINOR: One is school libraries, one is disabilities. Therefore, is it up to us to choose which one of those would be best served to do a follow up?

MS. GOULD: Judy?

MS. HOLAHAN: I thought we had done that.

MS. GOULD: Judy, you have a comment?

MS. RUSSELL: Only that that was why Bob and I presented this type of a presentation before the last meeting gon the budget rather than simply saying it's this much for rent and this much for salaries and things, was because, in a rough way, this is the kind of range of projects that the breakdown was last year. Some of those projects like sister libraries, which was \$160,000, is virtually complete. We hopefully are not going to have to spend the same level of effort on our appropriations this year. That frees up some money. The government study is at a phase where things are rather quiescent and a lot of

the things that come out of our government study may flow into the 9-1-1. But they're -- we're going to end up realigning everything, but the commission itself needs to sort of say, "Okay, yes, we want to follow up on school libraries; yes, we want to follow up on disabilities; yes, we want to do 9-1-1," I mean. And if there are eight or nine or ten other things, then we need to know -- and we have a pretty good idea, like the information literacy thing is something the commission has made some commitment to.

MS. CHALLINOR: We may have to put some money into this.

MR. WILLARD: We are, \$35,000.

MS. CHALLINOR: But we may have to put in more if it is to come to fruition if we don't kill it. But what we're really hearing about is a budget process.

MS. RUSSELL: Maybe that's the problem. You need to tell us your priorities and then we will try to come back to you and say, okay, in order to meet this -- if the highest priority is we're hearing is 9-1-1, then the first thing off the plate has to be how much money do we need to allocate to that? What's the second priority? What's the third? What's the fourth? And then all through the year there is an ability to trade off. Let's assume we start by saying that disability is second and illiteracy forum and then school libraries. If we find we don't need as much money for the literacy forum, that money's going to immediately get rolled into something else. If we find we need more money for 9-1-1, then we may slow down or scale back another one. I mean, we do that all the time throughout every budget year to try to respond to priorities that shift or opportunities that arise.

MS. CHALLINOR: Maybe we should tomorrow -- maybe tomorrow we could discuss right in order which of these priorities we would like to go on to. We have school libraries. We're not going to let school libraries just go.

MS. GOULD: That's one of the reasons that we can't do too much until our budget is closed and we know what is being appropriated.

MS. RUSSELL: But this past year, for example, in our research budget, we spent more than \$25,000 on the Bertot-McLure study. We're not doing that study again this year, so that's 25,000 that can be used for something else. It doesn't necessarily have to be used for this. But, I mean, there are other projects that we have funded. The sister libraries project in the past years took a fair amount of money. We still have some time, some expenses to finish the report and print it, but they're relatively little compared to the amounts that we've been spending. So there are other activities that have been completed for which we have made substantial investments, and that money can be realigned if that's the priority set by the commission.

MS. CHALLINOR: Do we have a forward-looking budget; do we have a budget already to show how much we're going to spend on the international, the Prague thing, how much we're going to spend on this, how much we're going to spend on that?

MS. RUSSELL: It's sort of a chicken and egg thing. As Bob said, we sat down and did a budget for the Prague meeting, and we determined that about \$30,000 of commission funds would be necessary for that over and above what we were requesting. If we have to spend all of the money, that it's in the budget and we budgeted conservatively. So we might not need all that much, but worst case scenario, we would put 30,000 into that meeting.

MR. ROBINSON: Bob, can you pull up that sort of \$90,000 page that was on the board before, page 10 of 10?

MS. RUSSELL: And that's -- Howard's straw man of those numbers. We haven't gone back and taken those apart and validated them.

MS. GOULD: So they're ballpark figures at this point. Yes, Bob Martin?

MR. MARTIN: It seems to me we can't do anything definite at this stage anyway since we have no idea what the overall budget situation is. What would be an appropriate action to take today, to support this in concept and ask staff to develop the budget further once the budget is --

MS. GOULD: I would appreciate a motion to support this in concept and that we would go ahead and look at hard budget figures once we have our appropriation.

MR. MARTIN: So moved.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Nancy.

MS. DAVENPORT: I'm probably out of order now.

MS. RUSSELL: Now we need a second and then further discussion.

MS. DAVENPORT: I will second your motion so I can discuss it.

MS. GOULD: All right. You must made a motion?

MR. MARTIN: I did.

MS. GOULD: Would you like to repeat the motion?

MR. MARTIN: I move we endorse this in concept and ask the staff to come back with hard budget figures as soon as we have an appropriation.

MR. WILLARD: Right now we have --

MS. GOULD: We have to have a second.

MS. DAVENPORT: I second.

MS. GOULD: I has been seconded by Nancy Davenport. Discussion?

MR. WILLARD: We have a budget for \$3,000,000. That is what -- that is the forward-looking budget that is before Congress. Now, we know that they're going to come back with a number less than that. So at that time is when we do the fine-tuning. Here --

MR. MARTIN: My motion was to bring back a firm budget on that -- this project.

MR. WILLARD: Right. Which we will have to do as a part of the overall budget anyhow.

MS. GOULD: Robbie, you had something you wanted to say?

MR. ROBINSON: You were talking about some purchase orders floating around that were used. Do the top two things, have they already been done?

MR. WILLARD: They have been begun.

MR. ROBINSON: It says 2002.

MS. RUSSELL: That is when completed. That is the target date for completion.

MR. ROBINSON: So, in other words, the \$18,200 is already expended and in motion?

MR. WILLARD: Part of it.

MR. ROBINSON: So what we're really looking at --

MS. RUSSELL: At this point, the work that Howard has done to date and there's still some money left on his purchase orders is all prior year money.

MR. ROBINSON: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: Some money from 2001, and some money from 1998. We have not spent a single penny of 2002 money on this project yet.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. But --

MS. RUSSELL: And he can complete a substantial part of those tasks. I think the funding that we had with him was all the way through the development of the document to present at the first public program, as I recall. So we're funded.

MS. GOULD: Yes. Paulette, will you repeat your question?

MS. HOLAHAN: How much more does it require?

MS. GOULD: Paulette wants to know how much more this will require out of the 2002 money. I think the answer is we're not sure.

MR. ROBINSON: But it seems to me though that, if you look at what is up there and you're telling me that we can get all the way down to above surveys or including surveys --

MS. GOULD: No, public programs.

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, public programs. There we're already talking about expending \$32,000 on this project, not necessarily from this budget but the cost is 32,000 bucks that we have in reserve or what --

MS. GOULD: Part of which is carry-over money.

MS. RUSSELL: There's something less than \$30,000 of money from prior years, 2000 and 1998, that has been committed to get through the first stage of Howard's work.

MR. ROBINSON: How long is that going to take?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, he stopped doing forward motion on it pretty much after the conference call until we got commission approval to move forward.

MR. ROBINSON: But if he owes us \$30,000 worth of work --

MS. RUSSELL: He's already done some of it.

MR. ROBINSON: Why don't we see what the result of this \$30,000 is before we go on? There must be something we will find out from \$30,000 before we spend 60 more thousand dollars.

MS. GOULD: But if you remember, we have to approve going forward. Everything is in hiatus after the conference call.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. But it seems to me you could approved going forward to the category above public policy without expending any new money.

MS. GOULD: Well, I think that was the gist of the motion that is currently on the table and being discussed.

MR. ROBINSON: I don't think so. Bob says --

MR. MARTIN: What I would like to do is for us first of all to say this is a good project; we ought to move forward with it as we can judge the resources that are needed. And then the second part of it is come back and show us what has already been done and paid for, what has not yet been done but we already have the money to pay for, and what needs to be done that we will have to find additional funds or allocate additional funds for.

MS. GOULD: I guess that was my understanding.

MR. MARTIN: Those are things that aren't clear to me.

MS. GOULD: Nancy?

MS. DAVENPORT: And I seconding this motion, not necessarily because I completely support what Bob has said. I think that we've got some other things that are going to be talked about tomorrow, this project, on post 9/11 opportunities --

MS. GOULD: Right.

MS. DAVENPORT: -- that may also require funding, and I think the commission really ought to see the whole package in front of itself and perhaps at the conclusion of tomorrow, then address which ought to go forward with what level of potential funding for it. But let us see the whole picture before you ask us to vote on a piece of that picture.

MS. GOULD: All right. Yes, Commissioner Mason?

MS. MASON: I have a question and a comment.

MS. GOULD: Would you speak into the microphone?

MS. MASON: Sorry, sorry, sorry. I have a question and a comment. My question is exactly what is conduct ongoing NCLIS public program; what exactly does that mean?

MS. GOULD: Marilyn asked what we mean by conduction ongoing NCLIS public program.

MS. MASON: The concept that Howard and Denise and I had come up with when we structured the early stages of the first stage of work for him. Was that, in anything that NCLIS did, there would need to be substantial communication with the library community as well as with the community of people who represent -- yeah, you want to put that slide up? So what the intent was to try to have a program, which it may already be too late to do now at ALA Midwinter, which might push it back then to the summer meeting, where we would bring together representatives of, as it says, interested and affected organizations, primarily library communities, but ask individuals representing the disabled community to come there because it would be a forum where a lot of library community representatives would already be present, to present the early stages of the

report which would have already had -- have already been reviewed by a technical review panel, so we would have had a first stage consultant report followed by further input and advice from the technical review panel. And at that point, we would have a document that we were ready to take more public, if you will, not as a final report but more public as a way then of being ready to reach out for broader public comment. And that if this is, as Bob talked about, a long-term initiative -- in other words, if it becomes like public libraries and the Internet where we do a survey and we get a baseline, and then we monitor this over time by every year or every other year kind of following on. Or if we try to get it folded into other library surveys so we can follow on. Having a series of recurring meetings that keep people informed and that engage other people in being aware of what we're doing so that it's not a process simply of printing a piece of paper and hoping somebody reads it, but that there -- that the process involves actually, on a recurring basis, having presentations -- not even so much presentations, but meetings and dialogue at venues like ALA conferences.

MR. MASON: Thank you. My comment is I think my concern is similar to what I've heard from other people around the table. This is a good thing. There are many good things we could do. There are probably thousands of good things we could do. I suspect we could come up with tens of them in a few minutes. And so it's a matter of setting priorities. And it's not clear to me if this should be our priority. It seems to me we backed into it because we had some open purchase orders rather than affirmatively going into it.

MS. RUSSELL: Let me clarify that we have identified this as an issue we needed to do. We needed to follow on activity to implement and work with what we had learned in the disabilities hearing. Denise had already identified. And, in fact, in our last survey done by Bertot and McClure, we had added and worked a special question on this issue because the prior surveys had indicated it was a problem area. But she did not have the ability to do it herself because her time was so tight. And so when the opportunity came, because Howard left Maryland and he was available as a consultant, we talked about using him. And when that came up, I went back because I remembered there was some money. I didn't realize it was going to be as much as it was. But -- so I went back and found the existing money, and then we found money out of this year's budget. So it's not that we did the initiative because we had the purchase orders. It's that the purchase orders made it possible, otherwise this whole initiative would have had to have been on hold until this year's budget.

MS. MASON: That is helpful. I would go along with what Nancy suggested, that we hear everything and then make some decisions.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I would endorse that also. I think that it probably should be the approach we take to all of our projects so that we look at new projects in the context of possible projects and ask the question what would we do with these resources if we weren't to do this project; what else is there that we might do? Would allow us from time to time to reallocate funding from areas of commission activity that, from one to another, that we may not otherwise do.

MS. GOULD: I think also, because I tend to make leaps of faith, I think, in the post 9/11, we do have to go back and take a look at our priorities. But I saw this as a logical part of our disabilities hearing, and I felt very strongly -- have I just lost my microphone? No. Okay. But I'm losing my hearing. I felt this was a logical follow up.

MR. MARTIN: You're just differently abled.

MS. GOULD: I'm differently abled. There are people who believe this, believe me. But I agree, we're going to have to look at priorities and we really can't do that until we know what kind of money we have. Yes, Joan?

MS. CHALLINOR: I would absolutely support what Nancy says. And I believe with Marilyn that there are ten different wonderful things we could do, and that this is one of the ten wonderful things we could do. But I don't think that it should take precedence over the 9/11 project or these other projects, and I think we ought to wait until we see and put it on hold for the moment until we see what the budget is and see closer budget figures.

MS. GOULD: Bob Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Just for clarification, since we're still discussing a motion that I made, I thought implicit in my motion was the fact that staff would come back with firm figures, and at that time we would make that priority assessment when we knew what the overall budget situation was.

MS. GRIFFITHS: But you have to have firm figures for other elements as well.

MS. GOULD: But we would because you can't do firm figures for all of the other things we have to do as well as this until we know what our appropriation is. That was my leap of faith. On the other hand, we do have this left-over money that has to be expended, and so I -- and it can only be expended on the open contract.

MS. DAVENPORT: Has all of it been obligated now?

MS. RUSSELL: Everything is obligated up to, as I said, when we looked at that other slide, we have something under \$30,000 obligated between the two different years to carry Howard's work forward, and I believe that that was to take us forward until -- through the planning for the first public meeting.

MS. MASON: Can we go back to that other slide?

MS. CHALLINOR: Could Howard work on something else or can he only work on this?

MS. RUSSELL: No. I mean, originally -- his original contracts were to work on other aspects of library statistics, and we redefined the tasks to be working on the disabilities project. So we have ability within his skill set to redefine it.

MS. CHALLINOR: Could there be other work that he could do for us on, for instance, the 9-1-1 project?

MS. DAVENPORT: Or this component of the 9-1-1 project.

MS. GOULD: Which might be very interesting.

MS. DAVENPORT: Or this component of the 9-1-1 project.

MS. RUSSELL: At this point, the 9-1-1 project is to develop a brochure and hold public meetings. It's not something that is extremely resource intensive, and it's not something that this would knock out of the ballpark. That is why I asked Bob to back up to the other slide that you all had looked at at the last meeting showing all the different projects we were working on last year. As Bob said, the government information thing is right now fallow. Well, last year we spent \$350,000 on government information.

MR. WILLARD: That's where I see a lot of the money for the 9-1-1 project.

MS. GOULD: Paulette has a question.

MS. HOLAHAN: Is there a time limitation? I wasn't able to hear everything that's being said so this may be a stupid question, but is there a time limitation on when we have to utilize these funds or can they be held over for a given length of time?

MS. GOULD: The question from Paulette is is there a time limitation or can we continue to carry the money over?

MS. RUSSELL: The part of the money that we committed in 2001 has a five-year life cycle, so it has to be fully expended by 2005.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, is it not possible then that all of our debate could be redefining what this gentleman does in having him perhaps allocate his services to a project that we may later define, that it could be held in abeyance for the time being until we do know what our budget is? It seems to me we're talking about various things and it all comes back to we don't know what our budget is and we don't know, therefore, what our priorities will have to be.

MS. RUSSELL: If we get a million-dollar budget --

MS. HOLAHAN: Do we not have something that is mandatory at the moment?

MS. GOULD: May I make a suggestion at this point to the mover of the motion? Would you perhaps like to redefine your motion as a friendly amendment that would allow us to understand that we need to know what our budget is, what money can be held over, and set the priorities before we go any farther with what is being committed?

MR. MARTIN: Certainly. I will take that as a friendly amendment.

MS. HOLAHAN: I can't hear him.

MS. GOULD: He's agreed. We all agree.

MS. HOLAHAN: Is this subject to amendment?

MS. GOULD: He considers that to be a friendly amendment. Yes, Robbie?

MR. ROBINSON: Have we actually signed -- he is doing some of this work right now, correct?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MR. ROBINSON: And to what extent is there a commitment on the part of the commission staff on the use of this money as of right now?

MR. WILLARD: Actually we can go into the purchase orders and the payments and find out. It was 12,000 or so and --

MS. RUSSELL: We're less than halfway through the money.

MR. WILLARD: That's, in my opinion, not really the issue and Howard Harris is not the issue, and \$12,000 is not the issue. The issue is whether or not this is a topic that the commission thinks worth investing in, and it may well be. But as we move forward, Howard Harris has nothing to do with it. He's got lots of clients. He's very employable.

MR. ROBINSON: This doesn't have to do with Howard Harris. It has to do with the budget.

MR. WILLARD: There may be \$6,000 still in play from the prior year.

MS. GOULD: That's peanuts.

MR. ROBINSON: I'm not trying to stop him from getting paid his \$6,000. I just wondered how we were dealing with that money and should we have him have a report on the results of the expenditures of that money before we then go further on into this operation?

MS. GOULD: You also have to understand that once we have published the disabilities report, it is incumbent upon the commission to follow up with policy recommendations. We have to do that. That is part of why we hold these hearings, and there are people waiting for us to come forth with policy recommendations. So we have two hearings that are outstanding that are waiting for us to, you know, look at the proceedings, to evaluate

the proceeding, and to, you know, bring forth some policy recommendations. One is a disabilities; the other school libraries. But in the meantime, we have post 9/11 which I think is very important.

MR. ROBINSON: What you're saying is, as a result of our studies on disabilities, we should be using -- we should be going forward with policy recommendations?

MS. GOULD: That's what we're supposed to do.

MR. ROBINSON: I'm saying, if that's the case, before we go onto a side bar issue or a continuation of this, it seems we ought to do the policy recommendations first on the two-year-old disability report.

MS. MASON: No, I better --

MS. RUSSELL: That is what this was intended and the first step he took was to do an in-depth analysis of what had come out of the hearing and to look at the existing circumstances in terms of, since it's been two years since the hearing, what is the Council on Disability doing, what are other people doing. There's some -- like the 508 statute has passed since the time of the hearing. What do those things mean? An the whole point of this was to develop things to bring back to the commission for the commission to then make policy based on that. But we could go to the hill with a lot of anecdotes, and the hearing brought out a lot of anecdotes about issues and problems and opportunities. What we found with the public libraries and the Internet was that, until you could say, "Yes, here's ten anecdotes and, oh, by the way, here's also some statistics that say that these anecdotes really are representative of a broad issue," then it's very hard to go to Congress and say to them, "Gee, you should be putting more money into LSTA to be allocated out to libraries to bring up their services for people with disabilities." For example, if that might come out as a policy recommendation. Until you can say, "Here's a benchmark of where they are," and without doing the survey, you have -- you don't have data. So the logical steps in this process were gathering, through a hearing, reports. Then, based on the kinds of issues that we saw evolving, doing some statistical analysis to document how widespread it was, and then -- I mean, you see what I'm saying?

MR. ROBINSON: What I think has happened is none of that really came. I mean, this was presented as a almost a freestanding project without any -- if you look at the stuff from Sturbridge, the Sturbridge folder, there doesn't seem to be anything in there that says, "Oh, and by the way, we want to do this because we need to do that, and if we do this, this will fulfill our obligation to provide the policy issues that we are going to take to Congress." I think that's where the thing got goofy because it looked like it was a freestanding project.

MS. GOULD: No, it is a continuation. Joan Challinor?

MS. CHALLINOR: Do we have -- do I understand then that we have two things outstanding that need this follow on?

MS. GOULD: That is correct.

MS. CHALLINOR: One is school libraries, one is disabilities. Therefore, is it up to us to choose which one of those would be best served to do a follow up?

MS. GOULD: Judy?

MS. HOLAHAN: I thought we had done that.

MS. GOULD: Judy, you have a comment?

MS. RUSSELL: Only that that was why Bob and I presented this type of a presentation before the last meeting on the budget rather than simply saying it's this much for rent and this much for salaries and things, was because, in a rough way, this is the kind of range of projects that the breakdown was last year. Some of those projects like sister libraries, which was \$160,000, is virtually complete. We hopefully are not going to have to spend the same level of effort on our appropriations this year. That frees up some money. The government study is at a phase where things are rather quiescent and a lot of the things that come out of our government study may flow into the 9-1-1. But they're -- we're going to end up realigning everything, but the commission itself needs to sort of say, "Okay, yes, we want to follow up on school libraries; yes, we want to follow up on disabilities; yes, we want to do 9-1-1," I mean. And if there are eight or nine or ten other things, then we need to know -- and we have a pretty good idea, like the information literacy thing is something the commission has made some commitment to.

MS. CHALLINOR: We may have to put some money into this.

MR. WILLARD: We are, \$35,000.

MS. CHALLINOR: But we may have to put in more if it is to come to fruition if we don't kill it. But what we're really hearing about is a budget process.

MS. RUSSELL: Maybe that's the problem. You need to tell us your priorities and then we will try to come back to you and say, okay, in order to meet this -- if the highest priority is we're hearing is 9-1-1, then the first thing off the plate has to be how much money do we need to allocate to that? What's the second priority? What's the third? What's the fourth? And then all through the year there is an ability to trade off. Let's assume we start by saying that disability is second and illiteracy forum and then school libraries. If we find we don't need as much money for the literacy forum, that money's going to immediately get rolled into something else. If we find we need more money for 9-1-1, then we may slow down or scale back another one. I mean, we do that all the time throughout every budget year to try to respond to priorities that shift or opportunities that arise.

MS. CHALLINOR: Maybe we should tomorrow -- maybe tomorrow we could discuss right in order which of these priorities we would like to go on to. We have school libraries. We're not going to let school libraries just go.

MS. DAVENPORT: The slides you're showing on the screen now is a retrospective of how money was spent. I think what the commissioners are asking for is a prospect of the whole picture of how the staff would recommend to the commissioners that projects be initiated and that money be allocated, a whole picture and not the piecemeal picture so the commissioners can then decide which projects need to be done first and whether or not that project responds to something that is a previous commitment. I mean, the Prague conference sounds like a wonderful event, but it does not respond to any of the previous commitments that the commission is still obligated to follow through on.

MS. GOULD: And as you remember, we can -- you remember that Woody said earlier in this meeting that, depending on the money that can be raised from other entities, we may have to push it back to 2004 or 2005.

MS. DAVENPORT: I understand that. And, at the same time, realizing that and realizing that a \$500 honorarium, which is not a huge amount of money, but that a \$500 honorarium is being offered to a multiple number of speakers. You push a technology and information literacy conference off a year, you commission all new papers. So I'm -- what I'm looking at here is what is it that the commission is obligated to do in order to sort of fulfill work that has already commenced so that it can go back to the Congress with the recommendations on those projects that were already initiated rather than being sort of half done.

MS. GOULD: We are obligated really to do the policy recommendations and follow up from our two hearings, disabilities and school libraries. However, having said that, because of 9-1-1 and the shift -- what happened with 9-1-1 and what we do afterwards will impact both the disabilities and the school library policy recommendations.

MS. RUSSELL: We're seeing the school library follow up, and that'll show up somewhat in the agenda tomorrow, as being intricately involved with the LSTA reauthorization because of the issues that come up of how school libraries are funded and whether there's a role for federal government to increase the flow of money to help school libraries bootstrap themselves up to some level. So those kinds of things are covered. I mean, at one level I agree with you. At another level, the development of the budget -- I mean, if we left this meeting with the commissioner saying we didn't want to do anything more on disabilities, we wouldn't be spending a lot of time trying to work up a budget item for it. So we need -- we were seeking guidance from the commission and a commitment as to whether this was an area of strong enough interest to pursue and --

MS. DAVENPORT: And I think you're being asked -- is what I hear us saying is that we're asking to see it in context with all the other potential opportunities for --

MS. GOULD: In other words, you want a pie chart like you have here?

MS. DAVENPORT: Yes.

MS. RUSSELL: I think you have to first set the priorities and then we develop the pie chart.

MS. CHALLINOR: We would like to see what it is.

MS. RUSSELL: The first question is are we going to do anything on it at all and then, from there, we scale up to deciding what the level of involvement is.

MS. GOULD: Joan and they Marilyn.

MS. CHALLINOR: I would like to see a list of the priorities that we are being presented and budget figures on those priorities so we can make an informed consent. I don't think I'm making any kind of an informed consent.

MS. RUSSELL: Until we have a report from the 9-1-1 task force adopted by the commission, we don't know what the activity is to try to figure out the cost.

MS. MASON: I think we're getting into a classic chicken and egg discussion. Which comes first, the budget or the priorities, and it's always kind of a combination of the two. I would suggest that perhaps a way out of this at this point is for us to suspend discussion.

MS. GOULD: Can you speak up a little louder; Paulette can't hear you.

MS. MASON: I'm sorry, Paulette. It's hard to be heard all across the country. I recommend that what we do -- I think we have probably discussed the meat of this at this point, is to hold the discussion of the funding until tomorrow after we have gone through the rest of the presentations. There are several large items in front of us in the context of this budget. It might be helpful, Bob, if you thought about -- we know it's either going to be a million or a million and a half. I mean, I think it would be a big surprise if it were more than that, and it would be a big surprise if it were less than that. So it would be really helpful for me to hear your thinking about the pie -- what the pie chart might look like without getting into, you know, just a rough approximation. If it were a million and what the pie chart might look like if it were a million and a half looking at the different projects we have in front of us, and then maybe we can actually talk about which ones to pursue tomorrow after we've had the discussion of all of them.

MS. GOULD: In that case, do you wish to table any action on Bob Martin's motion or do you wish to vote it down and start from scratch, or you can withdraw it.

MR. MARTIN: Actually what I thought I was going to move was simply this is a good idea. Go back and give us some real numbers before we do anything. That is what I'm trying to get at.

MS. GOULD: Which I think we all want to get at.

MS. CHALLINOR: But that does not include all the other priorities.

MS. GOULD: Yes, it does.

MS. HOLAHAN: Why doesn't he just withdraw the motion until we can see the pie chart?

MR. WILLARD: Just a reminder, when somewhere upwards of a year ago, we found ourselves in the middle of a strategic planning exercise where we went through a list of activities that we said was important, and then when the White House proposal to do us in came along, strategic planning seemed not to be as important as immediate resuscitation. So I believe that it's incumbent upon staff to revive that effort to bring back to your attention what you said earlier as an institution. And I have to confess my memory is not good enough anymore that -- I do know that dealing with the problems of special populations was a strategic initiative that the -- right, and I will say this one more time, the probability that another plane will fly into a building is much lower than a disabled person walk into a library.

MS. GRIFFITHS: For the record, post 9/11 activity is not about another plane going into a building. It is much deeper and much more comprehensive.

MS. GOULD: Okay. At this point, are we still holding onto something? And that is, what do we do with the motion that's on the table?

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'll be glad to withdraw the motion if that makes it easier for everybody else?

MS. GOULD: Will the second concur?

MS. DAVENPORT: Absolutely.

MS. GOULD: You can't. The second of the motion has to concur. Thank you. We have withdrawn the motion and we will revisit this tomorrow. With that, we are running 15 minutes late. Before anything else, we have three additional observers who have joined us and I would love to have them introduce. We will start with the one closest to me.

MS. BRADLEY: Lynn Bradley, American Library Association.

MR. LADUKE: David LaDuke from the Software and Information Industry Association.

MS. BOLT: Nancy Bolt, State Chiefs of Library Officers.

MS. GOULD: We're happy to have you with us. The next item then on the agenda is emerging policy issues. Mr. Willard?

MR. WILLARD: There have been a couple of topics that have bubbled up recently, and in light of our conversation, I think all this is is an opportunity to say, "Yes, we know those issues are around and we think that staff ought to give us a little bit more information so we can make a decision on it," or we already have enough information to say it's not worth pursuing any further. The three areas that we identified are these: Pubscience. That refers to -- and maybe Judge could comment further after I give introduction because she's been in touch with the people. But the Appropriations Committee -- the appropriations for the Department of Energy cut back on the amount of money that was available for the Energy Information Administration, I guess it's called. And specifically called attention to a product called Pubscience, which people in the information -- in the commercial information industry would say is a product that is competitive with that which is being offered by the industry. This is an issue that has come up before the commission in the past. I mentioned our public sector/private sector report 18 years ago. The issue the commission would pursue is whether or not we would weigh in and offer comments to the Congress on whether or not it was a good idea to withhold funding for Pubscience.

MS. RUSSELL: What we were actually asked by the people at Pubscience to do was to consider, in light of their having observed what we did with the NTIS closing, whether the commission might do something like that of having a public meeting, bringing together people who were for and against and kind of airing some of the issues. And then based on that, trying to bring to some resolution what the product actually is. It is a database that the Department of Energy developed that cites journal articles. And then under the new way that a lot of these journals are available electronically, they are linked to the pages of the publishers where people can actually buy copies of the journal articles. When DOE negotiated the contracts with these journal publishers, they ended up picking up not just articles about energy or journals about energy, but if one of these companies had four or five journals, they -- the companies wanted them all out, so the scope of it went more broadly than just narrowing to energy. Pubscience is saying that this is merely an extension of what they used to do before and identifying the articles. And if there was a place to purchase a book or an article that they referenced, they would, you know, give the publisher's address and the price and other kinds of information. Now, instead, they're just linking you to the place where you can buy it. As Bob said, the commercial information industry sees this as -- particularly because the subject matter went more broadly. But even aside from that, they didn't go through a public process of announcing a major change in their publication and having all those issues aired before they tread in there. And they've stepped on some toes, and so they've asked whether we would want to look at it and, most specifically, not just to like communicate to the Congress or something, although we might ultimately do that. But rather to see about being honest broker. Actually their funding in the conference committee was cut below what was either in the house or the senate funding. And the house had language on which the Conference Committee was silent, so it apparently was language that remained standing, that hasn't been overturned, which said that they should look closely at this product and consider, you know, its impact on the private sector. So they've actually been -- they

haven't been told to stop, but they've certainly been told that it's being viewed in a not terribly favorable light.

And we have some papers that were given to us by SIIA and also by the people at PubScience that we can make available to you if you want to read about it in more depth. But that's essentially the issue. And whether that's the kind of issue that you feel the commission should weigh in on is the question.

MS. GOULD: Comments? It seems to me, before we think about anything, that we might want to look at the information that's been provided to you.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I understand the National Science Foundation has funded a project between the Oak Ridge office and the University of Tennessee to do -- take a look at the - - and I'm not quite sure exactly the nature of the project, but it relates to an evaluation of the Department of Energy's digital libraries which includes Pubs -- includes this information.

MS. GOULD: Again, is it one of these issues that we'll just sit and wait on until tomorrow? Okay. Bob or Judy, do you want to talk about access to presidential material?

MR. WILLARD: Recently the - President Bush signed an executive order that changes the rules of the road in terms of access to presidential documents. A number of list serves, and I guess has put more authority in the current government, whoever it happens to be. Then in the -- even the President -- the former president himself. So that the -- I think they extended the time under which presidential documents are safeguarded, not made available, and also allows the current government, the current president to overrule a former president who wants to release his data. The library community has various list serves, especially in the archival community has been raising concern about this. I claim no expertise at all, but I thought there probably would be people around the table who knew more about it than I, so I thought we at least ought to put it on the agenda. If it sounds like it is something that you want to have more information about, we can do that. If you think it's just either politically or technically not something we need to get involved in, that would be it.

MS. GRIFFITHS: There are a lot of groups looking at this right now, so I don't know what we would necessarily add that's unique to the discussions. Again, it would be a question of what would we likely do and how does that fit into the priorities. I think it could come up again tomorrow.

MS. GOULD: Nancy?

MS. DAVENPORT: I think we should look at this as an issue of transparency of government and whether or not this denies the American people or anyone else access to information about their government. That would be one whose administration has now ceased. The rapidity and lack of announcement. I mean, this was a done deal when this occurred. Follows right into -- I think it goes to the core of what this commission is

about, which is looking at government and information policy vis-a-vis its citizens. And I would suggest that I think this is perhaps one of the areas where the commission probably ought to speak out, whether it supports my particular point of view or not.

MS. GOULD: Robbie, you were going to say something.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, I think maybe we ought to hold off while several other groups take a whack at it because this is a very politically charged issue, and I don't think that we know that much more, you know, about it except that, on the face of it, it looks like this was, as you say, it was a done deal and people were -- and I guess my issue is I don't know why it was a done deal because that's -- I haven't looked into it, but obviously some people will be doing that.

MS. GOULD: It seems to me that this is an area right now that we should monitor very carefully in terms of what other entities are doing it. And once that information is available to us, we can come back and look at this and perhaps move forward. But I'm inclined to agree with Nancy Davenport that this is an arena that definitely impacts our legislative mandate. But we can't do anything until we have more information.

MR. WILLARD: I think we also have to be -- I was going to say, let me just say somewhat pragmatic. We are in a situation where the current administration has I think for reasons that have nothing to do with us, but, nonetheless, has taken a position against our continued existence. I think highest on our priority list, if we are indeed reappropriated -- I think that will happen. I think we need to look for all of the opportunities where we can say, "Here is our unique contribution and it's supportive of the administration approach." So, for example, to be supportive of education as we were in school libraries initiative and to go into them and say, "Here's where we can make a contribution clearly," that helps us. Nonetheless, we are frequently called upon to be conscience bound, and if upon examination of this issue it looks like just an inappropriate withholding of government information, while this commission has a 30-year history of encouraging maximum possible access to government information. So we need to learn more, but it's a minefield.

MS. GOULD: I'm beginning to think everything we do is a minefield. The last is the US Army Library in the Pentagon.

MR. WILLARD: I think not directly related but certainly related in time, the Army Library was actually in the damaged zone from the crash. There is a proposal now within the Department of the Army and maybe even defense wide to no longer have an Army library in the Pentagon. Part of this is motivated by that common misconception that everything's on the Internet. Part of it is just real estate. Part of it is moving much of the library to another location, one of the annexes. Within, I guess, within FLIC, there is a group that is or already has articulated --

MS. GOULD: Bob, can you speak more loudly. Paulette cannot hear you.

MR. WILLARD: Within FLIC there's a group that has articulated a letter to the Defense Department urging them to not go ahead with this decision and to indeed maintain a Department of Army Library which I guess is the library for the Pentagon in that structure. And the issue before us is whether or not we would want to either sign on to that sort of activity or look into it ourselves and take our own action or do nothing.

MS. RUSSELL: Let me just add a little bit because I was at the FLIC Executive Board meeting when this was discussed, and I've seen the draft letter. There were multiple concerns that the Army library has a unique collection of government regulations and other kinds of materials that's kind of a one of a kind for older historical materials, and they're planning to break that up and sort of ship a little of it here and a little of it somewhere else on the theory that it isn't all -- somebody could still find it if you can, of course, figure out who got it. A part of the library, as Bob said, would move to Crystal City. Some of the materials would be put in storage. Most of the staff apparently would be let go. And, of course, they have enormous expertise with these documents. So from the point of view of FLIC, the concern is also the human resource issue.

It is the single library that the Army then provides as a service to all the other services who share the Pentagon facilities, so there would be no physical library anymore in the Pentagon. And so, for a number of those reasons, the people of FLIC were very concerned about the fact that they didn't recognize the value of the collection, that they didn't recognize the value of having the collection intact, that they, as Bob said, assumed that, if somebody wanted something, they could either wait long enough to have it sent from storage or to find it from somewhere or that they would be able to get it electronically and, therefore, that there was no longer this need.

MS. GOULD: There is a saying that, when an elder dies, a library is lost. When we forget the human resources and what resides in the minds of many of our professional librarians, when you lose that and you've disbursed a collection, then you've lost a history and information. And that again speaks directly to what this commission is all about. I still think I'd like a little more information and background before we make a decision. But again, it speaks not only to the transparency of our government but it also speaks to something else. And that is, if we don't learn from the lessons of history, we're bound to repeat them. If we don't have access to what happened in the past, how do we make good decisions for the future?

MS. MASON: I agree with that, but I guess I'm a little concerned with the commission coming to the defense of agency libraries in every instance without knowing -- at least I don't know what they're planning to do specifically with the material; who was using the library. Typically those libraries are for internal use, not for public use. To what extent is it likely to cut down on public access to information? I'm not sure that library was ever available to the public. I don't know.

MS. RUSSELL: It has in the past been available. And, in fact, when I worked in the private sector -- this is, gosh, back in the late '70s -- I went to the Army Library and did major work on legislative histories of various military statutes that were subsequently

published by the company I worked for, in the Pentagon library. They do a significant inter-library loan business to other federal libraries and to historians and researchers of various kinds. Obviously the primary mission is to serve the Defense Department in that building, but they also serve the rest of the military throughout the country in terms of providing materials that don't exist elsewhere and then this larger research community.

MS. MASON: And what are they planning to do in place of that?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, the presentation that was made at the executive board, which is all I can speak to, was that they expected to disburse their collection, that different parts of it would go to different places, that none of it would remain in the building, that some core of it, not the historical materials but some core of the more current research materials would be moved to a much, much, much smaller place in Crystal City with a few of the librarians. But that -- I did not get anything more specific than that. This is supposed to happen in February, so it's something that's going to happen relatively soon.

MS. MASON: I think our concern is a policy issue about the availability of information, especially information about the government. And so I think there's an important principle there. I don't think our responsibility is organizational structure around that. And so I feel the need for more information.

MS. RUSSELL: I agree.

MS. MASON: If it's being buried under, you know, 10 feet of concrete and nobody will ever have access to it, then that's very important. If it were to be -- I'm making this up. I have no idea. But if it were to be digitized, for instance, and made more available with the primary documents put in an environmentally protective someplace, that would be totally different. And in both instances, you'd lose the library as it exists today. So I'd just like to know which or where in that range this appears.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, because the Navy has its own library at the Navy Yard and it's always been available for the public. If it's just the Army --

MS. RUSSELL: Probably not anymore but -- because a lot of these buildings -- I mean, and that's been one of the issues with a lot of the federal libraries has been coming up is how do they continue to support public access when they can't even get people in the buildings. And they're all struggling with how they use inter-library loan and other kinds of things to keep a public support when -- that's a post 9-1-1 piece that is very tiny and probably doesn't fit into our briefing but probably comes within the structure of the task force.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Paulette?

MS. HOLAHAN: Did you all just turn something off? Did some machine just get turned off?

MS. GOULD: I think that the blower on the projector went off.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, now you all come in perfectly. I had this background sound the whole time. Now the meeting is over and I can finally hear.

MALE VOICE: A bit of laughter.

MS. RUSSELL: Tomorrow we'll position you on the other side of the table.

MS. HOLAHAN: I can even here Robbie.

MS. GOULD: Then I believe it's a consensus that on this particular issue we look for more background information before we make a decision as to what it is we may or may not do.

MR. WILLARD: I would suggest that at this point the only information we have is from advocates of a particular interest, and it would be appropriate for the commission, and I could write to the Secretary of the Army and ask what is happening; we've heard one side, we would like to hear your side.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Mr. Willard, what's next?

MR. WILLARD: Well, we are through with the public session of the meeting unless there is anything else the commission would like to discuss in public session. We have just a very short period of personnel matters.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I have one question. This morning when you were making your presentation, Bob, you mentioned two other areas which you said were important areas. But presumably, for pragmatic reasons, you didn't think we would be able to pursue them, but they were I think intellectual property and telecom. And given the discussion we've had this afternoon about priorities, I realize the both intellectual property and telecom issues could consume the commission in their entirety, but it would be interesting as you come back with these areas of potential -- of options for us to prioritize if there are particular areas that you think may be more relevant to the commission's scope of activity, you should bring those forward.

MR. WILLARD: There actually will be some discussion because, in the federal support for libraries component, when I say telecommunications, that's really shorthand for E-rate. That is the actual dimension of telecommunications policy that makes sense for somebody concerned with library and information needs of the public. So we will be talking about that a little bit in tomorrow's session on federal support. I don't think -- well, let me just toss it out. I don't think the complexity of intellectual -- I think the complexity of intellectual property is so large, the old cliché it blocks out the sun. I think the -- if you look back at the history of the commission, we did play an important role in the mid '70s and rewrite of the Copyright Act of 1976, specifically on the issue of library photocopying, rather a narrow cut. I believe that adequately resourced and staffed, the

commission could play a similar role in attempting to separate intellectual property issues that affect Hollywood from intellectual property issues that affect scholarly research. Right now it's a big, broad brush that is being used to deal with all of those issues, and I think it can be separated. But it will require more resources than we have, even if we got the 1.5 million. I can't point to anything on the existing pie chart and say, "We don't do that, we don't do that, we don't do that, then we can do intellectual property." I don't think there's enough there. We really need to have someone legally trained, and we're talking about salaries at the high end of the spectrum. Nonetheless, I think it is absolutely important that somewhere down the pike we do get into that battle. But I'd say, with regard to the telecommunications issues, yes, I can see us doing something there.

MR. ROBINSON: I would like to be able to see if this is possible, making several assumptions. One, that we get 1.45 million dollars in the next -- in this year's budget. We have several ongoing things like the statistics program and whatever. But taking the parts that we're talking about in terms of the international thing, that we talked about, how much is there and how much of that would be prioritized by the commission, one, two, three, four, five? That's all. I think we would be very -- we could say, "We don't like that. Make that number one should be number five," or something like that.

MR. WILLARD: With another very broad brush.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, because it's -- and if we --

MR. WILLARD: Because I can tell you that, when we did go through the strategic planning exercise when we had all sorts of projects written on little sticky notes, and we still ended up with more that we wanted to do than we ever possibly can.

MR. ROBINSON: I don't believe I was a commissioner then so I have no memory of that, so I would like to see something like that in a pie chart.

MR. WILLARD: Before we leave, Lynn, do you have any comments?

MS. BRADLEY: Yes.

MS. GOULD: Do you have any comments you want to make tonight?

MS. BRADLEY: I just appreciate being here and look forward to the discussion tomorrow.

MS. GOULD: Nancy?

MS. BOLT: Ditto.

MS. GOULD: Short, sweet, and succinct. Okay. Then I would have to say, at this point, this ends the public portion of this afternoon's meeting and we're now going into a closed

**NATIONAL COMMISSION ON  
LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE**

--

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARY SCIENCES  
1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, 8TH FLOOR, SUITE 820  
WASHINGTON, DC

December 6, 2001

## PROCEEDINGS

(9:05 a.m.)

MS. CHALLINOR: We are in the conference room and we are ready to begin the second session, Thursday, December 6th, of the meeting of the U.S. National Commission. And I, what I read here, at 9:00 I see we're talking about federal support for libraries. And since I understand school libraries better than I understand the LSTA, I am suggesting, with your permission, that we begin talking about the school libraries hearing follow-up.

MR. WETHERELL: Martha wanted us to go ahead and skip to the role of libraries in emergency preparedness --

MS. CHALLINOR: That's fine with me.

MR. WETHERELL: -- because the school libraries follow-up falls in with the LSTA re-authorization discussion.

MS. CHALLINOR: And I call to your attention the fact that Rosalie xeroxed for us this disaster preparedness workbook and this is the summary of it. Did you get one?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes. Yes, but --

MS. CHALLINOR: I have not -- I have to admit that I have not read this. Do you have a copy of this, Paulette?

MS. HOLAHAN: No, but I assume one can be mailed to me eventually. I'll follow along as best I can.

MS. CHALLINOR: And I think --

MS. HOLAHAN: Is it small enough to be --

MR. ROBINSON: No.

MS. HOLAHAN: No. Okay.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, you mean faxed?

MS. HOLAHAN: Yeah.

MS. CHALLINOR: It's got about 10.

MR. ROBINSON: It's just simply a --

MS. CHALLINOR: We're not going to talk about it. I just want to be sure that you know that it exists.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, just eventually if someone will be kind enough to mail it to me, that would be nice.

MS. GOULD: We'll make sure you get it.

MS. HOLAHAN: Thank you.

MS. GOULD: Do each of you also see that Bob had put at your places the slides from yesterday that you all had requested? And we'll also send a set of those to you, Paulette.

MS. HOLAHAN: Thank you.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, that can be faxed, because it's only --

MS. GOULD: Not with that dark color.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

MS. CHALLINOR: But it's color. It's not going to do it. It's not going to do it at all.

And I think what we're talking about is the policy making briefings first. Do we have some idea of the dates?

MS. MASON: Well, would you like me to give a report --

MS. CHALLINOR: Yeah, absolutely.

MS. MASON: -- of the committee? I think this is --

MS. CHALLINOR: Absolutely.

MS. MASON: -- the report of the committee. The committee met yesterday and renamed ourselves Information as a Strategic Resource, since the Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Recovery seemed to be a bit of a mouthful. And we talked about several things. As you recall, at the last commission meeting -- can every -- is this coming through?

MR. ROBINSON: Can you hear that, Paulette? Can you hear Marilyn?

MS. HOLAHAN: I don't hear her as well, but --

MR. ROBINSON: All right. We're going to --

MS. MASON: All right. I'll try to --

MR. ROBINSON: -- move the microphone to her.

MS. MASON: -- speak. Is this better?

MS. HOLAHAN: Yes.

MS. MASON: Okay. At the last commission meeting we discussed the appropriate response of NCLIS (phonetic) in the wake of the 9/11 tragedies, and Martha asked me to chair a committee to look into this. And what we have discussed is conducting a series of briefings. It's really hard to read my notes and talk directly into this microphone at the same time; it's one of those challenges in life. So if I get in a odd position --

But what we're planning to do is to conduct a series of briefings for staffers from the congress and from the key executive branch agencies, as well as mayors and governors and other appropriate policymakers. The purpose of the briefings will be to clearly articulate the role of public libraries specifically in this environment.

And we have identified three -- four key activities. The first of those activities is the role of the public library in providing accurate and up-to-date information to individuals in a community. And to achieve this we really need the cooperation of government agencies to recognize that by making sure that key information is funneled to public libraries that can insure that the public does have access to accurate information.

We discussed the role of libraries with respect to the role of the media in this regard. And it seemed to us that television and radio provide the first stream of information to the public, but it is a single stream. And what the library can and should do is collect those streams of information and be able to respond to the individual questions or concerns of individual citizens. I think libraries are doing this and take this responsibility seriously, but often government agencies are not aware that this can be a very effective way to communicate with the public and we want to make sure they understand that. Especially were there to be an attack on the communications infrastructure of the country, we could see a situation which public libraries, being a relatively limited in number, could provide a really key element in that stream of information to the public.

The second part is for the public to understand that they can go to libraries to get accurate and pertinent information. So there are really two prongs to that one.

The second we're calling preserving the culture of the nation. And this has to do with coming up with a plan or building on existing plans that will help identify those really critical pieces of our history and culture, some of which need to be distributed perhaps, or duplicated in some instances. There are issues about which should be digitized perhaps and housed in alternative locations, but that's in general the second point.

The third has to do with encouraging local libraries to develop emergency preparedness and disaster recovery plans. Most libraries do have that already, but I think very few

libraries were really equipped to deal with the nature of the disasters that we have seen most recently. And one of the elements we discussed was looking at the appropriateness of including in those plans the kind of staffing that would be necessary to staff information desks for the public to perform the role that we talked about in the first item.

The fourth point was to encourage libraries to support their communities, much as many of them have done, as community centers where people can come together. I think many libraries have done this. And as Bob Martin noted, this really leads us back to the first point.

At any rate, those are the topics that we hope to cover in the briefing. We plan to prepare something like a very sophisticated PowerPoint presentation that will include perhaps video clips and some additional kinds of technologically driven bits that will make it more interesting and accompany that with a flyer or one page fax sheet, something along those lines.

One of the advantages of having pretty much a canned report or presentation that can be accompanied by real live human beings to respond to questions is that we can - - it becomes transportable and we can present it to a variety of audiences over a period of time. In Washington, for instance, staffers are most attracted by meal-based functions, and some like breakfasts and some like lunches. And by doing this repeatedly it gives us an opportunity to reach a much broader audience and engage them in some substantive discussions.

The -- okay, audience content, format, timing. We're hoping to do this probably beginning in February. We would also like to talk with other organizations who we feel would have some important things to contribute to this effort, and those include ALA, COSLA, PLA, Urban Library Council, among others, and I will be calling representatives of some of those associations.

And Jose is preparing a better articulated list of our four topics which we will run by them initially. And we're hoping to set up a meeting just prior to ALA midwinter, a very small meeting with individuals from half dozen organizations, where we can perhaps run through a draft of this to get some initial responses before we take it on the road.

Let's see if I covered everything on the sheet here. Well, in my own fashion.

Does anybody have any questions?

MS. RUSSELL: I just wanted to comment that we were intending, as Marilyn said, that this could be something that could be on the web site that people could access through streaming video. Those of you who were at the October 26th meeting remember Bob played a little clip that he had actually downloaded from the Internet. We could do something like that. It's also something that could be very easily pressed on a CD that could then be mailed out to libraries or other places.

So Marilyn's quite right, that by doing a really well tuned presentation we could send it with some supporting materials; you know, mail it to libraries, send it to COSLA and have them distribute it in their states or whatever the right ways might be to get it out, but not just to them.

If we're trying to reach state and local government, obviously we don't have the resources to go and do a dog and pony show state by state by state. But it would be a mechanism that would let us get it to key people in each state who could see that presentations were then run for state government and that kind of thing. So it'll -- we're hoping that it'll give us something that will be a tool to be distributed widely.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes, Robbie.

MR. ROBINSON: Do we need to approve this, because it sounds like this is going to go -  
-

MS. CHALLINOR: Mic.

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, sorry. My informal nature carries me away.

Yesterday we were talking about budgets and what was priorities, and does anybody have an idea what this is going to cost? When we were calculating putting up a big circle and dividing the \$300,000 into that, do we have any idea what this would cost initially?

MS. MASON: The answer answer is no, because we just developed this program yesterday. But looking at the numbers yesterday concerning the challenged -- did I get that right -- users of libraries, I would guess that that element on -- I've forgotten the word, Judy, the development, community development might be appropriate. Because we're going to have some resources used to develop the presentation itself, and the print, I think, will be probably minimal, frankly. And then -- but then there will be the travel and human support needed to accompany that.

I think I would see it as a kind of interactive process whereby the commission itself would handle the federal government and the federal agencies, and then --

MS. RUSSELL: Possibly things like the Governors Association, or Meetings of the Mayors, things like that, where there are groups already together.

MS. MASON: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: Where we can --

MS. MASON: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: -- make one trip and reach a whole group.

MS. MASON: And then work with COSLA to work -- to reach the state agencies and state officials in the state. And then work with perhaps Urban Library Council and PLA to reach the cities and city officials and city agencies. So I see this as a very dynamic and interactive process that will ultimately involve many people in the library community in a cooperative way. That's why we want to be sure and involve some representatives of those groups early on, so that what we have is something people are comfortable with.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, I think, Robbie, your question is extremely pertinent, because it will take a lot of staff time here. And the staff time gets included in the cost of this, like Sister Libraries is mostly staff time, and this will take a lot of staff time.

I have a question whether we ought to go to the Gates Foundation (phonetic), to Richard Ackroyd and talk about this, because they certainly have the attention. You don't think so?

MS. MASON: Well, I don't think this is the kind of thing they will fund.

MS. CHALLINOR: No, but they ought to know about it. We ought to keep them informed.

MS. MASON: I'm in pretty regular contact with Richard, so I can do that.

MS. RUSSELL: They're actually probably more likely to be interested in what we're doing in the disabilities area, because that could be a second sweep of their things, is that they might be convinced that --

MS. MASON: Actually, Bob and I are planning to meet with Richard at midwinter. We've been having some communication about this and can do that.

MS. CHALLINOR: Good.

MS. MASON: But I would not count on them to fund this.

MS. CHALLINOR: No, but I think they ought to know about it.

MS. RUSSELL: I think there's a couple things we need to think about in terms of what some elements of the cost are of this. First of all, as Marilyn said, you're going to attract staffers very often to breakfasts, to lunch, to a late afternoon something with munchies. As you know, because we've been through this many, many times, we cannot buy food with appropriated funds.

So one of the things we're going to need to do if we're going to use functions that include refreshments as a way to draw people in is we are going to have to do some fund-raising for the gift account, because that type of thing -- we can get people on the Hill to sponsor us for rooms and we can get probably rooms in a number of federal buildings if we're meeting with federal officials, but the food component's going to have to be fund-raising.

MS. CHALLINOR: How much do we have in our gift account now?

MR. ROBINSON: Seven grand.

MS. RUSSELL: Less than that. We have less than four. Probably after the reception tonight, it's going to be closer to three.

MS. CHALLINOR: There's a lot of very expensive food we're getting tonight.

MS. RUSSELL: No, it's not that, but I mean it's --

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob.

MR. MARTIN: I'm just trying to make sure I'm clear on this. What is it that we're going to congressional staff about? What -- in other words, what legislation are we looking for? What kind of legislation do we want?

MS. MASON: I'm not sure we want legislation as much as we want them to understand what libraries can do. I think the action we want is from executive agencies who are charged with the distribution of information.

MR. MARTIN: That was what I was puzzling about, because it seemed like to me we really ought to focus on executive agencies rather than on --

MS. RUSSELL: Well, a lot of legislation has passed in the wake of the September 11th event, and a lot of funding has been thrown at a lot of organizations to do a lot of things. I have not seen one penny of that funding directed to libraries. But if they become part and parcel of the community of local agencies that respond in the event of disasters, then the fact is they could be at some point named in those things.

It may also be that if -- and this is sort of bridging over to our LSTA discussion, but that if we're seeking funding for LSTA and re-authorization of LSTA, the higher the visibility of libraries in general, the better. But there's also a possibility that there could be a case made for add-on funds, rather than redistribution of existing funds, in order to allow libraries to prepare to provide -- to serve this role more adequately.

So it isn't -- we're not going in saying yes, we want you to pass this legislation, but I think it's an education process, as Marilyn says, to get them thinking. I mean look at things like the Community Technology Center Acts and things that pass, and libraries don't end up listed. So we have a lot of work to do educating people on the Hill so that when they think about institutions and organizations that can be helpful in a variety of ways, that libraries come up in the consciousness.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I certainly don't have any qualms about enhancing the visibility and consideration of libraries in the congressional arena. I just wanted to be clear about

what it -- what our objective in talking to congressional staff was, because ordinarily when you go to talk to congress you're usually -- they want a bill number.

MR. ROBINSON: That's right. HR --

MR. MARTIN: They want a dollar figure. You know, what is it you really want. And so I just wanted to be sure that that -- that we weren't headed in that direction, because I was - - I had missed something if we were.

MR. ROBINSON: One thing that I thought about last night after our -- the task force meeting yesterday was the whole if we are going to get the imprimatur of the Office of Emergency Planning, or --

MS. RUSSELL: FEMA.

MR. ROBINSON: FEMA. Sorry, I've been around too long. That if we get -- if we can get that set up first, then we can go to the Hill and say, "Oh, and by -- here's what we think ought to be done. And by the way, we have the, you know, approval; and in fact they've said that we're going to -- next time there's a big crisis that's one of the first places we're going to put the information." Then we're in a position to say all of our little song and dance, that, you know, libraries have already been designated, but we want you to know how this is going to work and who's going to work with us, and blah, blah, blah.

MS. HOLAHAN: That sounds great.

MS. CHALLINOR: That's what I think. I think we ought to go first to FEMA.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, and that was one of the things that came out of the task force meeting yesterday as a to do, was to go and meet with them and --

MS. CHALLINOR: And I think that FEMA --

MS. RUSSELL: -- see how receptive they are.

MS. CHALLINOR: -- is a very open organization. They -- remember they had an awful lot of trouble about five years ago when one of those hurricanes in Florida, they got --

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. Texas, I think.

MS. CHALLINOR: -- pummeled from all sides. And it has caused them to be more open, I think.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, I think there's also the other side. If they say absolutely no, then we're going to have to change our tactics and then, you know, but --

MS. CHALLINOR: Who is running FEMA these days? Does anybody know?

MR. MARTIN: Joe Albaugh is the --

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- executive director.

MR. ROBINSON: The boss is --

MS. CHALLINOR: Do we have a way of getting to him? Anybody know him, or do we make a cold call?

MR. ROBINSON: The Texas delegation --

MS. CHALLINOR: He's a Texan?

MR. MARTIN: No. He's actually from Oklahoma, but he's --

MR. ROBINSON: Really?

MS. RUSSELL: A born again Texan.

MR. MARTIN: He worked in --

MS. DAVENPORT: Texas North.

MR. MARTIN: There are a number of ways we can approach FEMA. It's not -- it's -- I don't -- I can't pick up the phone and get an appointment with him tomorrow, but I think we can get in to see him eventually.

MS. RUSSELL: We've also made --

MR. MARTIN: We'll probably have to start with one of his deputies.

MS. RUSSELL: We've also already made contact with Ridge, which we also need to follow up on. So we have the both of those avenues --

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MS. RUSSELL: -- that need to be pursued and will be pursued.

MS. CHALLINOR: I wonder how many of the executive - - of the cabinet officers need to know about -- just need to know about libraries as a possibility during -- for instance, Norman Minetta, head of the transportation; the transportation department certainly ought to think about libraries as a place where people can get information, because it's transportation that is often the first to be hit.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. But I don't think we ought to overkill this until we find --

MS. CHALLINOR: No, I don't think we ought to overkill.

MR. ROBINSON: Until we get --

MS. CHALLINOR: But I think we should --

MR. ROBINSON: -- somebody's sort of nod. And then we can go from there, it seems to me. Don't you think so, Bob?

MS. CHALLINOR: Is there anything else, Marilyn? Do you want to --

MS. RUSSELL: Nancy had a question.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yeah, go ahead.

MS. DAVENPORT: Can I -- I've been working on a lot of this supplemental legislation that the congress is passing. And everything that they are asking for both information or for dollar figures falls into one of three categories. And so if perhaps the briefings could address these three categories, I think it might help to frame the issues for them.

The first is life saving, the second is emergency preparedness or prevention, and the third is reconstruction; and that is written broadly; of both sort of the human reconstruction of disintegrated families and making them whole, as well as of buildings and institutions. So they have already established this framework for thinking about these sorts of disasters.

MS. CHALLINOR: Who is "they"?

MS. DAVENPORT: They the congress. So if the -- if this briefing would address those three issues in the way that libraries can address them, both as an information giver as well as how those three issues affect cultural institutions, life saving issues particularly, emergency preparedness for cultural institutions, and then the reconstruction issues of collections, much of what Marilyn has talked about. I'm just suggesting that when you're doing this for a congressional audience, do it in the way they're already thinking.

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob.

MR. MARTIN: Your -- Nancy's very accurate in that description, but there's one additional element that I think we all need to pay attention to and this goes back actually to my original question.

There's a considerable difference of opinion between the administration and the congress on what needs to be done here. And if our audience is executive branch, we have one message; if our audience is congress, we have another message. Or we have the same

message, but we need to frame it in a different way. And I guess that's what I was trying to get at with my earlier question about who are we going to talk to and what is our goal in talking to them. I think we need to think that through very carefully, because it will affect the way we frame the message.

The administration has parsed this piece up slightly differently, and they also have been a lot more limited in scope. And in fact there's talk today about the president vetoing the defense bill that's supposed to get passed today because it's too loaded up with stuff from Senator Byrd (phonetic). So, you know, all of this is just politics as normal in a way. There's nothing unusual about it, but we have to be careful not to get caught in the middle of that.

MS. DAVENPORT: How -- excuse me. How is the administration parsing it? Did they have specific --

MR. MARTIN: There's an OMB advisory that talks about using the funds. You know, congress appropriated a bunch of emergency funds at the outset, and then OMB said, "Okay. Tell us what you want money for" and they specified what it could be used for. And one -- the first was specific anti-terrorist functions, the -- I think the second was enhancing security in federal agencies and properties, and I'm forgetting what the third was. There was three pieces to it.

And we looked real hard at it and we talked to people at OMB, and basically they told us "Forget about it. We're talking about stuff that's directly related to damage from September 11th." And they allocated that \$40 billion in that way. Oh, business difficulties, you know, like the airlines, et cetera. That was --

MS. DAVENPORT: Business continuity.

MR. MARTIN: Business continuity, right.

MS. CHALLINOR: I think the hotel workers are trying to get in on that.

MS. DAVENPORT: Another suggestion I might make on this is that while this may not have direct relevance to members of congress and their legislative staffers on the Hill, it could have very direct influence on district staff and state staff.

MS. RUSSELL: Constituent service.

FEMALE VOICE: On what?

MALE VOICE: Constituent service.

MS. DAVENPORT: Constituent service.

FEMALE VOICE: Oh.

MS. DAVENPORT: So that if in -- if rather than going to members in their Capitol Hill office and looking at this as a legislative issue, you instead look at it as a community issue and go to members and ask if they wanted to sponsor community discussions around this for how our libraries and sort of cultural institutions in their communities prepared. They're frequently very happy to be a focal point for that kind of discussion, and you accomplish the same thing.

MS. CHALLINOR: That's a very good idea.

MS. DAVENPORT: You bring it to the attention of the members and you get the local community to tell the members and the staff how important those libraries are to them.

MS. MASON: Well, I think that reinforces our concern that we involve state libraries and urban libraries, so that we have that kind of capability. I mean it's impossible for me to imagine that we can go around to every state and all the major cities in the country, so it's really important that we work together with the library community broadly defined.

MS. CHALLINOR: I want to ask if we have time to do this.

MS. MASON: Well --

MS. CHALLINOR: I want to be sure that we have time to do it; that we get our ducks in order, that we have the staff here to do it. Now we have Jose, who's been staying with me, said that she has a very good person who does publicity, PowerPoints and things like that for her half time in a pinch. And she would be happy to donate some of that time to help us here to make this presentation. But I just want to make sure that the staff here isn't completely inundated by that and that they feel that they can't do it by -- are we -- we're talking early February; right?

MS. MASON: Well, no. We're talking about the first cut at this in mid-January. And Woody, I'm looking at Woody because I heard Bob say yesterday that Woody's going to be the person on the staff. And so I think it really, I mean can you respond to that?

MR. HORTON: Well, first of all, it's very kind of you, Joan, to ask whether the staff --

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, I do. I mean I care.

MR. HORTON: I appreciate that. If we're talking essentially of a core, if you will, straw man kind of basic presentation, that might later be adapted, modified because of involvement of different audiences, I would say yes. We can -- my discussion with Judy yesterday is --

MS. CHALLINOR: Would you talk into a microphone? I'm getting flack from Rosalie Vlach.

MR. HORTON: We -- I think we can get together and do kind of a straw man draft core presentation using a PowerPoint format. Certainly we'll avail ourselves, if Jose has someone who could assist us.

MS. CHALLINOR: She does.

MR. HORTON: But I think the responsibility should primarily be ours.

MS. CHALLINOR: Oh, I think so.

MR. HORTON: And -- yes, the OCLC got mentioned. So I think the answer has to be yes, if it's been approved by the Commission we'll do our best to come up with that core - - I don't think it'll take us, to produce the first draft, more than a matter of a couple of weeks. And then we can go back and forth with Marilyn and with Jose and do it that way.

MS. RUSSELL: Even though we --

MS. CHALLINOR: Is this --

MS. RUSSELL: -- haven't started actually preparing anything because we were waiting for the task force and for the Commission to focus on how it wanted to approach it and what it wanted to do, we've been thinking about this since this first came up in the Commission conference call subsequent to the Sturbridge meet -- the canceled Sturbridge meeting, and, you know, gathering materials and that kind of thing. So we're not starting from a cold start. And we've certainly been quite well aware from that initial conference call where this issue was raised that this was going to be the top priority and that's the way it will be treated.

MS. CHALLINOR: That's what I wanted --

MR. ROBINSON: That's what the issue is, is is there a top priority --

MS. RUSSELL: Well, that's certainly what we've been hearing.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

MS. RUSSELL: I mean obviously you're here and you can say no, it isn't, but if --

MS. CHALLINOR: And putting it on the floor.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, that's -- I -- that's what I was saying. In lieu of yesterday's discussion about where does the ball bounce and what order, it seems to me that since we've obviously been involved in this intellectually for a couple of months that now that we're at that stage we should probably say as a Commission that this is our top priority.

MS. RUSSELL: Aside from the issue of applying financial resources, the disabilities study uses different people and different --

MR. ROBINSON: Right. So --

MS. RUSSELL: -- resources.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, yeah.

MS. RUSSELL: I mean it's not, for instance, something that Woody and I would be -- all of us get a little bit involved in almost everything, but it would be something that would be largely Denise and a set of consultants, where this is something that will largely be Bob and Woody and myself. So the two things are not -- I wouldn't want you to frame it as a --

MR. ROBINSON: No, no. I don't --

MS. RUSSELL: -- do we have to pick one over the other.

MR. ROBINSON: -- mean it that way, but I mean in terms of resources, et cetera, that my feeling is that this is the top priority for the -- at this time and we ought to sort of make sure that we have all the resources we need to carry on this item number one in our agenda. And I don't know whether that we need to say that officially, or --

MS. CHALLINOR: Does anybody else want to speak to that? I would feel very comfortable with this as our number one priority. I remember about three years ago Bob tried to get the Commission to set some priorities. You remember, we had a wall full of things. And I would feel very comfortable with this, but I, you know, I want to turn it over to you people --

MS. MASON: I would --

MS. CHALLINOR: -- to say also what you think.

MS. MASON: I would suggest that even though I think the general sense is that this is our first priority, that we wait and look at all of them together, as we suggested yesterday. And I would feel more comfortable with Bob and Martha here for the discussion of priorities.

Also, and I don't know, do you know, Judy, if we need to vote on this as something to do or should we just hold it and do it as part of the whole priority thing?

MS. RUSSELL: There are certain kinds of things where the Commission may feel strongly enough to want to do a vote or a resolution, but in general, the sense of the Commission is very well expressed and it's not a mystery to anybody what the sense of the commission is. So if you all feel that you want it to be something that you convey

through a vote, then you can do that, but it isn't necessary to do that in order to accomplish the giving of direction to the staff, which is really what is at issue here. So --

MR. ROBINSON: At some point this morning are we going to have this mythical pie chart of the amount of money that we think is available?

MS. RUSSELL: No.

MR. ROBINSON: No?

MS. RUSSELL: I mean there's no -- between the end of dinner at 8:30 last night --

MR. ROBINSON: No, no, I know.

MS. RUSSELL: -- and the start of the meeting this morning?

MR. ROBINSON: But I'm saying some of this really relates to the issue of the budget and -- not this, because I -- let's say this costs \$30,000 or \$40,000, or something like that. We can handle that. But I'm saying, you know, I'm looking at this in terms of the 1.45 and how that pie up there was reallocated. And in that connection, then is this an -- you know, are we going to spend 40,000 on this, are we going to spend 50,000 on our international project, are we going to spend \$70,000 on - -

MS. RUSSELL: Right. We have some round numbers like that that we can talk about.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, that's what I mean.

MS. RUSSELL: But they haven't been converted into that type of a format.

MR. ROBINSON: Well --

MS. RUSSELL: We haven't gone through the allocation of rent and communication services and other kinds of things to projects the way we did in building that pie chart, but we can talk -- we know we have a core of sunk costs in terms of staff and rent and, you know, the communications server and, you know, those kinds of things. And then we know we have a body of discretionary money which we can use to bring in additional consultants, or publish materials or do those kinds of things. And so in a sense, the staff cost is sunk anyway; I mean it's there.

Not that we couldn't decide that if we needed a consultant that we laid off two or three staff people and went out and hired somebody with a specialty. We could do that; that's within the scope. But --

MR. ROBINSON: Are we prepared to do that under the category Future Budget? Is that - - I'm just trying to figure out when does this all happen, since --

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. I think that comes down somewhat into the, kind of the next steps when we've gone through these various topics and -- I mean the other issue that's going to come up, you know, we don't know, I don't think until congress comes back and we see if they've calmed down and begun to focus on the rest of their business, we don't know exactly what the schedule's going to be on the LSTA and when those -- the need for those resources are going to kick in. And we won't know that, I don't think, until January or February.

So a lot of these things, as always, are going to have to be somewhat fluid and responsive, but I think we could make some broad brush strokes about how we want to prioritize and what kinds of percentages of resources we want to allocate to different things.

MS. CHALLINOR: Woody, are you waving your pencil to be called on?

MR. ROBINSON: He's pointing at me.

MR. HORTON: Thank you. It would be very helpful to me if the commissioners can call to our attention specific concrete examples that they have run into, either in the media or through personal sources or otherwise, that underscore in a very concrete way exactly why and how libraries should be considered by policymakers at all levels of government. There's been a flurry of material in the media, as you all know, talking about the confusion in the government and who's on first, who's on second; we can't get the information we need, et cetera. And I've collected quite a sheath of those, but I'm sure you must be aware of some others. And be -- the reason I say that I think you probably suspect.

We've marched up so many times to this point of lamenting the fact, and we end up, I'm afraid, too often exhorting or admonishing congress and the executive agencies that "Why have you overlooked libraries" sort of thing. And if we have some specific bullet examples, that would be very, very helpful to us if you could furnish that.

MS. MASON: Yeah. I think that --

MS. HOLAHAN: There's something weird happening in the phone. Does Rosalie hear it too?

MS. CHALLINOR: The sound is because the air conditioning is on. We're in a hot spell.

MR. ROBINSON: No, it's breaking up; right? The clicking sound?

MS. HOLAHAN: Yes.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

MS. MASON: What I hear underlying your question, Woody, and I also hear the same thing underlying Bob's comments, is that we want to have a specific goal in mind. We don't want a general angst. It can't be just a complaint or a you guys ought to pay more attention to us kind of delivery. And I really agree with that. I think that we may end up with a presentation that changes at the end, and when we get to the "And this is what you want -- we want you to do" part. And I think it needs to have "And this is what we want you to do" part to it.

The -- I mentioned yesterday Ann Friedman; I don't know if you were here or not. But when I met with some librarians in Washington October 1st she was describing her attempts to do this in Arlington after the Pentagon was hit. And she had some very specific examples of their struggle to get the information to the public in a timely way. And that's -- and New York may also have some very specific examples that are real life examples that could be dramatized. And I think that's where using a video clip in the presentation might be useful. Not just talking heads, but pictures; and to add a little drama to this so that it isn't another one of those hopelessly boring presentations that most of us now sleep through.

MR. ROBINSON: No, I'm fine.

MR. MARTIN: I, at the risk of beating a dead horse, I want to come back to the focus on the content. It seems like to me in those four pieces that Marilyn described we have multiple messages for multiple audiences. It seems like to me, for example, the first item, that the audience is probably executive branch agencies first, perhaps secondarily congress. The second and third items it seems to me the audience is primarily libraries, unless we are wanting to talk to congress about more money to do some of that, but basically we're talking about issues that the audience is librarians. The third -- I mean the fourth one I'm not sure, maybe multiple audiences. But I don't -- I'm wondering how we're going to craft a presentation that successfully addresses those multiple messages to multiple audiences.

MS. MASON: What I would suggest at this point, that it would be a good idea for us to take a shot at some scripts, because I'm not sure we can resolve that until we actually start putting words on -- I started to say on paper. In little bits, because I do think that in this instance it does depend so specifically on what we say.

I mean I would, for the second one, for instance, I would argue that NEA, for instance, might want to be involved. And I'm just giving you a hard time, Bob. But I mean I would see many cultural institutions involved, but there are multiple messages for multiple audiences. And I'm not sure we'll really know to what extent a single message and to what extent we need multiple messages until we start writing scripts. But thank you for raising that issue, because I think it is something we need to be sensitive about.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes. I think that often libraries are -- that libraries do present an amorphous message, sort of like motherhood. All right? We're here, we're capable of a lot more than you people have any idea of. And I think that's a very good point. I think

we've got to be -- I think the word is targeted. I think we have to target the audience. I agree with that.

Martha is now back in the chair.

MS. GOULD: And I thank you --

MS. CHALLINOR: I never used --

MS. GOULD: -- for allowing me to go to the Hill this morning. We did have a chance to speak with Senator Reid.

FEMALE VOICE: I'm sorry, did or did not?

MS. GOULD: Did.

FEMALE VOICE: Did?

MS. GOULD: Yes. I did have a chance to speak with Senator Reid.

MS. CHALLINOR: Do you want to tell us about --

MR. ROBINSON: No, she's not going to tell us. She's going to tell us she had --

MS. GOULD: Basically that was it. And he was most gracious and we do have his support. And I think we probably have his support on the library issues period, not only our budget, but undoubtedly LSCA. LSTA. I just lost 10 years.

MS. CHALLINOR: Does any of what we're talking about come under LSTA? Can any of that money be used for the - -

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry, say again.

MS. CHALLINOR: Could any of the LSTA money be used for emergency preparedness?

MR. MARTIN: Well, state libraries are able to program the money any way they want to within the fairly generic, you know, outlines of the statute. And certainly if state libraries chose to do that they could probably allocate a substantial portion of their funding for emergency preparedness of one kind or another. Some of them already do in terms of underwriting disaster planning and that kind of thing in local libraries.

In terms of the National Leadership Grant program, we certainly would be happy to receive proposals that addressed some of those issues. And we have communicated that actually; in sending out the National Leadership Grant guidelines we included language that strongly encouraged libraries to craft proposals that responded to the post 9/11 situation. But we are not able to, you know, earmark or set aside funds for --

MS. CHALLINOR: No. I was just wondering if it could be used.

MS. GOULD: Oh, I would think so. And again, it depends on each state plan as to how they use --

MR. MARTIN: The state --

MS. GOULD: -- the LSTA money.

MR. MARTIN: The state funds would, yes.

MS. GOULD: And --

MR. MARTIN: It's up to the states to do that.

MS. GOULD: -- there is no reason why an entity could not put in a request under leadership. It might not be a bad idea.

We are, I gather, talking about --

MS. RUSSELL: We're ready to do item two under the role of libraries in emergency preparedness.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Excess -- access and preservation of public information.

MS. RUSSELL: We already did that.

MS. GOULD: You --

MS. RUSSELL: Well, we touched on it a little. I don't know if there was anything else that --

MS. GOULD: Now are we -- have you been discussing basically the outline that --

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MS. GOULD: -- Jose and I worked on last night?

MS. MASON: We've been discussing the results of the meeting, yeah.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. MASON: We have not gone through the outline you and she did. I have not seen that yet.

MS. CHALLINOR: No, because --

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. MASON: But --

MS. CHALLINOR: -- Jose is writing a proposal.

MS. MASON: But we can -- I mean I think we have outlined everything including the items on this list.

MS. GOULD: In that case, I would like to perhaps suggest at this point, if you feel that we've discussed this enough, I think that this really is a priority item and we need to give some direction to staff as to our next step. And at this point then I would entertain a motion.

MR. ROBINSON: We just went through that. So now that you --

MS. GOULD: Oh, I don't have to?

MR. ROBINSON: No, no. We do, because we delayed it --

MS. CHALLINOR: We do. We delayed it --

MR. ROBINSON: -- for your return.

MS. CHALLINOR: -- until you got here.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Then I'm ready to entertain a motion.

MS. DAVENPORT: Before we get to that stage --

MS. GOULD: Yes, Nancy.

MS. DAVENPORT: Or if we go back up to federal support for libraries and the items that are listed under that agenda item. Are there potential project budget implicating -- implications of those? Because we had talked yesterday about waiting until we had heard sort of the full picture.

MS. GOULD: It's possible, yes. It is possible.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, anyway, since I've been sitting around here waiting to draft a resolution for 20 minutes - -

MS. HOLAHAN: I have a question.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. HOLAHAN: I've been following this, I think, and if we're going to proceed and do something by midwinter and we're not going to deal with the priorities as a whole at this particular meeting today, we're going to have to give some kind of assurance that we wish to go forward with this. It does not necessarily have to be a resolution, but something concrete is going to have to be done by us in order to have this proceed; right?

MR. ROBINSON: Right.

MS. GOULD: Right. And also I feel very strongly at this point that we do have to provide direction to staff in terms of what issues are top, second and third priorities, and some kind of -- so that they can look at that and come back to us with a time frame of what they can realistically accomplish. And again, I have to say that I feel very strongly that we have a really unique opportunity to look at what libraries have been doing over the past three months in terms of these --

MS. HOLAHAN: The clicking is happening again.

MR. ROBINSON: You're just going to have to live with it.

MS. HOLAHAN: Oh. What is it?

MR. ROBINSON: I don't know.

MS. GOULD: I don't know. It's --

MR. ROBINSON: Gremlin static.

MS. HOLAHAN: Okay.

MS. GOULD: I mentioned gremlins one day and people looked at me and said, "Are you talking about the movie?" And I said, "No. This goes back to World War II."

MR. ROBINSON: These are the people who fly underneath the wings of airplanes.

MS. GOULD: Right.

MS. HOLAHAN: Oh, yes. That was a Twilight Zone.

MS. GOULD: Anyhow, we do have to understand that our staff can only do so much, so we do have to set some priorities. And right now, I think the issues dealing with the role of libraries in emergency preparedness and disaster recovery, I think this is an extremely important issue, most particularly if we want to have something by midwinter.

Now I agree with Nancy that we have other things on the table in terms of the big picture. And so at the pleasure of the Commission, if you want to hold off until we talk about the federal support for libraries and then the next steps, we can actually do the final --

MR. ROBINSON: That's what we --

MS. GOULD: -- resolution at next steps, which would be at 11:00.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Then we're going back up to federal support for libraries.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, I want to ask something. Are we going back to any of the ones that we visited yesterday? I wasn't here during pub science, access to presidential material, and U.S. Army Library.

MS. GOULD: That's going to be at 11:00 on next steps.

MS. CHALLINOR: Those three things will be --

MS. GOULD: We'll --

MS. CHALLINOR: -- subsumed under next step? Okay.

MS. GOULD: Yes. So we then are going back. And I thank you for bearing with me, but I thought it was very important that I have a chance to talk with --

MS. CHALLINOR: We think so too, Martha.

MS. GOULD: -- Senator Reed.

MS. CHALLINOR: Believe me.

MS. GOULD: Who is a very good friend of libraries.

Okay. LSTA re-authorization.

MR. WILLARD: The bill -- and I'm sure everybody in this room has a passing knowledge of the long history of federal support, from LSA through LSCA. And in 1996 the most recent version of the principle federal support program for libraries was enacted, I guess on September 30, 1996 as the Library Services and Technology Act. It is one of those pieces of legislation that must be renewed, and that renewal is coming up. Technically I guess it's by September 30th of 2002 the LSTA has to be renewed.

There has been a very active movement within the library community that I'm aware of. I know there's also been movement within the museum community, because the LSTA is part of a larger act that focuses on libraries and museums, which also has to -- the larger act has to be renewed.

The initiative has -- there have been -- there's been a coalition that has met quite frequently over the past year. The Commission, of course, as a federal agency is not part of the coalition, but we have attended many of their meetings as an invited observer. I think -- and there are other people in the room who know far more than me and I think we should open the conversation to those -- invite those people to comment where appropriate.

My assessment of the initiative is the proponents of re-authorization essentially want business as usual in terms of the structure of the law. They want to encourage a significant increase, and the number of 500 million is being talked about. They want to restructure -- the way the state grants work is that there's a flat amount that goes to each state as a basis and then the remainder is distributed on a population formula, pro rata population. That base amount has not been adjusted for what, 40 years, 20 years, something like that. So there's support for adjusting that upwards, I think doubling it. There's also an explicit requirement for assessment of how the funding programs are working and earmarking some small amount of money to specifically cover that assessment function.

I guess the American Library Association has the most insight into what's going on because they have engaged professional lobbyists to help them and these lobbyists have background with the particular committees of jurisdiction. So would it be appropriate to ask --

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MR. WILLARD: -- representatives from ALA if they want to add anything?

MS. COSTABILE: I think you presented it quite well, Bob. I'm Mary Costabile from the (indiscernible) office staff. So we were disappointed that (indiscernible) this year yet, so that the attention of the senate and house committees that are the key committees in this situation could not address the issue at the latest session this year. On the other hand, we've done a lot of work with them, so the groundwork is there.

And I think we are continuing to have meetings of the task -- of the coalition, and we will have (indiscernible) there. I hope you will be able to come and observe. We're having a meeting of various -- let's see. What's a good way to describe (indiscernible). Untapped resources in the community that we feel could support our initiatives to increase funding for LSTA. So that will take place early in January and we'll report on that meeting (indiscernible).

These are people that we've not had in a room together with us before, so -- the business community. And I think that's a good direction. It's to everyone's interest to increase the funding for LSTA and for, if we get it, the school library piece, the ESDA. So that's what we're working on during what people call the down time, but there hasn't been any down time because (indiscernible) still here. So both my issues, which are funding and ESDA, are still sitting there waiting to be finished. And --

MR. WILLARD: Another group that is very actively involved, of course, is the chief officers. Nancy, do you want to say anything about --

MS. BOLT: We're part of the coalition working very hard. I was going to say this later on this afternoon actually, it's one of our top priorities to get the LSTA re-authorization task a lot more money.

MR. WILLARD: The role for the Commission is obviously what should be before you. When the -- what was originally conceived of as LSCA, library Services Construction Act re-authorization, which was an agenda item for the congress back at the -- well, '94, '95, '96, in that period. The Commission played a significant role, both formally; we held hearings out in Lake Tahoe; and informally and very effectively, because our chair at the time was Jeanne Simon and she was a very forceful spokesperson for library interests with members on the Hill.

It is fair to say that at this point the commission has not been involved in this discussion at all. We've been observers, but it is a reasonable thing for us to consider how we weigh in as the members of congress finally turn their attention to this issue. I somewhat tongue in cheek said that they'd be getting around to it in September.

MS. GOULD: Which September?

MR. WILLARD: 2002. Or give them 30 days to deal with it. But they -- we know that staffers are already looking at the issue and a consensus proposal that has been put together by the coalition I'm sure is in their hands. And they are also working on their ideas. So that's the legislative process. But when it gets to the point where members are actually interested is anybody's guess.

MS. GOULD: Bob Martin, do you have any comments in sight, because LSTA is part of the Museum & Library Services Act, which is also the vehicle for re- authorization.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah. Well, quite naturally I have a substantial amount of interest in this. But our approach to this all along has been that this is not our legislation, it's not our program. It's the museum and library's communities legislation. It's their program and we -- our role is to administer it. So we have been observers and been at most of the -- I personally haven't been, but staff have been involved in all of those discussions and have contributed some viewpoints.

But in general, the consensus legislation presented by both the museum community and the library community is, you know, fine with us. And we assume that it will not be a controversial issue. The real problem is going to be getting congress to pay attention before September 30.

I've had no substantive discussions. I've had one brief discussion with someone in the White House just alerting them that this is an issue that will be coming up. I've had no substantive discussions with the administration and I don't anticipate that the administration is going to have a significant part -- impact on this. They're not going to have their own bill.

MS. GOULD: I think from the point of view of the national commission that we continue to liaison to be at the task force meetings, but that whatever we do in terms of support for the re-authorization will, I think, come to play after we actually see a bill.

MR. MARTIN: Let me add a couple more things. We have had some conversations with congressional staff. They all seem to think it's perfectly fine, won't be a problem. There's some discussion of strategy about who the sponsors might be and that kind of thing. The indication we've had so far is that they don't think it would be useful or advisable to have hearings. We have suggested if they do have hearings field hearings would be preferable to the -- to Washington hearings, but they don't seem inclined to have hearings. And that cuts both ways, but it keeps things simple. So we'll see how that proceeds.

MS. GOULD: So I think I -- yes, Marilyn.

MS. MASON: Is there a draft consensus legislation at this point?

MR. MARTIN: There -- sure. It -- I don't know who's got it handy, but there is. There's a side-by-side comparison.

MS. BOLT: I have it on my computer if you have --

MR. MARTIN: It's not something we own.

MS. MASON: Do you --

MR. MARTIN: It's the coalition's.

MS. MASON: Does someone here have it?

MR. WILLARD: Not the most recent.

MS. MASON: Just Nancy?

MS. BOLT: I have it on my computer if you have a diskette.

MR. MARTIN: During the break we could copy it.

MS. BOLT: It's just a side-by-side --

MS. MASON: Yeah. I just -- I'd like to see it.

MS. BOLT: Not a lot of change --

MR. MARTIN: The changes Bob mentioned are the most significant ones. There's some - - quite a bit of additional findings legislation whereas congress finds that it is desirable yah, dah, dah, dah. But in terms of actual mechanism, the change in the base level allocation is the only really -- and the overall authorization.

MS. COSTABILE: Eval piece.

MR. MARTIN: And the evaluation piece, yeah.

MS. BOLT: And some rewording of purpose and what it can be used for, but it's mainly for clarification (indiscernible).

MR. MARTIN: The consensus of the task force participants seemed to be that it works just fine the way it is. Let's not fix something that ain't broke. The only thing that really was a matter of issue was the base allocation, which, you know, you can quite understand the perspective of the small states. It wasn't enough.

MS. GOULD: I do have a question, and I don't know whether Nancy or Mary can answer that. Do you have a time line in terms of taking your draft and making a decision as to how you're going to work and who's going to introduce the legislation?

MS. COSTABILE: We did do that last year. We took the draft (indiscernible) and then that (indiscernible) office --

MS. GOULD: Right.

MS. COSTABILE: Things have changed a bit, but those staffers are still there. So I assume we will --

MS. GOULD: You'll continue to --

MS. COSTABILE: -- pick up where we left off with that.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. COSTABILE: At house we've been speaking with the permanent staff over there. I know that Sandy was in town a week or so ago and spoke with some of the staff. We've spoken with some of the staff in the education of the work force committee and, you

know, I would expect (indiscernible) supposed to do it. And he would do it. So who sponsors it is the question. We have a number of library friends, as you know, in the house committee. So we'll see. And we're going to see quick, because we want to do it as soon as we can once they come back.

MS. GOULD: Good. Yes.

MS. BOLT: Our game plan has always been to get our ducks in a row and ready to launch the moment someone says now. So it's already in and sitting on staffers' desks and we are basically waiting for them to say now is the time.

MR. MARTIN: I will say I have also been visiting, when I can get in to see them, members and -- of the relevant authorizing committees, both sides.

MS. GOULD: In the house and the senate.

MR. MARTIN: And we've had -- we haven't met -- I suppose we met with fewer than half of the members of those committees so far, but the reception has been friendly, in some cases enthusiastic. I don't anticipate any real problem, other than getting their attention at the right time.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Yes. And then Robbie.

MS. CHALLINOR: Let me summarize what I understand, is that we are fully ready to help those who wish to see this authorization in any way that would be helpful. And at the moment we are simply waiting to know what would be helpful and what role we could play, but we don't want to look as if we're just not doing anything. But I think that -  
-

MS. GOULD: I'm not sure we can do anything until there is --

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, that's what I'm saying, but --

MS. GOULD: -- actual legislation.

MR. ROBINSON: Sometimes anything -- nothing is the best thing to do.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes. We're doing nothing until we find out what it is, how we can be helpful. But we want to convey to those who are on the front line that we do indeed wish to be helpful and we'll do anything we can.

MS. MASON: We appreciate that.

MR. WILLARD: Well, I say this not to indicate that it's what I think we should do, but I just want to remind you that what we did in '94 was hold hearings ourselves. And if the

issue is on the reticence of the congress to hold hearings and the community felt it was appropriate to establish some sort of record, we certainly could be helpful that way.

MS. GOULD: And I think that we -- I think what we did in '94 was very good, and we may have to think in terms of doing that again. But again, we will continue to keep in touch with the Washington office, with COSLA, with IMLS, and once we have a concrete piece of legislation we can move ahead, hopefully.

Paulette, did you want to say something?

MS. HOLAHAN: No, I coughed. I apologized and turned the phone away.

MS. CHALLINOR: You don't have to cough -- apologize for coughing.

MS. GOULD: You don't have to apologize for being sick. Believe me, we're grateful that you're hanging on the telephone to be with us.

What about school libraries hearing follow-up?

MR. WILLARD: Well, as I reported yesterday, we do anticipate the formal publication will be ready within weeks. Course that could be 52 weeks. No, soon.

The issue as with other -- as, for example, with the disability hearing too is that okay, now that you have the hearing, what does the body want to do with that knowledge. And candidly, and this will come up in the discussion at 11 or when we get to that, the real politics suggests that maybe there isn't too much that can be done on any of these things given the fact that the Commission is shrinking in size and that the current administration has not yet designated individuals to be on the Commission.

So we have a rather narrow window right now with the composition of the Commission as it is to make real fast decisions, but I'm not sure that there are any -- there certainly are no staff recommendations yet that we could say with regard to the school libraries hearing. But most of you were at it, so I think it's, rather than a report from me, it's more a discussion by the members that would be useful in this time period.

MS. GOULD: I'm waiting for comments from commissioners.

MS. CHALLINOR: Well, I would certainly say that I can -- I take the whole thing extremely seriously. I think that Rebecca can certainly speak to that, how important it is that we don't lose more school -- we're probably losing some as we sit around this table today.

MS. BINGHAM: Certainly. That is a fact all across the country. And I think that we certainly need to speak very forcefully, because if we expect children to be technologically literate as well as literate in reading, we've got to get them when they're young. They're already using the computers and things at home; we've got to have them

in the school libraries. And the school librarians have got to be respected as something above clerks once they get there.

MS. GOULD: I attended the Region 9 conference on excellence in education because, interestingly enough, it was held in Reno, Nevada. And glaringly absent in all of the discussion in terms of excellence in education was any mention of the role of the school library in the education process. The conference basically emphasized being computer literate, but didn't take that next step on being information literate. And I feel that it really behooves us to weigh in very strongly in terms of school libraries. And I know that I personally have discussed this with Senator Reed in terms of the re-authorization of ESEA and the school library component.

MR. ROBINSON: From a timing --

MS. CHALLINOR: Marilyn.

MS. GOULD: Marilyn.

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, okay.

MS. GOULD: And then Robbie.

MS. MASON: As part of my ongoing tour of libraries of the country on behalf of OCLC, when we were on the west coast and met with many public library directors out there they commented repeatedly on the enormous impact on children that the closing of school libraries has had. And public libraries can tell this and academic libraries can tell this, because children are reaching these levels with no understanding of how to do searching in either print or digital information. And this is -- it was further confirmation of the kind of testimony we heard in Cincinnati.

One of my colleagues at OCLC has expressed an interest in studying -- in doing a rather rigorous study of the impact on children when they do not have access to a school library. And I have given her Denise's name and told her of the work that the Commission has done in this regard. I don't know where that's going, but it certainly, if we -- if someone conducted a study, a statistical study that could look at the impact, how well students do in college who have had a history of school libraries and those who have not, to see in fact if there is any observable or measurable impact. I think that would be a quite useful document.

MS. BINGHAM: I might add that I think any publications or any expressions that come from this group need to be brought to the attention of those administrative associations that control what happens at the school level. And I'm talking about the school boards association, I'm talking about the association for superintendency, and I'm also talking about the principals, because very frequently they run their little shop the way they feel. And we certainly have to do something that is at least as binding as Title 2 in the ESEA Act was.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Paulette.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, you know, it's deja vu all over again, but we've got to do something dramatic and use all kinds of media words. Dynamic isn't going to get their attention because this, you know, we've been going on, now we've been looking at it and studying it. This is the second time around, at least that I know of. So we've got to do something that really gets their attention.

And I think we talked about that a little bit in Cincinnati, about doing something that would really -- I don't know what it is, but we've got to do something forceful and really attention getting, because people are not paying attention. Administrators are not paying attention at all. They have to realize and understand what we're saying is true, but why aren't they doing something? It's a monetary thing. So I don't know how we get around that, but we've got to offer something that makes them willing to cooperate.

MS. GOULD: Robbie.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. I remember my comment in Cincinnati, which is that we're going to have two tiers or three tiers of education, where -- in what was it, Chestnut -- Western Hills I think it was in Cincinnati, where when the librarians -- or the libraries were starting to be pushed out of the schools, the parents went out and, you know, raised money and did whatever they did.

MS. HOLAHAN: It was a very affluent area.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, exactly. And that way you're going to end up with public education with several tiers of libraries. There's going to be the hotsie-totsie library at Western Hills, there's going to be the so-so library at their place, and then there's going to be the no libraries. And, you know, I think we -- that to me was a very bad thing, because it changes the whole concept of public education if you are having parents to do the bands, the high -- the school nurse, the, you know, whole series of these things which used to be part of the public school system and now we see them all being eroded. And I think that that's what bothers me most, because I think we're going to have an unpublic public school system.

MS. GOULD: Jose.

MS. GRIFFITHS: And I think even more critical, as part of what Robbie was saying, is the fact that we do have increasingly the so-so libraries, which we really -- I mean give people the impression that they've done something when they've provided library service. I'm not talking about the librarians, I'm talking about the principals and the administrators and so on. Where in fact they may do almost more harm than good by showing people a model of a library that isn't truly a library.

MS. GOULD: Mary --

MS. CHALLINOR: Nancy wants --

MS. GOULD: Oh, yes. Nancy.

MS. DAVENPORT: I did not get to attend that hearing in Cincinnati and will read the publication when it comes out, but I'm wondering if there were examples of sort of the good, the bad, the ugly, and the effects thereof; that coming on the Commission's letterhead as a report from -- not reproducing the hearing, but as a report from the hearing could help to inform the congress and its policy making, which is immediately one of the first directives to the Commission.

MS. GOULD: That is correct. And that's what I, you know, mentioned yesterday.

Marilyn, just --

MS. MASON: But we don't really -- all we have is anecdotal evidence --

MS. GOULD: That's it.

MS. MASON: -- about the impact. We don't really --

MS. DAVENPORT: But anecdotal --

MS. MASON: Well, then --

MS. DAVENPORT: -- is the story about which -- around which you can wrap the statistic and you can then wrap the effect. Helps one to remember the statistic.

MS. MASON: And also re --

MS. HOLAHAN: (Indiscernible) the problem. They're old.

MS. GOULD: But remember we have the four reports that were done in Colorado, Pennsylvania, Alaska, Texas - -

MS. BOLT: Alaska, Texas, New Mexico. There are more and more states that every single study, even ones Keith doesn't do, every single study shows that where there is a good school library there are higher student achievement scores.

MS. GOULD: Correct.

MS. BOLT: And we have new research that shows that where there is access to technology, particularly when that technology is linked and connected within the school to outside resources, there are higher scores at high school too. Those kids have dramatically higher student achievement scores on the standardized tests.

MS. GOULD: You wanted -- Jose.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Yes. I was just going to say maybe the -- one of the better things that we could do is to take the indicators and trends from the various reports and show where and how they reinforce each other. So that in fact we don't get bogged down in controversy over one study or another, or one methodology or another, but say the general trend of these indicators are that there is an effect and it's positive and, you know, there might be arguments about the degree to which it's positive, but we could at least move that bit forward.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Joan.

MS. CHALLINOR: As I remember, one of the strongest messages we got from that hearing was they didn't have any statistics; that they didn't have any statistics and they weren't in the habit of going to their local people to get money and they couldn't put statistics on. So I'm extremely gratified to hear that there is some, because that was some of the --

MS. BOLT: In fact, he testified at the hearing. Or maybe -- I'm not sure if you were there, but Keith testified --

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes, I was.

MS. BOLT: Dr. Keith Lance, he works for the Colorado State Library, has done three studies himself. And at least two or three other states have done studies that all show positive impact. And in fact Pennsylvania used that with their legislators to get increased funding for school libraries.

MS. CHALLINOR: That was exactly --

MS. BOLT: Senator Reed is also using Keith's study as part of his justification for the ESEA bill.

MS. GOULD: That's Rhode Island Senator Reed?

MS. BOLT: I'm sorry. Yeah, the other -- yes. Rhode Island Senator Reed is using --

MS. COSTABILE: The other librarian friend.

MS. BOLT: Right. Is using that to get -- using it as part of the justification for his bill that's part of the ESEA (indiscernible) --

MS. CHALLINOR: That was exactly what the school librarians were asking for, that somewhere they get a bunch of statistics that they can go. But at the same time, they have

to learn what Martha's been preaching lo these many years, how to use those statistics and where to go and how to put it on the table successfully.

MS. GOULD: Mary or Lynn, maybe you can answer this question for me, because I know that there is some contention over ESEA --

MS. COSTABILE: Huge.

MS. GOULD: Huge -- well, all right.

MS. COSTABILE: It's a huge bill and there's a lot of pieces to it, and there's a lot of --

MS. GOULD: Is there any controversy over the school library set-aside component?

MS. COSTABILE: Yes. However, Senator Reed has managed (indiscernible) up to this point.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. COSTABILE: That's not to say he will prevail forever, but I have some very optimistic hopes that he will, because it's stayed in this long.

MS. GOULD: Would it be appropriate at this point in time for the Commission, based on not only the anecdotal information that we have from the hearing but also referring back to the numerous studies, to point out to congress that there is a very definite policy issue here that, in the support of education erodes school libraries, needs to be recognized and supported?

MS. COSTABILE: I would think that might be quite helpful, because they're not finished. (Indiscernible) rumors, but they might be (indiscernible). They're, you know, there are some very large issues of concern, like Title 1, there's (indiscernible), yet some stuff in here about disabilities, there's some stuff in here about bug extermination in the classroom. I don't know what that's about, but there's a whole lot of things that people are digging their heels in on and then the question of whether the -- how big the block granting will be. And that's set a course of concern to us too. So it's -- I would say it's not -- if you can write the letter this week, that would be great.

MS. CHALLINOR: And what we want is a very hard- hitting one page zip, zip, zip letter. So we take --

MS. GOULD: I would at this point then --

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob Martin would like to say something.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Bob.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry. I'm sorry I stepped out and missed some of the conversation, but -- and I don't know if this is an appropriate place to put my oar in the water or not, but I just wanted to --

MS. GOULD: Go right ahead.

MR. MARTIN: -- report to you that we at IMLS are currently engaged in ongoing and pretty intensive conversations with Mrs. Bush and her staff on -- following up her interest in school libraries. And I expect that there will be something specific that comes out of that in the not too distant future. Now that will not -- that's East Wing, it is not West Wing.

MS. GOULD: That is correct.

MR. MARTIN: And it will not -- I'm not suggesting that there will be a legislative or appropriations initiative that comes out of that, but something more along the lines probably of raising the visibility and of the importance of school libraries in education.

MR. ROBINSON: So that's all complimentary to this whole thing.

MS. GOULD: Right.

MR. ROBINSON: We do our thing, she does her thing, you do your thing --

MS. GOULD: Yes, Marilyn.

MS. MASON: Well, I don't know if a motion is appropriate at this point, but it does seem -- but if it is, I'd like to make a motion. And if it isn't, someone can tell me and I will withdraw it. But it does seem to me since -- and I appreciate Nancy reminding us of the statistical information. Sometimes these things drop out of our heads and that's why it's important for you to be here.

But because we have had the hearings and there is some hard evidence of the connection between school libraries and achievement, and it is our role to advise the President and the congress, it would appear to me an entirely appropriate thing for us to do, to send a letter to the appropriate committees reinforcing the need for the specific set-aside for school libraries. And I would so move.

FEMALE VOICE: Second.

MS. GOULD: Any additional comment?

All those in favor?

(Chorus of Ayes)

MS. GOULD: Opposed?

(No Response)

MS. GOULD: The letter will go out by the end of this week.

MR. ROBINSON: But that doesn't necessarily preclude doing a study of our own based on --

MS. CHALLINOR: That's a good point.

MR. ROBINSON: -- that the -- I mean I'm just setting here -- putting together priorities of my own in terms of what the commission should be doing. And when Marilyn brought up the person who is interested in doing a study on the statistics of libraries, school libraries, et cetera, that seems to me another way to utilize our research funding, it seems to me.

MS. GOULD: Once we have the proceedings done and we begin to look at our policy issues. The important thing right now is to make sure that the school library component stays in the ESEA.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

MS. GOULD: Then over the next period of time when we go through the appropriation process, we have the authorization. And that's when I think we can continue to work on the annual appropriation in terms of providing to the congressional committees the type of data and information they need to make a good decision.

But this is definitely a policy issue and there is definitely a role that needs to be played, and so I will call upon --

MS. HOLAHAN: It's a road we've been on a long time.

MS. GOULD: And we will continue to be on this --

MR. ROBINSON: It's bumpy.

MS. HOLAHAN: It's a bumpy road ahead.

MS. GOULD: Follow the yellow brick road, yes.

MR. WILLARD: My recollection of one of the key findings that just was manifest at the meeting in Cincinnati was the inadequacy of statistical information. And --

MS. GOULD: Yeah. That's what I was --

MR. WILLARD: -- since Denise isn't here, I can't say anything definitive, but I know she has that message. There already is an existing survey of school libraries. It is done extremely slowly, and she is working with NCES to rectify that. I think some of the improvements they have done in other areas, especially in the use of the Internet to collect statistics, to collect the data in its raw form, will be applied to the school survey, so that we should be getting that information on a more ready basis. But it doesn't get to the more qualitative issues that I think

MS. GRIFFITHS: But if I can say, school libraries for the last 10 years have -- the movement of looking at library measures and metrics has been very active in the school arena, not only here, but internationally. So there are measures and metrics that could be applied to school libraries. I think the concern is that there's no systematic collection of good quality data, you know, with standard definitions, et cetera, et cetera. And that's really what's needed. And so bringing some kind of systemic approach and standardization to what's gathered I think would begin to make the kind of argument we make.

But I want -- on the subject of statistics, we do tend to get very bogged down, since I've worked with library statistics for like 25 years, we get bogged down often in the statistical validity of what we're doing. Which is all very good, you know; we research it so we want to make sure they're valid. But when you look at what happens in congress, you find nicely colored charts showing trends and correlations with very few numbers on those charts, but, you know, nicely colored charts that show, okay, a reduction here relates to something else somewhere. And I'm sure we could produce one or two good charts out of the data that do exist that would make a point.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. GRIFFITHS: That's really what we want to learn to do, is to use selected statistics to make a point, selected, defensible statistics to make a point.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. MASON: When we talk about statistics I'm a little confused, because I see two separate sets of statistical information and I'm not sure which of these we're talking about. When I think of the collection of statistics that Denise is involved in, I think of the measure of how many school libraries there are. It's -- is that what you're talking about?

MS. GRIFFITHS: No, actually that's -- actually I'm talking fairly holistically about statistics. I mean the statistics that Denise is involved with are predominantly NCES, but even NCES has commission studies of school libraries and their role in achieving goals. Goals 2000 was a big study that West Stat conducted just a few years ago. That -- the report didn't seem to get much publicity because Goals 2000 at that time had gone out of favor. But -- so there have been a number of studies of that kind, but there are also statistics collected by varying groups of libraries, coming sort of more from the bottom up. Either groups like state, whole states, like the Kenlawn (phonetic) studies, or similar

studies conducted with McClure (phonetic) and other statistical consultants. So these do exist. The question is they've never really been -- there's never been a comprehensive look at them.

MS. MASON: Yeah. I guess the distinction I'm trying to make is the difference in input and impacts and the difference in, you know, how many there are and how much support they get, and that sort of thing, versus what is their impact on the individual child, which I think is much more compelling and much more difficult to achieve.

MS. GOULD: I think that these are issues that, because paramount is to get the letter --

MS. CHALLINOR: There's one other person.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Bob.

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob wants --

MS. GOULD: I'm sorry.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry.

MS. GOULD: Go on.

MR. MARTIN: I don't have to speak before you. I just wanted to follow up by saying that there are indeed some studies that show some strong correlations. Earlier this year the Texas State Library, for example, published a study; I don't know if you've seen it or not; that shows a high correlation between quality of school libraries measured on a couple of variables and the presence of a professional librarian with increased scores on the Texas Assessment of Academic Schools, the standardized test. And that -- you know, those data are there. They show the correlation.

The difficulty is that when you talk about that it - - I've had this experience firsthand twice already. The - - when you talk to people who do social science research about that, they go -- they smile and they say "Yes, you're -- what about all the intervening variables?" I don't -- so I'm really conflicted about using that stuff. The point being if you have good school libraries and good teachers in your school system, you probably have lots of other good things that correlate with that improved test scores. So you can't isolate a cause and effect relationship. It's a nice correlation, but what does it really tell you?

I think that when you go and talk to congress they may not be so sophisticated about it, but when you go to talk to people who do education policy you get it thrown right back in your face. So I'm kind of conflicted about how to use that.

MS. GOULD: I think at this point we will go ahead and do a letter to the appropriate committees, or conference committee on ESEA. And the other issues that have been

brought up we will address at the time we complete our study and start working on the policy issues, which would then be impacted when we start looking at the 2003 -- is it 2003 budget? I do wish the federal government went on the same fiscal year as local government. It would make my life so much easier. And we will continue to work closely and in cooperation with IMLS and with the Washington office. And -- yes, Bob.

MR. WILLARD: One other thing. And remember that -- where this subtopic appears in our agenda. We do have the whole issue of federal government, so what? The -- it can be argued that yes, if you've got better libraries you've got better students, but the federal government says so why isn't that a local issue. We certainly realize that funding for libraries in general has been so tenuous that the secret of whatever successes existed so far has been being able to reach to multiple providers of funding, but I think that it is probably incumbent upon this organization to flesh out that argument.

I think there are very strong arguments on why the federal -- what the federal role is and why it should be continued, but there are a number of people who are in positions of policymaking that instinctively say "Well, that's a local issue. We shouldn't even be wasting our time on it."

MS. GOULD: With that comment, before we go to the Internet study policy report, would you like to take a 10 minute break?

We'll see you back at 10 minutes to 11.

(Break from 10:39 to 10:49 a.m.)

MS. GOULD: I would like to call us back to order please.

Okay. We're down to the Bertot, McClure and Janette (phonetic) study policy report.

MR. WILLARD: As you know, the Commission has funded research into the presence of Internet access in public libraries over the past several years. That work has always been done by Chuck McClure and John Bertot. We have asked them to examine their own work, to look at those trend wise, to look at the -- what they have discovered, and to also review other significant -- turn the mic on, yes.

We've asked Chuck and John to review their work and also to look at other significant policy documents, like LSTA and the Communications Act as amended in 1996, and -- that established the ERIG (phonetic) program, and to submit to us what we will refer to in shorthand as a policy document. It is their informed opinion on what this body should do in terms of addressing national information policy specifically linked to federal funding for libraries.

They have submitted a first draft and it was stamped "draft" all over it and it clearly needed more work. I went through it and shared my observations on it. I think they will

be submitting to us their final copy within about two to three weeks. And we will get that out to the members of the Commission right away.

I think it is a very useful product, but I don't think it is what the Commission wants to publish stand- alone. I think we want to take their recommendations and have staff write basically an introductory piece that draws from and, my thoughts, also reorganizes, because I think they're -- they sort of wandered around rather than focusing on some of the key issues. So we will get you their submission in its original form immediately when we receive it so that you can begin to absorb it, but we will also, on the staff, begin to write that covering document, and we'll then get that out to you in draft. We think that the two of those together would make a very useful publication for policymakers concerned with library aid.

We also think that since they are mentioning some of the various organic documents, organic legislation in this area, perhaps we'll also include that as appendices to this document and thereby make it a useful publication for academic, especially for people who might be teaching information policy, for example. We did, by the way, get some feedback, I think I mentioned yesterday, about the publication of our other document on government information. So the Volume 3 and -- especially Volume 3, but also Volume 4, is looked upon as a good source book for government information policy. This would be more on library support policy. So it's in the works and I thought can't do anything more than report on it right now, but within the next few weeks you will be seeing deliverables.

MS. GOULD: Okay. All right. I think at this point, looking at the role of libraries in emergency preparedness, did you also talk about the role of libraries in cross-cultural communication?

(Voices Respond No)

MS. GOULD: That has not been addressed, so I think at this point I would entertain comments from the Commission on this issue.

MS. RUSSELL: Do you want to frame the issue (indiscernible)?

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. CHALLINOR: I'm not sure I know what it means.

MS. GOULD: They're going to frame the issue.

MS. CHALLINOR: I hope that --

MR. WILLARD: The role of libraries as a neutral disseminator of information is something that probably plays very well to our system of government and our belief in what is unique about America; that we feel pretty confident that if we just let the -- all of

the information out, principles like equality and freedom, recognition of human rights, all the things that characterize this democracy are a good message, and that the failure of other cultures to understand what we're all about as a contributing factor to some of the terrorist activities we've seen.

Now I know that's a simplistic statement, because there's just years and years of animosity and, let's face it, a fair amount of false packaging of what we are all about. So the element here, what we had in mind was that the state department, for example, has a well developed network of libraries that have -- well, they call them information resource centers now -- in embassies and other locations around the world. It's fair to say that -- and by the way, we just had a meeting on Wednesday morning, Martha and Joan and representatives from the State Department library operation met and we learned more about what they're doing.

We understand their focus is essentially government to government. They are dealing with the governments of other nations and acting as an information resource primarily to them. But they also reported that their -- the new overall head of their section of the Department of State, the Undersecretary for Public Diplomacy, has a marketing background, thinks in terms of targets. And very simplistically, and that's generally the way it is in marketing, simplistically she says their target is the 11- year-old Arab boy; we discussed the gender aspect of that just a little bit.

But the concept of getting the message not just to the minister of agriculture in a government, but also to the broader population, is something that is at least on the agenda for the State Department Library network now. And clearly it fits into the whole issue of what do -- what role do libraries have post 9/11. So that's why it's here.

MS. RUSSELL: Bob, the other piece of it is the materials at the public libraries, foreign language materials at public libraries.

MR. WILLARD: Oh. Yes, I'm sorry. This was raised to us by an individual who pointed out that many public libraries make very positive statements about their holdings in languages other than English. But when you really look at those, are they carrying the right message.

Example used was in a library that had a very small collection of Chinese language material. Most of it was from the People's Republic of China and it was biographies of the Communist leaders and so on. There really wasn't Western material translated into Chinese.

So I don't know whether that's a prevalent problem. This is just one letter raising the issue. But if it is something that resonates with this group, it's something we could look into further.

MS. GOULD: Yes, Joan.

MS. CHALLINOR: I would like to point out that Martha and I did raise the point of the 11-year-old Arab girl, but we decided to put it on hold until we reached the 11-year-old Arab boy first and then --

MR. ROBINSON: Who throws more rocks.

MS. CHALLINOR: -- not to push in all directions.

MR. ROBINSON: I have a --

MS. RUSSELL: The public library materials was that if you have people who are here who are non-English speaking and you are trying to assimilate them into the society and you are trying to culturally acclimatize them to democracy and things, that if they go to the library and all you can give them to read is --

MR. ROBINSON: Mao-Tse Tung.

MS. RUSSELL: -- biographies of Mao, right, that you're not teaching them about Lincoln and Jefferson and the principles of (indiscernible). It was -- that was the context in which that letter advanced the issue.

MR. ROBINSON: I guess --

MS. MASON: Yeah. I think there really is an issue here about what public libraries see as their role in this regard. And most public libraries don't see their role as -- well, propaganda is too strong a word for it, but indoctrination.

One of the things that has changed about immigrants into the United States, they tell me, the people I talk with, is that people who come to the United States now from other countries -- and they come from many, many, many other countries -- is that because of improved communications worldwide, they often stay in regular contact with their families back home, and continue, especially in the case of a country like Mexico, to consider that their primary home. And so when they come to the library they're really not looking for, in that instance, Spanish material about the United States. They're really looking for --

MS. RUSSELL: A newspaper from home.

MS. MASON: That's right. They're really looking -- so I suspect what you've observed is correct, that -- but I'm not sure it's wrong. I mean I'm not sure that that's -- there's a problem with that.

MS. GOULD: Robbie.

MR. ROBINSON: I guess I'm seeing this as a two piece operation. Marilyn's talked about the domestic library and the -- and I'm not sure what our role is in the, what I would

prefer to call the USIA library and -- which is now part of the embassy libraries. I don't know what the role of the U.S. Commission is in that.

MS. GOULD: One of the things that we discussed when we met yesterday morning with the people from the State Department was in terms also of how we, the library community, could work with library communities in other countries in terms of edu -- not in terms of acquisition of materials, but in terms of education. When I went to Vienna and to Tallenn, Estonia for the State Department, again and again and again what I heard was "We don't know how to do budgets, we've never had to administer a library." They have no public administration experience. And that's what they're looking for, the nitty-gritty.

And they come here, you know, on an exchange program through the State Department. They're here for three weeks and they visit New York and Chicago and Los Angeles. And these are wonderful libraries, but they have no relevance to what they're facing in Bulgaria. And I think that came home loud and clear through the sister library program. They need to know.

And is there a role for the Commission in this arena? I don't know. I know that the State Department wants to work with us. Bob and then Nancy.

MR. MARTIN: Well, actually I was going to go someplace else, so Nancy.

MS. DAVENPORT: I was going to give you an example of some of what's going on right now under the auspices of the American Library Association. Nancy Bolt and I are working on the -- a committee that is formed a partnership with the library associations of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. We went there last May and did essentially a week-long program for 10 librarians from each of those countries talking about the role of libraries in developing the infrastructure of a democracy: access to information, transparency of government, but the role of the library and the librarian in doing that.

We are planning on going back. This -- that particular conference was held in Georgia. We're moving to Armenia for the next one, hoping to have more participants; and not only from the libraries, but from local government and from their national governments and their academic and business communities; talking in this case about the role of libraries in developing a civil society. So we're looking not just at how one tracks one's government, but how one participates in one's government and governmental actions based upon the use of information.

We are seeking funds to be able to do this, particularly for bringing the participants from the other countries into Armenia. We will also be -- the American delegation will be staying on in Armenia, because we're timing this conference to be a pre-conference to the Armenian Library Association conference. So we will be staying on to be guest speakers and lecturers and participants in other workshops, in essence doing a lot of what previously USIA used to do when it would bring American librarians in to do workshops in particular places.

So we're taking this on our own, and with the idea of doing this, both the first program and this program, in such a way that while it is respectful of the culture that you are going into, it is not culturally dependent. In essence you could take the building blocks, the workshop program, the workshop participant documents, all of which were translated, and drop them into another set of countries to do. So we're building some models that people could work on.

MS. GOULD: Have you been in touch with the people at the State Department?

MS. DAVENPORT: We have indeed.

MS. GOULD: With -- you're working with Mary?

MS. DAVENPORT: Yes, we are. Nancy Kronick (phonetic) is the one who is chairing this, the immediate past president of ALA. And she and I have been to the State Department talking to the people about this, and we get some funds from them for it.

But I wanted to give you this as another example of we've got one model going that could be replicated other places. So the groundwork, the intellectual development of putting together sort of the underpinnings of libraries in a democratic environment, has been done. If you wanted to use that package someplace else, we'd sure be willing to talk.

MS. GOULD: I am aware of this. And actually I may end up in Armenia with you because of Silva, who's been - - who actually asked me if I would consider coming. Originally we were going to be doing this past fall and now it's, I guess --

MS. DAVENPORT: September.

MS. GOULD: Next September. And I said, "You say when and I'll be there."

Bob.

MR. MARTIN: Well, actually I was going to make another point, but I can't resist simply saying that I've had similar experiences in Rumania. I taught there two summers and it's the same kind of thing; they're eager for learning how to do budgets and acquire materials, and the more amorphous questions of what is the proper role of a library in a democratic society, which is interesting in a country which is still struggling with what is democracy.

I had a, if you'll permit me to digress for a moment, I had a fascinating experience that relates to archives more than libraries. Someone had arranged for me to meet the national archivist of Rumania. And it was a very interesting conversation, from which I came to the understanding that our notions about archives are completely different.

The idea in the West originates in sort of the enlightenment era notion of a social contract, and that we keep government records so that we can document rights, and

understand decisions of our government, and protect the rights of the people, and document entitlements, and things like that. In Rumania, and in most of the Soviet bought countries, the head of the national archives is a colonel in the secret police. We keep records so that the people can keep track of the government; in the East they keep records so that the government can keep track of the people. Nobody gets in to see the records. It was really quite an astonishing contrast. I'm sorry for the digression.

MS. GOULD: Well, it's not really, because when I was in Tallenn, Estonia what they sent me to do and what I actually ended up doing were two different things. And it was intense, an intense one week, but basically that's what we were doing. And I fell in love with Tallenn, Estonia. I'll go back to Estonia at the drop of a hat.

MR. MARTIN: If I may, I do have one other point that's very different from this in terms of cross-cultural communication. We're very interested in trying to find ways to encourage and foster and support library and museum programs that provide education to their communities about cultural understanding, if you will. And we're trying to figure out ways to particularly encourage museum/library collaboration in providing informal education opportunities.

And I've also talked with the public programs division of the National Network for the Humanities, which provides substantial small grants to libraries for various kinds of education programs. And we're trying to get -- see if we can't collaborate in a way that will take advantage of what I think is the very natural role of public libraries and museums to develop educational infrastructure that provide opportunities for people to learn about, for example, understanding Islam, what is Islam and how is the Taliban different from mainstream Islamic understanding. So

MS. GOULD: I think perhaps the only thing that we can do at this point in time would be to continue to work with you, to work with ALA, to support you any way we can in terms of letters. It already is a policy, cultural diplomacy is a policy of the State Department. And certainly we can weigh in on, as we already have, in working with the people from the State Department. So we are aware that there are some really good things going on.

However, I think it would behoove both Nancy and Nancy, two Nancys, to really promote this, because I think the vast number of libraries in the United States are really not aware of exactly what it is you're doing. And certainly if you have a report, you have a copy of the model, it's something we would like to see. And I certainly can use that when I talk to our contacts on the Hill saying, you know, this is something you're already doing and we support it and it should be expanded, along those lines.

MS. DAVENPORT: I can get those for you.

MS. CHALLINOR: But we're not thinking of making this a priority? I mean there are other prior --

MS. GOULD: No.

MS. CHALLINOR: Okay.

MS. GOULD: No, no. It's again one of --

MS. CHALLINOR: Just so I get our priorities straight.

MS. GOULD: -- these things that we will work with you and help you in any way, shape and manner we can.

All right. We are down now, running just a little bit late, next steps for us. And at this point, I think it is incumbent upon us to decide what our top three priorities are going to be and the order in which we will address them so that staff have an idea of where they're going from here.

MS. CHALLINOR: Are we in this also pub science, access to presidential material, U.S. Army Library?

MS. GOULD: Well, we discussed all of that yesterday. And yes, that's going to be part of what we're looking at.

MS. CHALLINOR: Okay. Because I want to weigh in on one of them.

MS. GOULD: All right.

MR. ROBINSON: Let her go, and then we can finish up.

MS. GOULD: Go with it. Go with it, Madam.

MS. CHALLINOR: All right. I want to talk about access to presidential material. And although I have the greatest respect for Nancy Davenport and would never, never say anything that I had not already cleared with Nancy Davenport --

MS. DAVENPORT: She's already told me.

MS. CHALLINOR: -- I would like to say for an organization that is swinging by its fingertips, and that George Bush is trying to protect his father, and that we would be in -- I, in my view, in enormous trouble to go and say that we think that the presidential papers ought to be open. I would say let us use that one as a priority later, later, later, and do nothing now that would bring us into the slightest difficulty with the White House.

MR. ROBINSON: Exactly what we decided yesterday.

MS. CHALLINOR: No, I was told not.

MS. GOULD: That's what we decided.

MS. CHALLINOR: Oh, I was told no, but that's all right.

MS. GOULD: That is --

MS. CHALLINOR: As the historian here, I would like to weigh in on that, because I hope, I have not noticed -- some of the historical profession has gone up to the Hill; Anna Nelson went up and a couple of others. But in no way has the historical profession weighed in on this as they should.

MR. MARTIN: We decided to pick our battles, and that was not --

MS. GOULD: And --

MS. GRIFFITHS: You mentioned yesterday that the archivists have weighed in (indiscernible).

MS. GOULD: So at this point, we really have three issues before us. One of course is the role of libraries in emergency preparedness and disaster recovery, and then we have our two hearings that we have to complete and begin work on the policy recommendations that we can bring to congress when they start working on next year's whatever. So --

MS. DAVENPORT: And by those you're -- you mean specifically disability and school libraries?

MS. GOULD: That is correct.

MS. DAVENPORT: And that -- the other one that came up yesterday that would be both time and money is the Prague conference; right?

MS. GOULD: That is correct.

MS. RUSSELL: Right. And the LSTA and the libraries will (indiscernible) McClure policy study (indiscernible) this morning also.

MR. MARTIN: One, two, three, four, five. I see six issues.

MALE VOICE: And the government assessment.

FEMALE VOICE: Government assessment.

MS. RUSSELL: And the follow-up on the government -- continued follow-up beyond what happens in terms of the emergency preparedness, other follow-up on the government --

MR. WILLARD: Right.

MS. CHALLINOR: Would you like to be specific about that? What does that mean, follow-up on government assessment?

MR. WILLARD: We invested a lot of energy in the "Woody" project that is at this point a series of recommendations to congress, somewhat linked to their concern about e-government. We have filed comments on e- government. Right now nothing is happening in that area, but it will.

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, sure. I mean that was a major priority and -- but it's in limbo; right?

MR. WILLARD: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, we have not gone up there and aggressively pursued the recommendations because they're so distracted by other things, but those recommendations remain to be communicated and something.

MR. ROBINSON: Can I make a resolution that the first priority of the Commission should be the role of libraries in emergency preparedness and disaster recovery, or whatever we're now calling it.

MR. WILLARD: Parliamentarily, it probably would not be good to make resolutions on any single one, but to have discussion first.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

MS. HOLAHAN: I'm not hearing Bob all of a sudden.

MR. ROBINSON: That's because he's not talking in the microphone.

MS. HOLAHAN: Oh, Bob.

MR. ROBINSON: It was an aside to --

MS. GOULD: What Bob was saying, and I concur, is I think we have to sort of do a single resolution --

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

MS. GOULD: -- that will lay everything out neatly and not address it one by one, so that we have something to say to the staff. You will do this, and when we're through with this you will do that, or the staff may be able to allocate their own resources as to how they will handle each one of the priorities.

MS. HOLAHAN: (Indiscernible) are many votes on the priority order before you put the big resolution together.

MS. MASON: I want to be --

MS. HOLAHAN: So maybe Bob's thing's in order.

MS. MASON: I want to be sure I have the same six that everybody else has.

MS. GOULD: We have --

MS. CHALLINOR: Could we hear them again?

MR. WILLARD: Well, this is what I've written down. The disaster area, disabilities, school libraries, informational literacy conference, that's Prague; NCES, the continuing support of our statistical activities with education.

MS. CHALLINOR: I didn't hear that.

MR. WILLARD: NCES.

MS. GOULD: National --

MR. WILLARD: For statistics.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yeah, okay.

MS. GOULD: Yeah, statistics.

MR. WILLARD: Denise's program.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, that's, you know --

MR. WILLARD: And government assessment -- I mean assessment of government information.

MS. RUSSELL: And LSTA. And our own funding. We might want to keep out of the way.

MR. ROBINSON: Well --

MR. WILLARD: I think there's -- it's --

MR. ROBINSON: That's a given, because if you don't do it --

MS. GOULD: Well, I think that --

MS. RUSSELL: 1-A and 1-B are --

MS. GOULD: I think the given is NCES, because we have the contract with the National Center and they do fund that. And certainly our own existence is a given.

But what we are looking at in terms of activities for the Commission basically lies in the area of what we wish to pursue in terms of emergency and disaster preparedness. We have the two proceedings, disabilities and school libraries, that we have to move ahead on. We can't do much on the Internet study until we get something back from Bertot and McClure, and at that time it'll go out for us -- for the commissioners to look at. And we have started some work on the informational literacy conference, and I think where that's going to go is going to depend on what happens with our request for funding.

But in terms of immediate activities, the three basics in my opinion, and I'm only the chair, emergency disaster, school libraries, disabilities. I mean I'm just listing them, I'm not saying -- it's up to the Commission as to how we want to prioritize those. The re-authorization of LSTA again is a given. We will continue to work with the Washington office and with IMLS on this issue.

MR. WILLARD: Now there's --

MS. GOULD: Bob and then Marilyn.

MR. WILLARD: There's an old rule for litigators that you never ask a question of a witness without having a pretty good idea what the answer is. And I'm going to suggest something that I have no idea, one, if it'll work, and two, if it's a good idea.

But first of all, we acknowledge that we're not just going to say "Okay. First priority, continue to work on that until you've done something and then you go to the second"; that there -- that we do things simultaneously and --

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MR. WILLARD: -- we have different resources that we focus on it. If we were to say that each -- let's stipulate that about 10 percent to 15 percent of our resources have to go to administration, just paying the rent -- in fact, actually that's not true, because we allocate rent to each of the areas. But just doing the budget stuff, all that, that leaves 85 percent of our time as an organization.

Could each of you take these N number of projects and say "Okay. If it were being run the way I want it run, I would put 25 percent into disaster, 30 percent into school libraries," whatever, so it adds up to 100 percent. And see -- then we'll do the averaging and see what happens.

MS. GOULD: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Marilyn, Bob, Robbie.

MS. MASON: Well, I guess I see this differently, because when I look at this group of activities it's not clear to me why we can't do them all. It seems to me that there are different staff that are involved with different ones of these and there is a certain amount - they really compliment each other in some important way. So I'm not really comfortable, as we come down to it after all the discussion yesterday, I'm not really comfortable -- and this is the advantage of seeing them all at one time -- weighing them against each other.

It seems to me that we have an immediate need to do the emergency preparedness number that we've been talking about, and there's some staff that -- who will work on that. Seems to me that the Internet study, the follow-up on the Bertot and McClure, I really want to see that done, but it seems to me like something that follows onto our whole statistical project and fits in with what Denise does and can go on its own track. The information literacy conference, we're already committed to that. We can't very well pull out at this point and say we were just kidding, folks. I mean we're kind of there.

So it seems to me as I look at it, I mean LSTA, we're not real active at this stage. I think that we may become active as we are with the ESEA at the appropriate point, but it's not really appropriate for us to be specifically involved at this moment except for monitoring.

The follow-up on government assessment, again, that's kind of more or less passive activity in the sense that you're following up, but it's not tremendously staff intensive, at least as I understand it at this point. That really leaves kind of the school and the disabilities, and I guess you need to tell us, I mean is this an agenda that, taken together, is manageable?

MS. GOULD: Okay. Before that, Bob and then Robbie. And I'm going to say something and then I'll give it back to staff.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I tend to agree with Marilyn. I think it depends in part on whether you, you know, the appropriation is a million or 1.5 million. But given a 1.5 million appropriation for the coming year, if we, you know, want to make that planning assumption for now, I don't see why you couldn't, at least on a minimal level, address all of these.

What you end up though making decisions about is okay, with school libraries, are you just going to publish the report and leave it at that or are we going to pursue it beyond that? With the disability thing, are we just going to publish the report or are we going to develop the program that was outlined to us yesterday? And I guess that ends up make -- being a decision we really can't make yet until we know the resources that we will have for the remainder of the year.

But I do agree that even with a million dollar appropriation, something could be done on all of these, to wrap up the things that are in process, to follow-up the things that need

following up, and to do the one or two new things that everybody wants to do. And if we get 1.5 million, I think you can probably do it all, at least at a minimal level.

MS. GOULD: Robbie.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, that's what I had. I'm looking now at yesterday's 2001 major projects and how the pie was carved up, and now how the pie is going to be carved up, but the question goes back to what Bob says. Making the assumption of a \$1.45 million budget, how much of this, disregarding the whole statistics thing which I don't consider discretionary, but of the other parts of this, how much of this pie or how much of this money is available for these projects?

That's -- I mean yesterday I heard a figure like well, we're going to put in \$35,000 for the international thing. (Indiscernible). And then yesterday the other idea was well, we'll put in about 35,000 for the emergency planning thing. And I'm just wondering, does all these \$35,000 equal the \$300,000 we have available? That's --

MS. GOULD: Yeah. Joan.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes. I'd like to say that during my tenure on this -- on NCLIS it has been my experience that we take on too much and we don't do enough, and that that's why one day we started a template. You remember, we never used to even have a template. We just started things and everything.

I would be much happier to start less and do more. And then towards the end, when something is going, like the sister libraries is being finished, then go to something else. But I think historically we have taken too much on our plate; and I'm worried about the preparedness, the disabilities and the school libraries all going at the same time, as we have the information literacy conference, the Prague conference. Those are four big things to take up staff time. And I don't think once we say what it is, if we set the priorities, we have no control over how those priorities are done within the office.

MS. GOULD: Nor -- at this point, we have identified a number of issues. Some are ongoing and one is, I think, very much prevalent, and that's the emergency and disaster preparedness. What I would like to suggest is that we don't have resolution or set priorities, but that we direct staff to look at what's on our plate and to come back with us with a reasonable approach of what it is they can do based on whatever money it is we have in this forthcoming budget, because indeed they are the ones that have to do the work. We have pinpointed the areas that we need to work on. Some, as I said, are ongoing; others are windup and one is -- two are pretty much brand new. So I would like to suggest that the Commission concur; that we direct staff, once we know what our budget is, to come back to us with a realistic work plan for the next federal fiscal year.

FEMALE VOICE: I concur. I concur.

MS. CHALLINOR: Taking on those things which we --

MS. GOULD: Correct.

FEMALE VOICE: Yeah.

MS. GOULD: Do -- is it a consensus then that --

FEMALE VOICE: Yeah.

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. CHALLINOR: And how do they come back to us? When do they --

MS. GOULD: When we know what kind of money we have.

MS. CHALLINOR: Next week, next week.

MS. GOULD: Hopefully.

MR. WILLARD: The analysis --

MS. HOLAHAN: (Indiscernible).

MS. GOULD: Whoops. Yes, Paulette.

MS. CHALLINOR: Paulette.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, I was wondering since it's for the staff, if they -- are they going to do this sort of in -- without any direction as to what we consider to be the most important thing? Because they can figure out what - - how much time any -- everything will take to go to fruition and how much money it will take. I guess, and then they come back with that and then we decide on the priority; is that it?

MR. WILLARD: Yeah.

MS. HOLAHAN: Okay.

MS. GOULD: Pretty much so.

MS. HOLAHAN: I answered my own question, I'm sorry.

MR. WILLARD: No, it was a good question, Paulette.

MR. MARTIN: And you answered it very well.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, if you want a good question and a good answer, talk to yourself.

MR. WILLARD: I've been doing that for years.

MS. CHALLINOR: Will we have this much of a commission when this happens?

MS. GOULD: Who knows. But remember that the executive committee has now been empowered to make decisions in the absence of a quorum.

MS. CHALLINOR: In the presence of all these wonderful people, I feel less empowered.

MS. GOULD: I don't know, I feel more empowered. I think that this is the only realistic approach.

MR. WILLARD: I did a rough cut on my sense of the priorities just listening to the conversation. And as usual, it came up to about 110 percent, so that's --

MS. MASON: That seems right.

MS. GOULD: Yeah. Okay.

MR. WILLARD: I should remind you that examining our activities programmatically like that pie chart did is new, new analysis for us. We've been following the federal budget which says "Okay. How much are you paying on rent, how much are you paying on" -- but this is really the way it should be done. And we will map out the activities that you've all discussed and assign our estimates to it, which we -- there'll be some formula application, but there will be some -- we'll -- Judy and I will look at the number of staff hours that are available in a year and say, "Okay. We want Woody to be working on this for" --

MR. ROBINSON: Or consultant hours or whatever.

MR. WILLARD: Yeah. And we consider that (indiscernible) say this is how much we will assign each project in terms of resources, cash resources to, you know, to get things like travel and publications and things like that, as well as staff resources. We can do that.

MS. GOULD: Now Bob told me this morning that we have received a notice from the OMB that we have to have our budget appeal in, I think it's on Monday. And --

MR. ROBINSON: What are we appealing?

MR. MARTIN: Is this the federal 2003?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MS. GOULD: Yeah.

MS. RUSSELL: We're appealing the -- yes, exactly. The budget process is that we submit, in ordinary times, a budget and say "We would like X." And then they come back and said, "We're going to give you X minus." It's almost always minus.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, right now they're giving us lots of money. So it's a --

MS. RUSSELL: Right. The issue this year was that in their view, we should not even submit a budget for 2003, because the guidance was whatever was projected in the 2002 budget and we were projecting zero. We had discussed it with OMB at the time and said once the budget passed and we knew what we were being provided for this year, we would submit a budget knowing that in submitting it we were in effect submitting it and appealing at the same time. However, we are going to be in a situation where we now need to appeal before we have submitted a budget and before we know for sure what our budget is this year. So we're just going to appeal.

MS. GOULD: If you remember, we authorized and agreed that we would put in for our budget what we did for this fiscal year. And I think that realistically we should send forth to OMB the same thing as our appeal and attach to it letters of support from John Brademas, from Frank Fahrenkoff (phonetic), the letter that I wrote to the President and our reply to the letter that we finally got back from when --

MALE VOICE: From the domestic policy hearing.

MS. GOULD: From the --

FEMALE VOICE: From the domestic policy hearing.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. This is sort of the height of bureaucracy monkey business, in which you get nothing and you have to appeal nothing, but you're really getting million and a half. And, you know, they're going to still put us at zero next year, or maybe they --

MS. HOLAHAN: Nobody said government was logical.

MR. WILLARD: The one thing --

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, of course it isn't.

MR. WILLARD: The one thing I don't want to see us do is spend a lot of resource repackaging to -- now I think there should be a cover letter that says "At the most recent Commission meeting, these issues were identified as the action that we want to work on in the future."

MS. GOULD: That's right.

MR. WILLARD: Because it just doesn't make sense to submit to them.

MR. ROBINSON: It's a big waste of our time, quite frankly.

MS. GOULD: And then we'll just do the same thing that we did for last year. And we'll get it in --

MR. ROBINSON: Bypass them and go to the Hill.

MS. GOULD: Well --

MR. WILLARD: And we know they're going to say no, or we think they're going to say no. I give it a 95 percent probability. But we also staked out clearly in our budget submission to congress last year our right, as an independent agency whose historical -- whose legislative history says we can -- we should submit to congress without clearance by any other agency, we can send our budget directly to them.

Now let me remind you, just so -- I think you know, but just to be absolutely sure. The budget that we submitted to congress last year was for 3 million. And that is what we will be sending to the White House now. They're going to say no to whatever we send, so we might as well be on record --

MR. ROBINSON: \$3.75 they're going to say no, so it doesn't make any difference.

MS. GOULD: So that --

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob, I'd like to return once more to what you are going to do for us to put these -- to say how much staff time all these can -- would you make a difference between what is given, what we have to do --

MS. GOULD: OH, yes.

MS. CHALLINOR: -- and what we could do? Because that's really big. I mean if we have to do the statistics and we have to do the government -- so I mean I'm not sure whether preparedness, disabilities, school libraries also includes going forward on the government assessment of information, the Woody thing. I'm not sure, are those the four? So if you can make a difference between what is given, what we have to do and what is truly --

MS. MASON: I think that's really --

MS. HOLAHAN: (Indiscernible) going forward is the question of degree too possibly. I don't know, but -- if the staff would know about that, but even that could be options in going forward.

MS. MASON: True. I --

MS. GOULD: Marilyn.

MS. MASON: I really like what Joan has said in the sense that there's a level of effort discretion in some of these and not in others. For instance, in the NCES, there's kind of fixed level of effort. In the --

MS. RUSSELL: They contract with us and they're paying us money --

MS. MASON: That's right.

MS. RUSSELL: -- service and we're committed.

MS. MASON: That's right. In the area of schools or disabilities, it strikes me that there are various levels of effort that we could put forward to satisfy our obligations in -- to complete those things that we started out. So I really like that approach, because that may be the difference between a million and 1.5 million actually. Well, okay, never mind.

MS. RUSSELL: If we get a million we're doing some serious cutting.

MS. MASON: Well, I think --

MS. GOULD: Yeah.

MS. RUSSELL: Our staffing is about 900,000, our rent's 144,000. That's not paying for the communications and the -- you know, so if we end up with a million, we're going to be --

MS. MASON: Well --

MS. RUSSELL: -- scaling back.

MS. MASON: -- it would have to be a diminished level of effort under any circumstance, but --

MS. CHALLINOR: We'll have to get together again.

MS. GOULD: Well, actually it's interesting, because at one point when we were in discussion about the Commission with Nevada Senator Harry Reed -- and he's very interested in the work that the Commission's doing. He thinks that we serve a very important role. He just looked at me and he said, "You know, I can always put in a bill or an amendment to something else." So we do have other avenues that we can pursue once we know what our appropriation is. Supplemental appropriations are not unknown in government.

MS. CHALLINOR: Bob would like to say something.

MS. GOULD: I know.

MR. MARTIN: I just want to ask a question. One of the things that I'm a little bit confused about is the pie chart figures added up to 1.9 something. I assume that that's the NCES --

MS. RUSSELL: And the State Department money.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, okay.

MS. RUSSELL: So it's money from all sources, because --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: -- activities.

MR. MARTIN: No, I understand, yeah. But the contract with -- for NCES is close to what is it, about 400,000?

MR. WILLARD: No, 190,000.

MR. MARTIN: Oh, is that it?

MS. RUSSELL: Last year it was, I want to say 325.

MR. MARTIN: Well, the --

MS. RUSSELL: It was 325. But some --

MR. WILLARD: But we had the big --

MS. RUSSELL: Right. But some of that was specifically allocated for us to subcontract for a geo coating contract. So we will probably get less from them this year --

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: -- but what we will get will still be the requirements that take Denise and Kim's time and that are --

MR. MARTIN: Well, the reason I was asking was to go back to if you -- your statement if you get a million you're going to have to cut a lot of stuff. But some -- there are additional resources --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- for specific things like --

MS. RUSSELL: For specific things like the (indiscernible), correct.

MR. MARTIN: December 13, 2001

MS. GOULD: When I talk about having the staff come back to us with a work plan, that's exactly what a work plan is. It's how we allocate our resources and the level of effort. And I think that this is something -- that's why we have an executive director and a deputy director. They are responsible for looking at what we have in the way of money, what we need, and the level of effort that will be given to the work that has to be done. That's a work plan.

MR. WILLARD: And I think we certainly benefit from hearing this conversation. I think we can factor it all in. We will produce a plan that shows the 1.5 million alone and then show what additional burden and opportunity we get from the NCES contract. The EXSEEKA (phonetic) money is mostly just a transfer, but we'll show that. It does require some level of effort in terms of staff time.

MS. GRIFFITHS: It would be helpful as well to identify where there are options available to us.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. GRIFFITHS: And they may not be immediately available to us, but certainly towards the end of the fiscal year we may be into saying do we want to shift some of the effort to here or there, and how that might play out.

MR. WILLARD: Since the bulk of the resource we expend is people, the shifting resources just means working on project A instead of project B.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Exactly.

MR. WILLARD: But we can identify that.

MS. GOULD: Yeah. All right. What about Commission meetings? Normally we try and have what, a minimum of four meetings a year?

Yes, Bob.

MR. MARTIN: I just wanted to toss in at the beginning of this discussion what we've been discussing about for a joint board meeting and the Museum Services board meetings for the coming year. And what it looked like to us would make the most sense would be to have the joint board meeting here in Washington in early to mid- June. That's tied to the national awards process as well.

What we're looking at is the Museum Services board meeting in connection with our web wise conference in early March and then in connection with one of the museum regional meetings in September, late September or early October. So having the joint board meeting here in Washington -- first of all, having it here makes the logistics considerably simpler.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: And secondly, having it in June would make some sense. Now the difficulty from your perspective is that that is -- bumps up against ALA. And I'm not sure how you like having a meeting here and then two weeks later a meeting in Atlanta at ALA, you know.

MR. WILLARD: You're talking about the first week in June?

MR. MARTIN: We haven't picked a specific date, but we're just talking about overall stretch, you know, spacing things out in the middle of --

MR. WILLARD: Anything later does begin to get -- not just ALA, but also SLA starts on the 8th. Not that we all go to SLA, but some would. So I would --

MS. GOULD: May I suggest --

MR. WILLARD: -- no problem with the first week of June.

MS. GOULD: -- that you -- that the two Bobs work together on the logistics of how we set up our joint meeting. You know, if ALA is going to be in Atlanta then, you know, we could come here just before ALA and then go directly to ALA. But it's a logistical thing that I think the two Bobs can work on.

MR. MARTIN: We can do that.

MS. HOLAHAN: Would it not be possible to meet earlier than ALA in Atlanta, right before?

MR. MARTIN: It would, but that negates the logistical simplicity of meeting here. But that's something certainly worth considering.

MS. GOULD: They'll look into it, but I like the idea --

MR. MARTIN: This will come up again this afternoon in the joint board meeting where we --

MS. GOULD: Good.

MR. WILLARD: The issue really for this topic to be on the agenda is given the fact that when congress goes out we are down to seven commissioners, should we even be thinking about scheduling meetings at all until we know what the composition --

MR. ROBINSON: Since we don't have a quorum, we couldn't have a meeting technically.

MR. WILLARD: Well, you could have a meeting as long as no one says --

MR. ROBINSON: (Indiscernible) informational meeting.

MR. WILLARD: Well, I think you can also take actions as long as no one suggests the absence of a quorum.

MR. MARTIN: That's what Robert's rules say.

MS. GOULD: And the executive committee can continue to meet. Again, we've already looked at -- now we do have ALA coming up. Where are we meeting?

(Voices Chorus New Orleans)

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MR. WILLARD: The -- but here -- the other side of the -- that coin is that this Commission could say we are here. We continue to see an important role for ourselves and business as usual, let us nail down a schedule for 2002 and put it on the calendar.

MS. RUSSELL: Always subject to change. I mean you can always cancel a meeting or reschedule.

MS. GRIFFITHS: It actually, from my perspective, it would be better to get them scheduled --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MS. GRIFFITHS: -- roughly so that we can reserve the time.

MS. GOULD: Then should we again direct Bob and Judy to work with Bob Martin on the joint meeting and come back with the proposed date so that we can block them in?

MR. WILLARD: Four?

MS. GOULD: Four. Now ALA is coming up. And as you all know, I made the decision -  
-

MS. RUSSELL: We've already had two. We've had October, now we've had December --

MR. WILLARD: No, we're talking about the calendar year.

MS. RUSSELL: We're talking four in the calendar -- the coming calendar year? Okay.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. RUSSELL: I'm sorry, (indiscernible). All right.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Remind me what I said about travel to ALA. One -- what is it, three days of expenses and --

MR. WILLARD: No. Only the chair and the executive director will attend, unless there is a compelling business reason for additional attendance.

MS. RUSSELL: Which, for instance, the task force meeting that Marilyn may be having would be an example of --

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Just a question. On the calendar that you've given us shows an ASIST (phonetic) meeting in New Orleans 15th through 18th; is that right?

MS. RUSSELL: That's what showed up on the calendar. (Indiscernible) files the calendar.

MR. MARTIN: Because that sounds like the ALISE (phonetic) meeting rather than the ASIST.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Is it just prior to ALA?

MR. MARTIN: Just prior to ALA.

MS. GRIFFITHS: Oh, it's probably ALISE.

MR. MARTIN: ALISE.

MS. HOLAHAN: Except for Joan, nobody's talking into a microphone.

MR. ROBINSON: That's because nobody knows anything. That's why.

MR. MARTIN: That is when the ALISE meeting is. Now whether it -- it may also be ASIST.

MS. GOULD: What I --

MS. MASON: It's ALISE.

MS. GOULD: It's ALISE? What I would like to suggest at this point is commissioners who wish to attend to put in writing why they need to be there, so that we can look at what we have left in our budget and what we can actually cover.

MS. RUSSELL: I think -- I was asked a question last night too, and I think we should clarify, because the issue comes up continuously about the status of the three commissioners who are recess appointments. Even if the appointment lapses and there is no re-appointment, we can still, for instance with Marilyn as chair of the task force, bring her on invitational travel. We would not --

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MS. RUSSELL: -- be able to pay salary, but we would be able to do invitational travel. So we do have -- we have the ability to invite anyone we want on invitational travel. We cannot be flexible about salary. We have no control over that once you're term expires, but we can do a consulting agreement if necessary. So we have some way to work around --

MS. GOULD: Now who -- I mean I will be there pretty much for the entire week, because I'll be sitting in on some other meetings. You're going to be there.

MS. GRIFFITHS: I'll be there Thursday through Monday. But I think since I'm there, one of the things I have to do, official university business, is committee on accreditation. Certainly the travel, probably most of my accommodations will be covered, so --

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes, and I have some things to re- work out. I'll put it in writing.

MS. GOULD: Okay, good.

MS. HOLAHAN: Well, I'll be there.

MS. GOULD: Yeah.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, but we're not going to pay your bus fare. That's --

MS. GOULD: And, Bob, you'll of course be --

MR. MARTIN: Oh, yeah. I'll be there.

MS. GOULD: But you'll be going as --

MR. MARTIN: Oh, for IMLS, yeah.

MS. GOULD: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: It's not a -- you can't pay my way anyway.

MS. HOLAHAN: What's the dates of ALA?

MS. GOULD: 17th of January through the 22nd.

MS. HOLAHAN: Okay. Are we -- we have anything that is going on for NCLIS there at that time? Do we have any dates of what we're going to do (indiscernible)?

MS. RUSSELL: Task force may be trying to schedule - -

MS. CHALLINOR: Can you get us that?

MR. WILLARD: We don't have anything scheduled except for the task force --

MS. GOULD: The task force.

MR. WILLARD: -- which is unscheduled, but planned.

MS. HOLAHAN: So we no longer, since we don't have sisters, we're not going to have any social event at all?

MS. GOULD: No.

MR. MARTIN: Well, you could have something at your house.

MS. RUSSELL: We'll all come.

MS. GOULD: Yeah, we'll all come. No --

MR. ROBINSON: Maybe some gumbo.

MS. GOULD: Oh, wow.

MS. HOLAHAN: There's a thought. Right now I still feel so under the weather, but that's a thought. I'll keep it in mind.

MS. CHALLINOR: Since you asked about sister libraries, I think it might be an appropriate time to ask the Commission to pass a resolution thanking Beth Bingham for her work on sister libraries. Believe me, she set it up, she worked tirelessly for what, two and a half years on sister libraries. And I think it would be good for the Commission to pass that, and I ask Martha to --

MS. HOLAHAN: Oh, I second that.

MS. GOULD: It has been moved by Joan Challinor and seconded by Paulette that we will draft -- we will prepare a resolution of appreciation to Beth -- Elizabeth Bingham for the work that she did on the sister libraries project.

MS. CHALLINOR: And the answer is yes?

MS. MASON: By acclimation, I think.

MS. GOULD: It has been moved by acclimation.

MS. CHALLINOR: And we got into the millennium final magazine.

FEMALE VOICE: Yes.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes, I brought it in.

MS. GOULD: And also when we talked with Mary, the two Marys --

MS. RUSSELL: Mary Boone and Mary Wells?

MS. GOULD: Yeah, from State Department. And they were thinking in terms of the outreach they want to do. We actually are going to provide to them the database from the sister library project, because that will be --

MS. CHALLINOR: It's very helpful.

MS. GOULD: I mean they were just delighted to hear about that. So that's just an aside.

Now we are down to commissioners' comments. Yes, Robbie.

MR. MARTIN: Well, since this is probably my swan song as a commissioner, I wanted to say that it's been a pleasure to be on the Commission. And I've learned a great deal in the one year that I've been on the Commission and it's been fun. I always take things somewhat with a grain of salt, but I've learned a great deal about libraries and library information and information science. And while I thought I knew a little bit about government, and it was mostly about the house of representatives, I didn't realize all the hanky-panky of the senate side, but that's -- but it's been fun. And I hope I can be kept abreast of what's going on on the Commission and perhaps do something in case there's a commission meeting on -- in Barnstable County, Massachusetts. But anyway, I just wanted to say that it's been a pleasure working with all of you, so --

MS. GOULD: And it's been a pleasure working with you.

Any other comments?

MS. HOLAHAN: Yes.

MS. GOULD: Paulette.

MS. HOLAHAN: It's probably my swan song as well. Which I hope may not be so, for Robbie and for Marilyn as well, but in case it is, I just want to say thank you. I have enjoyed it, as I enjoyed it for a time. I find that the Commission is always filled with interesting and intelligent and what's even more important, very dedicated people. And it was fun to reacquaint myself with some of you and to meet the new people that I did meet.

And I wish I would be on it longer because it takes a while to build up the background of what you have been doing so that you can bring a continuum to your own thoughts and perhaps whatever you may contribute to it. But I thank you for putting up with me and I thank you for putting up with the phone conference thing, because it really was not a possibility at this juncture.

MS. GOULD: Thank you, Paulette.

If there are no other comments at this point from the commissioners, I invite comments from our guests.

MR. DEERSTEIN: I'm Bruce Deerstein. I just want to thank you for letting me attend. This has been very interesting, very eye opening for me. and I look forward to the opportunity to coming back. So thank you very much.

MS. GOULD: We're glad that you came.

MS. BOLT: Nancy Bolt, representative of the Chief Officers State Library Agencies. I also appreciate being invited to your meetings and to your delightful dinner last night. I enjoyed that a lot.

COSLA remains anxious to continue to be a partner with NCLIS and continues to have a liaison, which this year will be me again. Just let me tell you just a couple of things about what COSLA is up to. Our -- we also talked about our priorities at our last meeting. And our number one overarching priority is to get LSTA preauthorized at increased funding, and Sandy Cooper chairs our legislation committee and is our point person on that.

We also continue to be very interested in access to government information. We were impressed with the report that NCLIS did, but didn't come to necessarily the same conclusions about how it might be dealt with. Gladys Henwells (phonetic) from Arizona is our point person on that. And we're pleased that you were interested in it, but I think I have some problems with the bill as it is written.

A third major priority is ERATE (phonetic), keeping it at the FCC, increasing the money and increasing the participation of libraries. I chair the ALA ERATE task force, so I'm the point person on that. We continue also to support Jack Reeves (phonetic), LSTA -- I'm sorry, ESEA proposal to fund school libraries. One of our major concerns in that area is that it will go to the Departments of Education. Where state libraries are part of Departments of Ed like I am in Colorado, that's not much of an issue. But where they're totally separate, there's a fear that the state library will be excluded from any contribution in how that money is spent.

We remain opposed to USEEDA (phonetic) and are very pleased to find that more and more people and other organizations are opposed to USEEDA as well, but we're monitoring that closely.

Outside of the legislation area, we are in the process of redesigning our web site to try and deal with more content issues. We know that a lot of state libraries are doing really exciting research and studies and reports, and they sort of get published in that state and then disappear. And so we'd like to be able to capture those so that when, for example, Florida does a study on the impact of public libraries on education, that doesn't just stay in Florida. That's the kind of thing that might be of interest nationally.

So we're going to try and get our members to remember to post those kinds of things on our web site, so you can look for that change. And we renewed our contract with our management service in Kentucky, so they'll continue to be our chief communication central place. And Keith Fields is still the president.

MS. BRADLEY: Lynn Bradley, American Library Association. I too want to thank you for including Mary and I into your meeting this week. There -- most of the things that we've been working on you have touched on in some fashion.

I would just like to very briefly expand a little bit, that a lot of the intellectual property arena is in flux right now. The legislative environment post 9/11 has affected a lot of these things in terms of preliminarily by delays in the dynamics, like on database and distance learning. But what we're seeing in the last couple of weeks is that while congress remains in town, there's bartering and add-ons and Christmas tree lights being added to any perceived moving object, whether it's an appropriations bill or what.

So, for example, Mr. Towzan on the bioterrorism legislation has a proposal to remove money from the ERATE funds for schools and libraries to designate it for health care providers to exchange bioterrorism information. The database legislation that Mr. Towzan -- the preferred, if you have to have some, he is now potentially giving up going to what we call the bad database bill in order to get his broadband legislation. We're also concerned about broadband, because that would not require universal fund contributions, which is on the long term a threat for ERATE relative to the broadband level of services.

Nancy touched on USEEDA. There's other litigation going on. And we'll be sharing information both at midwinter and you can go to our web site for other updates and more detail.

We talked about appropriations and LSTA. And of course the other main arenas are in government information. One related to the take-down issues, both in terms of the withdrawal of materials from the federal depository library program and removal of information from government web sites. We're still trying to analyze what the legal ramifications and whether what, you know, steps could be taken to at least protest if not change this. I think this is where we have some issues or some commonality with the archives community and others too.

Related to the Presidential Records Act, you probably saw in the paper Republic Citizen and others did file on that. ALA and some of the other usual suspects were not part of that lawsuit, not by our choice actually, but we expect to be following that; and as it moves forward, if and when there is an appeal, we presume that our association, as we have been in similar cases, be very much involved.

And then in terms of interpretation of the U.S.A. Patriot Act, we're convening a group of both legal, technical and library directors to help us assess or develop a set of guidelines for both library directors, higher education, and others who may be approached under provisions of the Patriot Act in terms of getting information about library patrons and their usage. That's a very complex kind of thing. And actually it may turn out that there's not that much difference in practice, it's just knowing where your lawyers are and so forth about what to do. So that's the other thing in the hopper that's taking on a great many of our resources in the Washington office.

And if you have other questions, be glad to answer them.

MS. GOULD: I would assume that we will continue to work closely with both COSLA and the Washington office monitoring what you're doing and how it impacts the work of the National Commission. I think we're all in the same boat at this point in time, and --

MS. CHALLINOR: It's a good suggestion.

MS. GOULD: -- it's not necessarily a leaky boat, but I don't know how many oars we have to row. So we just --

MS. BRADLEY: Well, and some -- you might want to save your oar for some -- you didn't ask my two cents, but there's some oars you might want to save for another part of the race, especially on the patriot act, because it's becoming very controversial.

MS. GOULD: I know.

MS. BRADLEY: And we're getting -- actually we're getting a lot of hate mail and phone calls related, just this week, to apparently Reilly, you know, the Reilly show, or O'Reilly, whatever --

MR. ROBINSON: Reilly Factor.

MS. BAILEY: Reilly Factor, thank you, Robbie. And - -

MS. GOULD: What is the Reilly Factor?

MR. ROBINSON: It's a scumbag program on Fox cable.

MS. GOULD: Oh.

MS. CHALLINOR: What does it have to do with --

MS. GOULD: I don't get it.

MR. ROBINSON: Oh, because he takes off on issues like this and gets everybody all uptight a little, but sort of a television Rush Limbaugh kind of thing.

MS. MASON: What specifically was said?

MS. BAILEY: Apparently he had a show on, I think it was Monday, bringing up the issue about the librarian in Florida who contacted the FBI and shared information with the FBI about terrorists that she'd observed coming to use that library branch. And he was really trying to get other librarians to really criticize her following a news report that had been in at least the Florida papers and elsewhere. I know the clip I saw was from a Florida paper. And, you know, how you deal with the many library policies respecting the confidentiality of patron records and library usage with the demands of the patriot act and the different circumstances we're under. It's an interesting debate, if nothing else.

MS. BOLT: A critical debate.

MS. BAILEY: A very critical debate, and one we can't avoid. I think it's going to be a much more difficult debate than filtering and some of these other things that are --

MS. GOULD: I agree.

MS. CHALLINOR: And every day it begins to look more and more like a pretzel. There are twists and turns and - - as --

MS. BAILEY: And some salt on it too.

MS. GOULD: Well, we will continue --

MR. ROBINSON: And a wound, I think. There's the sale --

MS. GOULD: We will continue, I think, a good close working relationship with the Washington office, with COSLA. And I have enjoyed the last sort of year and a half that I've been the chair. It has been a challenge for me because I'm following in the footsteps of a most extraordinary woman and I feel very strongly that we are continuing to address the issues that were very important to Jean Simon (phonetic) when she was the chair. And I have great hopes for the future and I appreciate the incredible support that I've received as chair from my fellow commissioners and from what I consider to be an extraordinary staff.

MS. CHALLINOR: Yes. I think we should also point out that the staff has been under extraordinary tension during this last year from March. I wonder every day that you people keep the calm that you do and I want to say how extraordinary I think it is, how much I appreciate it. And I'm sure that I speak for the whole Commission.

MR. WILLARD: For the staff, thank you.

MS. CHALLINOR: Oh, not at all. Yeah, absolutely.

MR. ROBINSON: You can authorize a stress massage.

MS. GOULD: It is a few minutes after 12. We are to adjourn. Do you have any comments before --

MR. WILLARD: (Indiscernible).

MS. GOULD: All right. Then unless there's any other business before us, we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:01 p.m. the meeting adjourned)