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HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1989

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, AND THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,

Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Pat Williams [chairman] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Williams, Hayes, Owens, Pos- shard, Goodling and Gunderson. Senators Pell, Simon, Kassebaum and Cochran.

Staff present: Richard Jerue, Patricia Sullivan, Alexander Crary, Michael Lance, Colleen Thompson, and Merry Richter.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Good morning. I am pleased to convene this joint hearing on the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act. I welcome my colleagues from the Senate and the House who have joined us here to discuss an issue that is dear to all of us; that is, support for our public libraries.

It is appropriate that we convene this hearing this morning, because today we are celebrating Library Awareness Day. Hundreds of library supporters have traveled from all across the nation to visit with their representatives about the importance of libraries in the United States.

LSCA was the first, and continues to be the largest, federal program of assistance specifically for public libraries. The Act is designed to assist libraries in extending and improving service, to provide some support for library construction and renovation, to promote sharing of resources among libraries and to improve services to native Americans, and finally to support literacy efforts.

A few weeks ago the House began the important process of rewriting the Library Services and Construction Act with our first hearing at a county library in Kalispell, Montana.

At that hearing we heard from some strong supporters of LSCA, and while they offered some suggestions as to how this program could be improved, no one recommended that we eliminate the existing programs and begin from scratch in rewriting the Act.

We will hear this morning from a wide variety of witnesses, including representatives from the Department of Education, librarians, trustees and citizens. Perhaps you all have a little different
perspective on these programs, and we look forward to learning from you more about LSCA and its importance in supporting your home state libraries.

Our work this morning will take us further down the path of re-authorizing the Library Services and Construction Act. We welcome your comments or suggestions as to how this Act might be modified to better serve your needs and the needs of those you serve, or, if it is the case that this program works just as well as it could possibly work and you prefer that we leave it alone, you need to tell us that, too.

The Library Services and Construction Act has many friends in the Senate and in the House. It is my hope that this reauthorization process will only strengthen that friendship, as well as develop a better understanding of just how successful the LSCA programs have been in creating a very strong system of public libraries in this country.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Pat Williams follows:]
Statement of Rep. Pat Williams
Before the Joint House-Senate Hearing by
the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and the
Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities on
the Reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act
April 11, 1989

I am pleased to convene this joint hearing on the
reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act and
I welcome my colleagues from the Senate who have joined us to
discuss an issue that is dear to us all; that is support for our
public libraries. It is appropriate that we convene this hearing
this morning as today we are celebrating "Library Awareness
Day". Hundreds of library supporters have traveled from all
around the country to visit with their Representatives about the
importance of libraries in this nation.

LSCA was the first, and continues to be the largest, Federal
program of assistance specifically for public libraries. The Act
is designed to assist libraries in extending and improving
services, to provide some support for library construction and
renovation, to promote sharing of resources among libraries, to
improve services to Native Americans and to support library
literacy programs.

A few weeks ago, the House began the important process of
re-writing the Library Services and Construction Act with a hearing at the Flathead County Library in Kalispell, Mt. At that hearing, we heard from some strong supporters of LSCA. And while they offered some suggestions as to how this program might be improved, no one recommended that we eliminate the existing programs and begin from scratch in rewriting this Act.

We will hear this morning from a wide variety of witnesses, including representatives from the Department of Education, librarians, trustees, and citizens ...you all have a little different perspective on these programs and we look forward to learning from you more about LSCA and its importance in supporting your home state libraries.

Our work this morning will take us further down the path of reauthorizing the Library Services and Construction Act. We welcome your comments or suggestions as to how this Act might be modified to better serve your needs. Or, if it is the case that this program works quite well, and you would prefer that we left it as is, then we need to know that too!

The Library Services and Construction Act has many friends in the Congress. It is my hope that this reauthorization process will only strengthen that friendship as well as develop a better understanding of just how successful the LSCA programs have been in creating a very strong system of public libraries in this country.
Chairman WILLIAMS. We are honored this morning to have with us the Chairman of the Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee, the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over this Act in the United States Senate, Senator Pell.

Senator, we are delighted you are with us this morning and we are eager to hear from you.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to join forces with our colleagues on the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education today in this joint hearing continuing a tradition of really twenty years now, or twenty five years, when we have had these joint hearings on matters dealing with libraries and the arts and humanities.

I welcome all of our witnesses and thank them for joining us today to help us determine the future of the Library Services and Construction Act.

Special greetings go to Dale Thompson, the director of the fine public library in my own capital city of Providence, Rhode Island, and I should also say that this is a wonderful occasion because it is the first time that Senator Kassebaum has been with us as the Ranking Minority Member on the subcommittee. We are very happy she is on it.

The Library Services and Construction Act, which I have been proud to support throughout my time in the Senate, is the single most important source of federal funds for our public libraries.

This has been sustained by the Congress despite administration proposals over the last eight years to eliminate it entirely. It is my hope that the Bush administration will join with us in reaffirming a strong federal commitment to our nation’s libraries as we undertake this review and renewal of the LSCA.

The administration has just sent to the hill a proposal somewhat similar to the Library Improvement Act that was introduced last year. We haven’t had much time to review it, but there will be some questions for witnesses regarding the proposal.

The importance of libraries to an educated American citizenry is undeniable, and I am very concerned that the libraries of this country be kept strong, vital and growing. I look forward to the testimony of the witnesses today and am very pleased, as I said, to be participating in this joint hearing process, which can save a lot of time for the witnesses and I wish could be emulated by other subcommittees and committees, although it is only, I think, in our own subcommittees that it is being done with any regularity.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you, Senator.

Congressman Owens?

Mr. OWENS. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I see that we have a very long list of very knowledgeable witnesses and I would like to allow maximum time for those witnesses to participate today.

For that reason I will incorporate my opening statement into remarks which I will make tomorrow afternoon on the floor of the House in a special order on libraries.

I urge all of you, as you visit your senators and congressmen, to urge them to either submit a statement for that special order or to come to the floor tomorrow afternoon and participate in that special order on libraries and the kinds of problems that libraries are facing at this point, as we go forward to reauthorize the Library
Services and Construction Act, and also as we prepare for the next White House Conference on Libraries.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Owens. I want to remind our friends in the room, as well as the Senators, that we understand that, in all the history of the United States Congress, Major Owens is the first librarian to have been elected to serve in the House of Representatives. We are delighted to hear this.

[Applause.]

Senator Kassebaum?

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to extend a welcome to all of the librarians from across the country who are here, recognizing the importance of National Library Week and, of course, participating in the activities surrounding this legislation.

My claim to fame is that I have a niece who is a librarian in Minnesota who keeps me well versed on the importance of this legislation.

I would particularly like to welcome Ms. Jane Hatch of Dodge City, who will be testifying on a later panel.

In addition to serving as the librarian of the Dodge City Library, Jane is the librarian for the Southwest Kansas Library System. In that capacity I think she will be able to testify to the importance of the libraries to our rural communities and the outreach that is available. This is becoming increasingly important, and I recognize what library services can do in an innovative and creative way.

Libraries give communities a great gift, because they give people the opportunity to open their minds and their hearts to dreams and knowledge, two precious gifts we cannot live without.

Being an avid reader myself, I find it difficult to imagine life without books and libraries. I have always said that you will never be bored if you like to read, and I can think of no more important, exciting and challenging task than to work with young people in creating an interest in books which then really stays with them a lifetime.

So it is a particular pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to be able to be a small part of this hearing today. I would like to ask that my full statement be made a part of the record.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Without objection, the Senator’s statement and the statements of all of the other members of this panel will be included as part of the record.

[The prepared statements of Senator Nancy Landon Kassebaum and Senator Thad Cochran follow:]
Opening Statement
Senator Nancy Landon Kassebaum

Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
Joint Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Library Services
and Construction Act
Tuesday, April 11, 1989

I welcome the opportunity to participate in today's hearing on
the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act
(LSCA). It is appropriate that this hearing is being held during
National Library Week. I welcome the many librarians from across the
country who are here as part of the Capitol Hill activities scheduled
for today.

I would particularly like to welcome Ms. Jane Hatch from Dodge
City, Kansas, who will testify on one of the later panels. In
addition to serving as the librarian of the Dodge City Library, Jane
is the librarian for the Southwest Kansas Library System. This
library system serves a number of the most sparsely populated counties
in Western Kansas, and I think Jane's testimony will underscore the
important boost which the LSCA has given to making library services
available in rural America. I can't tell you how pleased I am to have
you here today.

Libraries give communities a great gift because they give people
the opportunity to open their minds and their hearts to dreams and
knowledge--two precious gifts we cannot live without. J. M. Clark
once observed that "knowledge is the only instrument of production
that is not subject to diminishing returns."

Being an avid reader, I find it difficult to imagine a life
without books and libraries. The initial purpose of LSCA was to give
everyone the opportunity to open their minds with books. It created a
public fund which would help communities establish free, public
libraries. I believe we can all agree that we have accomplished that
goal. The Department of Education has estimated that 96 percent of
the population of our country has access to public library services.

I also believe that, for the most part, LSCA is operating well.
The focus of the Act as it stands today is to encourage innovation and
to reach out to groups such as the disadvantaged, elderly, and
handicapped--who might not otherwise be able to enjoy the treasures to
be found on library shelves. As Thomas Carlyle so wisely noted, "All
that mankind has done, thought, gained or been: it is lying as in
magic preservation in the pages of books."

The testimony to be presented today will be extremely helpful in
measuring our progress towards meeting the objectives of the LSCA. I
look forward to hearing from our witnesses.
Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate that we've chosen National Library Day for our hearing on the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act.

Since the LSCA was enacted in 1956, thousands of Mississippians have benefited from the federal assistance it has provided. In particular, Title 1 funds have allowed rural libraries to expand their services. Today, all library patrons in Mississippi have access to the resources of any public library in the state due to the funding of a book sharing network.

We are fighting illiteracy in our state. LSCA Title 1 funds provide assistance in this area also. In short, special populations are given the chance to receive the numerous benefits our public libraries can provide.

I'm pleased to welcome Mr. Earl Beck to our panel today. Besides serving as the President of the Sunburst Bank in Grenada, Mississippi, Mr. Beck is the Chairman of the Mississippi Library Board of Commissioners and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Elizabeth Jones Library in Grenada. Through his able leadership, the Grenada library's physical facility has expanded as well as its book volume. He knows how to put federal dollars to good use. I appreciate his willingness to testify today, and I look forward to working with him and all of the witnesses whose testimony will help us in our efforts this year.
Chairman Williams. Senator Kassebaum, you are very kind to be with us over here in the House today and we appreciate your attendance here.

Mr. Poshard?

Mr. PosHARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say that, having been a school teacher and a school administrator for fourteen years of my life and living within two blocks of two large libraries, it is a great honor for me to serve on this committee and to consider this piece of legislation.

The other honor which I have this morning is that this is the first time that I have been able to serve on a combined congressional committee with my United States senator, Senator Paul Simon. I am grateful for that.

Chairman Williams. Senator Simon, we want to welcome you back to this room and to this committee table, where you spent such a long and really glorious career before moving over to the Senate. Paul, it is always nice to see you and we are delighted you are with us this morning.

Senator Simon. I thank you very much. I am not used to sitting on this side of the table, but it is great to be here. Glenn Poshard is my congressman and I am very pleased to have him here and to have him be on this committee.

Let me join my colleague, Senator Pell, in welcoming Senator Kassebaum as the Ranking Member of this subcommittee. She is going to be a real asset to the subcommittee and to the nation.

I regret that I am going to have to leave immediately to preside over a subcommittee hearing over in the Senate, but one of the witnesses here is Sam Morrison, the Chief Librarian of the Chicago Public Library, and I am very pleased to have him here. I am lobbying my colleagues here as much as anything—I hope that in the process of reauthorization we keep two features in the Library Services and Construction Act that I think are very important.

One is foreign language materials acquisition part. Acquiring some of these foreign language journals is a very expensive proposition and, while every library doesn’t have them, it is important that we provide some assistance. The second is something that I also was able to get into the bill five years ago that I really think is important, and that is the literacy section.

Libraries are doing very important work in the whole literacy field and I think we ought to be encouraging that. The reality is that if you don’t know how to read and write you are not going to walk into an elementary school, or you are not going to walk into a high school. You are embarrassed by the fact that you can’t read and write. There is no social stigma in walking into a library. In fact, it is something you can be proud of and that is very important.

Finally, I would just add my appreciation for what all of you are doing. Fifty-seven percent of the adults in this country at some point during the course of a year go into a library for a book. I would like to get that figure higher, but the very fact that it is this high says something.

Speaking from my own experience, I remember reading William Alan White’s autobiography from your state, Senator Kassebaum. William Alan White in his autobiography said, ‘I got more out of
the University of Kansas' library than out of the University of Kansas classroom."

I read that and I thought that really was true for me. In my case it probably doesn't indicate very much for either the classroom or the library, but to know how libraries can stimulate people and open vistas is just awfully, awfully important for this nation.

I appreciate the witnesses being here and am pleased we have the opportunity for this joint hearing. I hope we move ahead and continue to do the job that is needed for this country and do it even better. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator Paul Simon follows:]
I am pleased to join my colleagues from the House and Senate and this group of impressive witnesses to discuss the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). I would specifically like to recognize Sam Morrison, who has been gracious enough to come at last minute notice in place of Jim Compton, President of the Board of the Chicago Public Library. I am sorry that Mr. Compton is unable to join us today, but, Mr. Morrison is certainly more than qualified to speak in his place.

Sam Morrison is the Deputy Commissioner and Chief Librarian of the Chicago Public Library. He has a long history and expertise in professional library management. The Chicago Public Library System is very fortunate to be under his guidance and leadership. I want to thank him and all of our witnesses for taking the time to share their expertise and views in the Library Services and Construction Act.

I have always been supportive of the goals and services provided by LSCA. In my own state of Illinois, LSCA funds have contributed greatly to the development and growth of library
systems and the expansion of library services. In FY 1988 more than 75 projects were funded and approximately $4 million in LSCA funds were used to promote library development in Illinois. Projects like the "Lift Up Your Hearts, Open your Doors" program to enhance a state-wide public awareness program and improve library access and collection for people with disabilities, and the program at the Atwood-Hammond Public Library District to expand library services to rural areas have put LSCA funds to good work in Illinois. I know that projects like these are going on nation-wide due to funds made possible through LSCA.

57 percent of all adults, that is over 79 million men and women, are using this nation's public libraries each year. The services provided by these libraries not only enrich the communities they serve but provide educational tools and resources for citizens of all ages. Consider what Leo Tolstoy once wrote about libraries:

"Instead of going to Paris to attend lectures, go to the public library, and you won't come out for twenty years, if you really wish to learn."

Public libraries are fundamental institutions in our society. They are places to meditate and think. They are social centers, meeting places and resource centers. And they are, of course, a
quiet place to read. But how do our public libraries serve those who are unable to read?

Between 23-27 million adults are functionally illiterate in the United States today. The Library Service and Construction Act contributes to the fight against illiteracy through its Title VI program which authorizes grants for adult literacy programs in public libraries. An excellent literacy program in Illinois which was made possible through Title VI funds is the "Bond Out or Book Out" program conducted in the Darrow Branch of the Cook County Library System. The Darrow Branch is located in the heart of the Cook County Jail Complex. An estimated 60 percent of the inmates are functionally illiterate. The program recognizes the link between illiteracy and crime and has developed several innovative programs to assist inmates in learning to read. In the words of one inmate, "Although you're locked up/and you may be facing time/This is no reason/to incarcerate the mind."

The "Bond Out or Book Out" program is a model literacy program, but this type of program is few and far between. Public and private literacy programs are roughly estimated to serve only 19% of those in need. I believe we need to expand programs like Title VI to reach more of the population. I plan to introduce legislation that steps up our fight against illiteracy. My bill
would expand Title VI of the Library Services and Construction Act along with other federal literacy programs. This bill would also create a cabinet level coordinating council, an Office of Literacy in the Department of Education and a national research center for literacy to increase visibility, coordination and dissemination in order to promote literacy programs.

Promoting literacy is one of the many services provided under LSCA. As the largest federal program of assistance specifically to libraries, LSCA is essential to the vitality of our public library system. I am confident that all of us here today agree that this Nation's public libraries serve an important service to our communities. I hope that we also agree that the Library Services and Construction Act should be reauthorized at levels that reflect the important contributions public libraries make to our communities and this Nation as a whole.
Chairman Williams. Thank you, Senator Simon. I see we have our first witness at the table: Charles Kolb, Deputy Undersecretary for the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation at the Department of Education. Undersecretary Charles Kolb is accompanied by an assistant, Carol Cichowski and Anne Mathews, Director of Library Programs of the Office of Education, Research and Improvement in the Department of Education.

We are delighted to have each of you with us today. Mr. Kolb, why don't we begin with you, sir?

STATEMENT OF CHARLES KOLB, DEPUTY UNDERSECRETARY FOR THE OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGET AND EVALUATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Mr. Kolb. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank you and the other members of the committee for the opportunity to present this morning the Library Services and Construction Act of 1989, a legislative proposal designed to increase the impact of libraries on education and lifelong learning.

The basic purpose of the existing statute has been to expand library services so that every community could be served. Over the past thirty years this purpose has been substantially achieved.

Our new proposal emphasizes activities that are still needed, while discontinuing those that are well established and for which there is now little need for continued federal assistance.

It targets federal dollars on services for economically disadvantaged and handicapped people, resource sharing and research and assessment.

Disadvantaged individuals frequently do not use libraries to their maximum advantage. Our proposed legislation would facilitate greater use of libraries by these individuals through a state formula grant program.

Under the Title I program, providing services to disadvantaged individuals, states would choose local projects to be supported with grant funds. Examples of local projects that states might support are literacy training and English instruction in the local public library, after-school homework programs, summer reading programs, purchase of large print books and other special materials and equipment for use by handicapped individuals, information and referral centers, services to correctional institutions, nursing homes or hospitals and specialized training of library personnel to improve services for disadvantaged and handicapped individuals. Our proposal would also set aside funds for grants to Indian tribes for improving library services.

The second focus of our proposed legislation is resource sharing. Although interlibrary loans and networks have increased in recent years, the inclination is for a library to serve only its immediate clientele and not to loan its books and materials outside its service area.

In poor or remote communities a good network is likely the best means of providing full library services. For scholars, library networks facilitate access to rare or unique collections, thus providing a nationwide resource.
In order to promote increased access to library materials, our proposal would provide seed money for new or expansions of existing library resource-sharing networks.

Under the Title II resource sharing program, funds could be used for specialized training of library personnel to operate library networks, acquisition and maintenance of computer hardware, software and communications lines, purchase and/or restoration of materials to complete significant collections and support for other activities that lead to the sharing of books and other materials among libraries.

We are proposing both a state formula grant program and discretionary grants to support regional networking activities.

Finally, Title III of our proposed legislation would support research and assessment in the field of library and information science. Libraries are moving forward unevenly in utilizing new computer and communications technology. Carefully designed research on the impact of this technology on library services, followed by effective dissemination of research findings, could greatly improve one of our nation's primary educational resources, its libraries.

Studies are needed to learn more about users' needs and the effectiveness and efficiency of library services, to find ways to identify successful library programs that can be replicated or adapted by libraries throughout the country.

Both field-initiated research and evaluation would contribute to improved library services at all types of libraries.

This legislative proposal defines an important role for the federal government in support of our nation's libraries. The changes we propose would strengthen the total library community by improving services to currently underserved individuals, facilitating library networks and supporting assessment of library services.

Clearly, concentration of the federal dollar where it can do the most good is essential. We believe that the Library Service Improvement Act of 1989 most effectively targets the federal dollar and defines the federal role in support of library services.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We will be pleased to take whatever questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Charles E.M. Kolb follows:]
STATEMENT OF CHARLES E.M. KOLB
DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY
OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGET AND EVALUATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BEFORE THE
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
Thank you for the opportunity to present the "Library Services Improvement Act of 1989," a legislative proposal designed to increase the impact of libraries on education and lifelong learning. The basic purpose of the existing statute has been to expand library services so that every community could be served; over the past thirty years this purpose has been substantially achieved. Our new proposal emphasizes activities that are still needed while discontinuing those that are well established and for which there is now little need for continued Federal assistance. It targets Federal dollars on services for economically disadvantaged and handicapped people; resource sharing; and research and assessment.

Disadvantaged individuals frequently do not use libraries to their maximum advantage. Our proposed legislation would facilitate greater use of libraries by these individuals through a State formula grant program. Under the title I program providing services to disadvantaged individuals, States would choose local projects to be supported with grant funds. Examples of local projects that States might support are literacy training and English instruction in the local public library; after-school homework programs; summer reading programs; purchase of large-print books and other special materials and equipment for use by handicapped individuals; information and referral centers; services to correctional institutions, nursing homes, or hospitals; and specialized training of library personnel to
improve services for disadvantaged and handicapped individuals. Our proposal would also set aside funds for grants to Indian Tribes for improving library services.

The second focus of our proposed legislation is resource sharing. Although interlibrary loans and networks have increased in recent years, the inclination is for a library to serve only its immediate clientele and not to loan its books and materials outside its service area. In poor or remote communities, a good network is likely the best means of providing full library services. For scholars, library networks facilitate access to rare or unique collections, thus providing a nationwide resource.

In order to promote increased access to library materials, our proposal would provide "seed money" for new, or expansions of existing, library resource sharing networks. Under the title II resource sharing program, funds could be used for specialized training of library personnel to operate library networks; acquisition and maintenance of computer hardware, software, and communications lines; purchase and/or restoration of materials to complete significant collections; and support for other activities that lead to the sharing of books and other materials among libraries. We are proposing both a State formula grant program, and discretionary grants to support regional networking activities.
Finally, title III of our proposed legislation would support research and assessment in the field of library and information science. Libraries are moving forward unevenly in utilizing new computer and communications technology. Carefully designed research on the impact of this technology on library services, followed by effective dissemination of research findings, could greatly improve one of our Nation’s primary educational resources -- its libraries. Studies are needed to learn more about users' needs and the effectiveness and efficiency of library services; to find ways to identify successful library programs that can be replicated or adapted by libraries throughout the country. Both field-initiated research and evaluation would contribute to improved library services at all types of libraries.

This legislative proposal defines an important role for the Federal Government in support of our Nation's libraries. The changes we propose would strengthen the total library community by improving services to currently underserved individuals, facilitating library networks, and supporting assessment of library services.

Clearly, concentration of the Federal dollar where it can do the most good is essential. We believe that the Library Service Improvement Act of 1989 most effectively targets the Federal dollar and defines the Federal role in support of library services.
Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. Let's complete our panel first, and then I am sure that we will have questions.

Ms. Mathews, are you going to testify?

Ms. MATHEWS. I am here to answer questions.

Chairman WILLIAMS. All right, thank you. Mr. Kolb, LSCA has been praised for the leverage effect of the federal dollars. As you know, there is significant leveraging effect at the state and local levels that is occasioned by the federal dollars that are appropriated.

As I understand it, the Administration is proposing to eliminate the matching grant. Is that correct? If my understanding is correct, how do you square that against what this committee has continually been told is a very healthy leveraging effect of those few federal dollars that are appropriated to libraries?

Mr. KOLB. Yes, we would be eliminating the matching grant.

In answering your question, Mr. Chairman, let me go back to your point about leveraging, because I think we share a common goal here.

We are asking for an appropriation level in the amount of $137.2 million. What we are trying to do is to restructure the way that library services are provided with federal money. We think that the Administration's proposal recognizes the excellent work that has been done over the last twenty or thirty years in this area and takes into account some of the changes in the way libraries have expanded across the country and the way in which they are being used.

We think that targeting resources on the needy, the handicapped and disadvantaged and providing additional funds for resource sharing would help leverage that federal dollar in a way that is more reflective of the patterns of usage that we see today.

To give you an example, when the program was first authorized in 1956, the figures that we have indicate that about 56 percent of the people in the country had access to libraries. Now, access is just about universal. It is not 100 percent, but it is in the high nineties.

We think that has shifted the issue away from questions of increased access. We think access has been achieved. It is not perfect, but we think it is substantially present. We think that the best thing to do now, given that the federal dollar amounts to about four percent of the total spending on libraries in the country, is to carefully target that money.

We have done this in other education programs, for example in Chapter I. It has worked, I think, very successfully. We have taken the federal resources and look at where they will have the most impact in light of overall spending. That is what the administration is trying to do in this bill.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Senator Pell?

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, sir. Out of curiosity, Mr. Kolb, why didn't President Bush make the proposed Library Services Improvement Act part of his Education Excellence Act that he unveiled last week, because it really is one and the same package.

Mr. KOLB. I think you have hit upon an interesting point. You have indicated that there are some similarities. The package that was unveiled last week reflects a number of the issues that the
President raised during the campaign. If you look at those seven programs in the legislative package, all but one, I believe, focuses primarily on elementary and secondary education.

That isn't to say that there aren't similarities between what this legislation hopes to accomplish and what President Bush has outlined. Let me just point out the similarities.

Targeting funds to the needy— the President has made it clear that, of the four principles that have animated his concern and have resulted in that legislative package, one of them, and the most important is targeting aid to the needy.

He has also been talking about providing greater flexibility and choice. We think that you see flexibility here in this bill in terms of how states can use the money for a variety of activities.

His third principle, rewarding excellence and success, is also tied in with our call for accountability. We are asking for money to be spent on research and assessment, so that we can find out what is working, what are excellent approaches, what have been successful programs. We need to gather more information about how best we can target this money.

I don't think there is an inconsistency at all between this proposal and what came forth last week, but again I would point out that what you saw last week was a series of proposals focused primarily on elementary and secondary education.

Senator Pell. Thank you. I would like to ask Ms. Mathews, who is the main contact in the Department of Education with the library community, what has been the reaction of the state librarians, who consider you their first port of call in Washington, to the Administration's proposal?

Are they proposing to replace that with the Library Improvement Act? Have you had a reaction from the librarians?

Ms. Mathews. Senator, several of those librarians will be on the witness stand today, and you will be hearing from them more specifically, so I don't want to communicate their ideas.

There have been mixed reactions. I did have a state librarian visiting my office yesterday who appreciates the fact that there is a "seed money" concept in our proposed legislation. Then there is an accountability and evaluation component built in. If you want to try a proposed program, it can continue for only five years, but after two years the State will conduct an evaluation and look the program over very carefully and decide whether or not the federal funds should stay in for the whole five years. We also learn from things that aren't working well. If it is not working you may wish to discontinue that program and go on to something else.

So that aspect of it is more flexible than, perhaps, current legislation.

There is also an interest in the increased money for resource sharing, but you will be hearing more from state librarians during the rest of this morning.

Senator Pell. I would like to repeat my question. About how many librarians have contacted you and what is the rough proportion of those who were favorable and those who were unfavorable?

Ms. Mathews. I have probably heard from half of them, either by letter, telephone, or personal visits.

Senator Pell. Generally are they favorable or unfavorable?
Ms. MATHEWS. Many are quite satisfied with LSCA the way it is, but I can't give you exact numbers.

Senator PELL. Right, I appreciate that and I thank you. I don't mean to put you on the spot. Thank you very much indeed.

I would like to ask the chairman, is there a five-minute rule?

Chairman WILLIAMS. The Senator has additional time. Yes, we do have a five-minute rule, Senator.

Mr. Owens?

Mr. OWENS. I am not sure I have a question. I would like to join Senator Pell in regretting the fact that the president did not include libraries in his new initiatives, although those initiatives fall far short of anything significant to do very much about education in America, but the fact that libraries in America were not included shows that the advice that the president is getting is not certainly up to date in terms of what scholars are saying in the field of education.

If you want to help education in general, or certainly if you want to help promote education for the disadvantaged, the scholars in this field are taking a very close look at the non-classroom resources.

Libraries as a free-standing community resource are one of the things that they suggest should be given far more resources, because it is available to the whole family. It is available on a voluntary basis. It is the best way to get your money's worth in terms of serving a broad population. That certainly is not one of the institutions that we should leave out of any kind of new initiative for education in America.

So I hope that the president will be encouraged to rethink his approach. The kind of cautious almost non-movement forward that we have in this Library Improvement Act would be certainly jettisoned in favor of a more aggressive and more dynamic and imaginative approach to education in America.

We are in serious trouble in terms of the anti-intellectualism in the population as a whole and the fact that youngsters who are in the seventh grade are reading fewer books than youngsters in the fourth grade—it ought to tell us something about the way we approach education.

To cut off the free access of youngsters as well as their parents to libraries by not going forward to put more resources into public libraries, I think, is a way to undercut our own effort.

I hope that you will lead the way in giving the president better advice in terms of his education initiatives.

Mr. KOLB. Mr. Chairman, if I could respond to the comments from Mr. Owens.

I think that in fact what we have here is an aggressive and dynamic approach. It certainly is a departure from the status quo. We certainly hope that it will receive very serious consideration by the chairman and other members of the House and Senate.

I would point out that we are in agreement. More people need to read. We think that the more access to libraries that we have in this country, the better off we all will be.

I would point out that what we have tried to do is build upon the successes of the last thirty years in this area and look at where the money can have the most effect.
I would point out, in terms of access, that our proposal would increase by a factor of five the funds that would be available for disadvantaged and handicapped, and it would double the amount of money that is available for resource sharing.

So I think what you have is substantial creativity and responsiveness to what we think the needs are out in the country.

Mr. Owens. Mr. Kolb, you say you are doubling. Are you adding money or are you doubling by taking away from some other part of the Act?

Mr. Kolb. As I said, we are requesting $137.2 million, and with respect to the allocation of that money we are recommending changes in the way that money is spent.

Mr. Owens. So you are adding no new money?

Mr. Kolb. That is correct.

Mr. Owens. You are not doubling anything in terms of new money?

Mr. Kolb. That is correct. I didn't say it was new money, but what I said was that the way we have structured this program, under our proposal $91 million would be available under the Title I portion, and we think that would quintuple the amount of resources that are available to be targeted on the handicapped and the disadvantaged. We think that is a good thing.

Mr. Owens. My final comment would be that libraries have been starved for the last eight years and all services are suffering greatly.

When you serve the handicapped and disadvantaged, the first thing that is necessary is to make sure that the basic services are there.

If you are ever in Brooklyn on a Sunday afternoon, please visit the Brooklyn Public Library and you will find that the main branch, which is open on Sunday, is packed with people. They come from all over Brooklyn. The disadvantaged are there because they want the microfilm, the microfilm readers and the better collection and the first-rate services they get there.

So any area of improvement serves the disadvantaged and the handicapped. To starve any area in favor of increasing the areas for the disadvantaged and handicapped is not the best way to go. You are undercutting your own effort.

Chairman Williams. Thank you. Mr. Poshard?

Mr. Poshard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the panel.

Mr. Kolb, I represent a fairly large rural area in southern Illinois. We have a regional library system there, the Shawnee Library System, that networks their efforts throughout the entire area and they do a tremendous job serving our schools and municipal library systems.

I am interested in knowing how you see this seed money helping Shawnee or any other regional library system to better facilitate the networking that is necessary in the rural areas to do a good job in providing quality services?

The other question is whether the seed money is accessible for all library systems such as Shawnee, or is this going to be another model program, so to speak?
Mr. Kolb. Thank you very much for your question, Congressman. We think that if you look at what has been happening over the last several years, there has been a lot of federal assistance which has gone into rural parts of the country. The states have also been doing a substantial amount to increase access. What we are proposing in this bill would be a system whereby the states would have flexibility in terms of how they direct those resources. All libraries would be eligible. We are not talking about a demonstration project, but making money available to the states to direct it to areas where they believe they have the greatest needs.

Some states obviously are doing that now, not only with federal money but also with state money, but we think that rural areas in the country would benefit substantially because, again, states would be freed up and have flexibility to target this money where they believe they have the greatest need.

Mr. PosHARD. I am happy to know that these are not demonstration projects. My experience with demonstration projects is that we put a model out there for a couple of years and we fund it and then we ask everyone else to emulate this posture, and the money isn't there for everybody else to do that, so it just falls by the wayside. So I appreciate your explanation of that and I thank you for it.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. Gunderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to follow up on the questioning that was just pursued here. Can you elaborate a little bit on your definition of Title I in terms of taking this to the disadvantaged? Define "disadvantaged."

Mr. Kolb. Well, Mr. Gunderson, the states would have the opportunity to define disadvantaged under our proposal. We are not going to mandate a definition from Washington.

Again, the key to what we are doing here is to make a significant amount of money available to the states to target it toward the handicapped or disadvantaged in urban or rural areas or both, depending on how they see the needs.

I think sometimes federal programs have a tendency to create so many categories that when you finally look at how the money is parceled out it is really in dribs and drabs.

Sometimes our conceptions in Washington of what those categories should be does not necessarily mesh with what your constituents really need out there in the country.

We want to focus on individuals who are economically disadvantaged as well as handicapped, but again, under our proposal, the states will have flexibility to target that money.

Mr. Gunderson. My question would be, would you limit or prohibit a disadvantaged definition that included socially disadvantaged, culturally disadvantaged, geographically disadvantaged?

Mr. Kolb. The only constraint that we would have would be economically disadvantaged.

Mr. Gunderson. That would be the only one that could be used?

Mr. Kolb. We are talking about economically disadvantaged.

Mr. Gunderson. Would you have any parameters under the definition of—-
Mr. Kolb. There could obviously be some overlap in terms of social and cultural disadvantage.

Mr. Gunderson. I mean, I'm getting all excited about that, because I come from a rural area and if there is one major role I want to see with regard to federal involvement in libraries it is to go into some of these communities where they do not have a viable library today. They want one. They need some federal start-up funds, frankly, you know, and I am trying to find out what kind of flexibility we are going to have in that regard. If you focus on the concept that the federal role is to deal with special needs, I would love to take you to some of these communities that are trying to get libraries in my district, they clearly have some very unique, special needs.

I would hope that we don't get into a formula that is so precise that a rural area is severely economically disadvantaged, but it is so severely disadvantaged that it has a low population, can't through the formula qualify by virtue of numbers.

Mr. Kolb. I share your concerns. There is another point that I may have not emphasized enough here in responding to your questions and Mr. Poshard's question, and that is the resource sharing component of what we are doing.

By also expanding funds that are available for resource sharing we think that will have an impact, as well, on rural areas, because so much of what is going on, that is creative and innovative in this area, really does involve high tech means of transmission.

We think, again, that that can be a cost effective way of disseminating materials throughout the country and also in rural areas. We believe that these two titles together are very promising with regard to addressing the concerns that you have raised.

Mr. Gunderson. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Williams: I also want to note the presence of Mr. Hayes of Illinois.

Mr. Hayes, we are about to conclude this first panel, but if you have an opening statement or any questions, we would be pleased to receive them now.

Mr. Hayes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The penalty for being late is to be quiet. Thank you very much.

Chairman Williams. Mr. Owens, did you have a follow-up question?

Mr. Owens. I just have one question for Ms. Mathews. Has the administration conducted any review or evaluation of the Library Services and Construction Act which serves as a basis for these new recommendations?

Ms. Mathews. Not a formal review, no, sir.

Mr. Owens. Any kind of review or evaluation?

Ms. Mathews. Charles, would you like to speak about that?

Mr. Kolb. I think one—we did not develop this in a vacuum. I think the staff has been fairly active in terms of consulting—

Mr. Owens. You say you did not develop it in a vacuum?

Mr. Kolb. No, we did not develop it in a vacuum, but, as Ms. Mathews says, there was no formal consultation.

Again, we have proposed a restructuring, Mr. Owens, which we think addresses the need and will present some of the leveraging of federal dollars that Senator Pell talked about.
Mr. Owens. Yes, I heard your proposal, Mr. Kolb. I just wanted to know on what basis you went forward with that proposal. You don’t have any evaluation or any review which serves as a guide to making changes?

Mr. Kolb. Well, we have looked at the way the money has been spent. We have looked at the needs out there. Ms. Mathews is in constant communication with her colleagues across the country.

We can have differences of opinion as to how to best target that money, but we think that this is a very responsible proposal. It is based on need.

Mr. Owens. Is that the way the federal government usually evaluates programs?

Mr. Kolb. The federal government evaluates programs in many different ways, sir.

Mr. Owens. Thank you.

Chairman Williams. Mr. Undersecretary, you have said, I think quite appropriately, during one of your answers that you hope that the chair and this committee and our counterpart in the Senate would take the administration’s proposals seriously. Although I know I don’t have to assure you that that is what we do, I nonetheless want to assure you of that.

Anytime the President sends proposals to Capitol Hill they are taken seriously. Your proposals will receive all due consideration. That is why you and Director Mathews are the lead-off witnesses here at this first reauthorization hearing held in Washington, DC, because we do take the President’s and your recommendations in earnest.

I would agree with you that protecting the status quo simply for the purpose of doing that is, indeed, not worthwhile. The Congress joins the administration in wanting to build on successes.

I do want to note, however, that the Congress of the United States does not need to be encouraged to be innovative. This Act is celebrating its third of a century, beginning with the Library Services Act authorized thirty-three years ago. It was innovative.

The Congress has not rested on the status quo of that Act. Each time we have reauthorized it we have tried to be innovative, adding the construction portion to the Act. A badly needed portion—which, by the way, the administration asks us to eliminate. We added that two decades ago.

Since then we have continued to be innovative in the Congress, oftentimes alone, without assistance from the White House, sometimes without assistance from Democratic presidents, sometimes without assistance from Republican presidents. We added in 1984, without the assistance of the White House, foreign language and literacy components. We added a Native Americans component earlier. This time we will take all innovative suggestions, including those that will come from the administration, those that will come from our colleagues on this committee, as well as those that will come later today and in weeks ahead from people in America’s library community.

We are delighted that you are our first witnesses here at this national hearing in Washington and we appreciate your being with us.
Mr. KOLB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We look forward to working with you. Thank you very much.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Now we will ask to join us Dean Summers and State Librarian Strong.

Dean Summers is the Dean of the School of Library and Information Studies at Florida State University and is, I am quick to note, the President of the American Library Association.

Gary Strong is the State Librarian from the California State Library in Sacramento.

We are delighted to have you both with us. Dean Summers, let's begin with you, sir.

STATEMENT OF F. WILLIAM SUMMERS, DEAN, SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION STUDIES, FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY AND PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

Mr. SUMMERS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The American Library Association is a nonprofit educational organization of 48,000 librarians, library trustees and other friends of the library. The Library Services and Construction Act was the first and remains the major, although still a very modest, federal program of assistance to libraries.

ALA played a major role in the development of the 1956 Act and has continued an active involvement in its evolution and strongly supports reauthorization of the LSCA as currently focused, with such improvements or technical amendments as are needed to meet urgent needs or improve the efficient working of the Act.

A resolution to this effect was passed by our council and January and is attached to my testimony.

The great strength of LSCA is that it is targeted to the improvement of library services, but within that overall purpose it allows the states and localities great flexibility. I believe that is why it continues as an effective program and why it has enjoyed both strong bipartisan congressional support and great popular support.

ALA appreciates the consistent support the subcommittees have given LSCA over the years. While the broad range of activities supported may complicate our ability to provide national or average impact data, it enables LSCA to be adapted to the varying conditions and changing needs in the states from Rhode Island to California and from Montana to Florida.

The accomplishments of LSCA can best be told in each of your states and districts. I am delighted for that reason that there are so many of my colleagues here today to help tell that story.

In Florida LSCA serves as seed money for the establishment of special programs and the extension and improvement of basic library services. As a result, residents of the state are the beneficiaries of improved access to strengthened resources programs and facilities.

More than $1.8 million has been used to support library literacy programs in Florida since Fiscal Year 1979. During this period, LSCA funds were used to increase the number of county libraries engaged in literacy activities from four to forty-six counties in the state.
In 1953 library services in Florida left more than one-third of our population virtually untouched. Today 97.3 percent of all Floridians have access to public library service and LSCA dollars now address the quality of that access and improving it.

While annual LSCA construction funds to Florida have been less than $1 million, they have served as catalysts for facility improvements and construction and have fostered federal, state and local partnerships in providing these better resources.

Another need that we face today is the preservation of library materials. ALA is very pleased that the leadership these two subcommittees and particularly Chairman Pell, Chairman Williams and Representative Owens have shown on the problem of preservation of library materials.

You have held hearings on this issue, so I know you are aware that the acidic nature of the paper used for books, magazines, newspapers and government records since about 1850 will self-destruct. It turns yellow and brittle and literally breaks or crumbles with use.

Briefly, libraries need help in planning for preservation. They need expert technical assistance for an acute problem that is national in scope. LSCA provides a natural vehicle and state library agencies a natural focal point within each state.

ALA, together with the chief officers of state library agencies, urges you to consider providing practical assistance for preservation of library materials through LSCA.

For both Fiscal Years 1989 and 1990, the administration has proposed new legislation to replace both the Library Services and Construction Act and the Higher Education Act library programs.

ALA is pleased to note that this proposal last year reversed a history since Fiscal Year 1983 of zero budget requests for library grant programs. A recognition of a legitimate federal role in assistance to libraries is a significant reversal of policy, a change welcomed by ALA.

I will not take time here to summarize the provisions of the proposed legislation, but I would like to indicate a few problem areas.

Last year’s proposal represented a significant cut from then current funding. This year the library programs are among those in the administration’s lower priority category of domestic discretionary programs to be negotiated with Congress.

The proposed authorization level of $137.2 million for Fiscal Year 1990 compares with a current authorization total of $181 million for LSCA plus such sums for HEA Title II. The most recent specific levels authorized for Title II totaled $30 million in Fiscal Year 1987.

Secondly, all maintenance of effort in matching requirements would be removed, thus eliminating the strength of LSCA as an incentive to state and local effort.

Third, minimum state allotments would vary according to appropriation levels instead of the current and stable fixed amount. This would severely limit the states’ ability to do effective forward planning.

Federal assistance for fellowships in library science would be eliminated, although training and education related to the purposes of Titles I and II would be eligible.
As a library educator I must elaborate on this last point. The loss of the HEA Title II-B fellowship assistance would remove one of the very few incentives to recruitment in our field, especially for minorities.

Shortages of librarians are expected to continue through the end of the century in certain areas of strong demand: children's and young adults' services, school librarianship, cataloging and minority studies and services.

The number of minority librarians with master's degrees declined forty percent between 1979 and 1984, paralleling the decline in HEA Title II-B funding. In addition, fully 15 percent of the approximately 550 faculty in our graduate schools are sixty years of age or older.

ALA recommends reauthorization of the Act as currently funded, with such improvements or technical amendments as are needed: an amendment to Title I to clarify the grants of Title I funds to multitype library systems would result in improved public library services; an increased emphasis on the use of technology improves library services and access to information; a component with LSCA to accommodate the needs within the states for preservation of library materials; increased authorization for LSCA Title VI, Library Literacy Projects, to accommodate the demonstrated need.

I would be pleased to respond to any questions or to provide further information for the record.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the views of the American Library Association.

[The prepared statement of F. William Summers follows:]
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I am F. William Summers, Dean of the School of Library and Information Studies at Florida State University in Tallahassee, and President of the American Library Association. The Association is a nonprofit educational organization of 48,000 librarians, library trustees, and other friends of libraries.

The Library Services and Construction Act was the first, and remains the major, although still a very modest, federal program of assistance for libraries. It was enacted in 1956 as the Library Services Act to assist the states in extending and improving public library services to rural and underserved areas. Over the years the purpose of LSA and the succeeding LSCA was broadened to support a range of activities: developing and improving library services to areas and populations which are disadvantaged because of distance, institutionalization, physical handicap, limited English-speaking proficiency, residence, income, age, or literacy level; assisting libraries to serve as community information and referral centers; strengthening state library agencies; strengthening metropolitan libraries and major urban resource libraries which serve national or regional needs; public library construction and renovation; promoting interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing among all types of libraries; improving library services to Indian tribes and Hawaiian natives; acquiring foreign language materials, and supporting library literacy programs.

ALA AND LSCA

ALA played a role in the development of the 1956 Act, has continued an active involvement in its evolution, and strongly supports reauthorization of LSCA as currently focused, with such improvements or technical amendments as are needed to meet urgent needs or improve the efficient working of the Act. A resolution to this effect was passed by the ALA Council in January and is attached to my statement.

The great strength of LSCA is that it is targeted to the improvement of library services, but within that overall purpose, it allows the states and localities great flexibility. I believe that is why it continues as an effective program, and why it has enjoyed both strong bipartisan congressional support and great popular support. ALA appreciates the consistent support the subcommittees have given LSCA over the years.

While the broad range of activities supported may complicate our ability to provide national or average impact data, it enables LSCA to be adapted to the
varying conditions and changing needs in the states, from Rhode Island to California, and from Montana to Florida. The accomplishments of LSCA can best be told in each of your states and districts. I am delighted to see so many of my colleagues here today to help tell that story.

FLORIDA AND LSCA

In Florida LSCA serves as seed money for the establishment of special programs and the extension and improvement of basic library services and programs. As a result, residents of the state are the beneficiaries of improved access to strengthened resources, programs, and facilities.

- More than $1.8 million has been used to support library literacy programs since FY 1979. During this period, LSCA funds were used to increase the number of county libraries engaged in literacy activities from 4 to 46 counties in the state. During FY 1987 and FY 1988 more than $473,000 of LSCA funds was allocated for library literacy programs which had the potential of reaching more than 122,604 of Florida's 216,858 adults aged 25 and older who have completed less than four years of school.

Significant achievements have been made with the available resources. However, continued funding is imperative, particularly in light of statistics which show that 1.1 million persons in Florida have completed eight years or less of school. This is further compounded by the facts that several thousand of these persons have completed only four years or less of school; 33 percent have not completed high school; of the reported 1.6 million foreign-born adults over 24 years of age, from 16-50 percent do not speak English well or at all; and the state has an estimated 50,000 young adults drop out of school annually.

- Between FY 1971 and FY 1988, more than $1.2 million was awarded for public library development. This provided for the establishment of countywide library service and program enhancements and improvements through planning.

In 1953, library services in Florida left more than one-third of the State's population virtually untouched. Little attention had been given to serving rural areas and there were no regional library systems. Of the 67 counties in the state, in 1988, 23 were served through seven multi-county systems, and another 40 through single-county systems. Three counties had municipal libraries but no overall countywide service, while one county supported library services below the Florida minimum standards for state aid. To date, 97.3 percent of all Floridians have access to public library service.

- While annual LSCA appropriations of construction funds to Florida have been less than $1 million, they have served as catalysts for facility improvements and construction and have fostered federal, state, and local partnerships in providing better access to resources. Between FY 1983 and FY 1988, more than $14 million in LSCA was used to assist 29 libraries in renovating, expanding, and building new facilities. This amount represents 36 percent of the total cost of these projects which was well over $35 million. "The Department of State's Agency Functional Plan, 1987-1991" notes that expanded and renovated library facilities are required for the establishment and extension of quality library
services and programs. Between 1981 and 1987, the State Library received 163 requests for library construction funds for projects with total construction costs exceeding $226 million. In FY 1983-84, the 320 public libraries in Florida occupied 3,078,754 square feet of space, representing approximately one-half of that recommended by state and national standards. By 1995, libraries will need more than two and one-half times as much space as was available in 1983-84.

- LSCA funds have provided the underpinning for the development of the Florida Library Network. The basic and initial component of the network was the establishment of the Florida Library Information Network (FLIN) in 1968. Using a hierarchical system, interlibrary loan requests from libraries throughout the state were filled by the State Library and five Regional Resource Centers. Through an evolving system of formal inter-library cooperation services and agreements and continued LSCA funding, the Network now includes a total of 58 full participating libraries. Forty additional libraries participate in the network through the Group Access program. Another developing and expanding component of the network is the establishment of consortia. Two consortia have formed in the most populous area of the state. Two additional ones are in the planning phases.

- Targeted populations of the state have received special benefits from LSCA funding for library programs. These groups include residents who are economically and rurally disadvantaged, handicapped, and incarcerated, as well as the young and the elderly.

Each year approximately 360,000 elementary school-aged children participate in a Summer Library Program designed to encourage reading and use of the library. During the past year, five LSCA funded projects provided services to young adults where none previously existed. Eight libraries provided services to children from preschool to young adult. Children participated in activities such as storytelling, festivals, homework and tutorial assistance, book talks, and teen advisory councils. In one project, young adult services and programs were initiated in two municipal libraries in Lakeland and Bartow. Before this project, neither library had special services for this age group. As is typical of many projects, this one had such an impact that residents of Lakeland organized and convinced the City Commission to continue the project with local funds. In support of local funding, the local newspaper provided an editorial, and parents signed and presented petitions supportive of the program.

Services to persons who are disadvantaged by distance from a library facility are provided through special outreach outlets as deposit stations, bookmobiles, and books-by-mail programs.

Subregional libraries for physically handicapped persons have been established, expanded, and strengthened with LSCA funds. The importance, need, and success of this program can be measured in part by increased funding from state sources. Automating the record keeping and circulation functions of the libraries using the Reader Enrollment and Delivery System (READS) and establishment of two, new subregionals are indicative of the most recent accomplishments.

Approximately 21,000 residents of correctional and mental health institutions received benefits of improved services and programs during the past
year. Services include such activities as discussion groups, increased print and nonprint resources, videos, computer use and instruction, and literacy instruction.

**ALA Observations and Recommendations**

Services, Technology, and Cooperation. While federal funding accounts for only about four percent of total public library support in the U.S., LSCA is a major source of innovative funding, stimulating improved community outreach, both locally and through statewide services, and encouraging new organizational patterns and the use of new technology to improve services. The state-based titles of LSCA, title I for public library services, title II for public library construction, and title III for interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing, have been central to these accomplishments. I will mention just a few of the challenges to libraries' ability to provide 21st-century services which make the continuation of LSCA essential.

The changing demographics of the U.S. population are well known. As we become a multi-cultural society, as the nation continues its great tradition of welcoming new immigrants, and as the population ages, the implications for library services are profound. As Ken Dowlin, City Librarian of the San Francisco Public Library, noted recently, libraries must provide a variety of tools for information, knowledge, and reading; and these tools must be multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-format, and multi-country. While San Francisco libraries have served many ethnic groups for a long time, what has changed is that each ethnic group is no longer confined to a single ethnic neighborhood. The library must spread its resources (in more than 40 languages) and its specialized staff over the whole system.

As the proportion of older Americans increases, libraries must take their resources to these active users who no longer may be able to drive, may be physically immobile, and may need large-print or recorded books and magazines. Options include: (1) library branches or deposit collections in or near housing complexes for the elderly; (2) service to the bed-ridden or institutionalized; (3) bookmobiles and books-by-mail; (4) special materials for the visually impaired; and (5) the acquiring of materials of special interest to older Americans.

Library buildings need renovation or replacement to allow adoption of new technologies, provide access to the handicapped, or accommodate population growth. Recent Department of Education budget testimony indicates LSCA II provides only six percent of the funding on assisted projects. However, states consistently report that the possibility of LSCA assistance so stimulates local fund raising to meet matching requirements that states choose to provide a little federal funding to as many eligible projects as possible in the hope that completion funds also will be found. The incentive to mobilize locally in many cases would be lacking without the continuation of LSCA II.

Another challenge is the need to provide access to materials in electronic format. With the stimulus of LSCA and the leadership of the Library of Congress, libraries have been involved during the last few decades with electronic creation and sharing of cataloging, and interlibrary loan location information; and they remain on the cutting edge of technology with regard to bibliographic data standards and cooperation. The next step concerns computer files of
textual, numeric, and graphic data. A recent meeting of the Library of Congress Network Advisory Committee on nonbibliographic databases indicated that some libraries and library networks are already involved in creating and providing access to such files. As an example, the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries provides access for its public, academic, and other library members to a commercial database of factual information, an electronic encyclopedia, and several library-created or public databases such as abstracts of articles on Denver business, a community information and referral database, a file of university resources for business, and a variety of Denver Metro Network Project databases.

Federal agencies also are turning to electronic formats. Civilian agencies distributed more than 7,500 government information products in electronic format in 1987. The Government Printing Office and the Joint Committee on Printing have identified pilot projects to test different delivery mechanisms through the Depository Library Program. The first electronic product, a Census Bureau CD-ROM test disk, was recently delivered to depository libraries in a phased process. The DLP is a joint venture in which GPO provides government information products to a system of 1,400 depository libraries in every congressional district, and the libraries provide the space, equipment, accessory materials, and expert staff to provide access to government information to the public without fees. LSCA can assist libraries in their commitment to the new electronic phase of the DLP.

The requirements of LSCA III, combined with a long tradition of cooperation among libraries, have been a powerful stimulus to the development of regional library systems and consortia, interlibrary loan programs, and bibliographic networks. More recently, LSCA III has helped bring smaller and more isolated libraries into the world of shared electronic information, and encouraged the use of optical disk and other new information technologies to improve services. Federal encouragement of interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing across local and state boundaries still is needed. Many local libraries always will find it difficult legally and budgetarily to participate in cooperative library agreements which may cross local and state boundaries. Yet, such cooperation makes most efficient use of scarce and expensive resources, and the benefits of public use of library resources are not confined within local boundaries. In addition, the up-front costs for technological equipment, as well as telecommunications costs (especially when spread across long distances, but few people) remain barriers for many libraries.

LSCA titles I, II, and III (which are state-based) should be reauthorized with a few amendments to strengthen the Act. The relationship between public libraries and multi-type library systems should be clarified. At times, the eligibility for title I and title III projects have been construed so narrowly that state and local flexibility in addressing title I priorities has been hindered. Title I should be amended to make clear that states may make subgrants to library systems or networks, which include other than public libraries, provided the intent of the grant is to improve services to public library patrons. This would avoid artificial accounting distinctions and increase the ability to use technology to extend and improve library services under title I.

We also recommend that the subcommittee consider other methods to accommodate the strongly expressed needs of many libraries for additional
assistance in using new technologies to provide access to the information needed by library users. Options include increased authorizations for title I and/or title III, or a new emphasis on services through technology.

Preservation. Another technology-related need is for preservation of library materials. ALA is very pleased at the leadership these two subcommittees, and particularly Chairman Fell, Chairman Williams, and Rep. Owens, have shown on the problem of preservation of library materials. You have held hearings on this issue, so I know you are aware that the acidic nature of the paper used for books, magazines, newspapers, and government records since about 1850 will self-destroy. It turns yellow and brittle, and literally breaks or crumbles with use.

While many of the books and magazines in public libraries wear out from use and are discarded long before the pages become brittle, there are still many titles, reports, and documents that should be preserved for their value as important sources for political or social history, and local community or state history, or for their legal value. Much of our young nation's history has taken place during the era of acidic paper production, and thus, almost our entire history is at risk.

We must not let this happen. Your role in calling attention to this national problem is much appreciated. At your initiative, measures (S.J. Res. 57 and H.J. Res. 226) are pending to promote the use of nonacidic, permanent papers for the appropriate records and publications of government agencies and private publishers. With your help, the preservation efforts of the National Endowment for the Humanities were increased from $4.5 million to $12.5 million this year. This should give a much needed boost to the preservation microfilming efforts of research libraries. However, I believe there is also a role for state library agencies in assisting all types and sizes of libraries, archives, historical societies, and other repositories to tackle the preservation problem.

All our libraries, large and small, need assistance in determining what should be saved for posterity, how to preserve such materials, and how to coordinate with other libraries to avoid duplication. But the needs go beyond the problem of brittle paper. Libraries need information on what to do when disaster strikes, such as fire, flood, or sprinkler system damage. Libraries in the Southeast must cope with mold, mildew, and insects. What environmental conditions and storage materials will prolong the life of printed materials, photographs, film, computer disks, and so on? In short, libraries need help in planning for preservation, and they need expert technical assistance for an acute problem that is national in scope. LSNA provides a natural vehicle, and the state library agencies a natural focal point within each state.

Presentations at the National Conference on the Development of Statewide Preservation Programs on March 1-3 at the Library of Congress pointed out that in some states (including Florida), small amounts of LSNA funds have been allocated for disaster preparedness or other aspects of preservation. Now a state-by-state infrastructure would enable states to deal with this national problem comprehensively. ALA, together with the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, urges you to consider providing practical assistance for preservation of library materials through LSNA. All types of libraries and archives would benefit, and the citizens who use their resources would be enriched long into the future.
Indian Library Services. LSCA IV involves a two percent set-aside of the funding for titles I, II, and III for basic and special project grants to Indian tribes and Hawaiian natives for library services. Indian tribes often have no access to libraries. They are generally considered separate nations and seldom eligible for direct library allocations from states. Funding for title IV began in FY 1985, and the need has only begun to be met.

The inadequacy of Indian library resources and services was demonstrated recently by witnesses from around the country at hearings in January in Santa Fe, New Mexico, conducted by the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The NCLIS effort was part of an examination of the status of tribal libraries, which will continue through an ad hoc Committee on Indian Library Services. LSCA IV requires maintenance of effort and is needed both as an incentive and for modest assistance.

Literacy. With increasing attention to the extent and hidden cost of illiteracy in the U.S., and with increased activity by the library community through such efforts as the ALA-initiated Coalition for Literacy, library literacy projects have grown in recent years. The need for LSCA VI assistance is shown by the fact that in FY 1988, libraries submitted 533 proposals requesting a total of $11.5 million, although only $4.8 million was available. The legislative history indicates that libraries were expected to cooperate with other community providers of literacy assistance, and project descriptions indicate that such cooperation is typical.

Since its first year of funding in FY 1986, LSCA VI discretionary grant levels have been at or near the authorized level of $5 million. The scope of the illiteracy problem demands efforts by all appropriate community agencies, including libraries. LSCA VI needs not only continuation, but an increased authorization and an increase in the maximum grant from the current $25,000.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED LEGISLATION

For both fiscal years 1989 and 1990, the Administration has proposed new legislation to replace both the Library Services and Construction Act and the Higher Education Act library programs. Last year, this proposal recommended a total authorization of $76 million and was called the Library Improvement Act. I understand that a slightly revised version of this proposal has just been transmitted to Congress. This version, the Library Services Improvement Act, would authorize a total of $137.2 million. ALA is pleased to note that this proposal last year reversed a history since FY 1983 of zero budget requests for library grant programs. A recognition of a legitimate federal role in assistance to libraries is a significant reversal of policy—a change welcomed by ALA. I will not take time here to summarize the provisions of the proposed legislation, but I would like to indicate a few problem areas.

- Last year's proposal represented a significant cut from then current funding, and this year the library programs are among those in the Administration's lower priority category of domestic discretionary programs to be negotiated with Congress.

- The proposed authorization level of $137.2 million for FY 1990 compares with a current authorization total of $181 million for LSCA plus "such sums" for HEA II. The most recent specific levels authorized for HEA II totaled $30 million in FY 1987.
• All maintenance of effort and matching requirements would be removed, thus eliminating the strength of LSCE as an incentive to state and local effort.

• Minimum state allotments would vary according to appropriation levels (0.5 percent of total state grants) instead of the current and stable fixed amount.

• Half of title I funds would be allocated in proportion to poverty population rather than total population, with as yet uncalculated effects on current state allotments and programs.

• State and local flexibility would be considerably narrowed. The proposed title I lists only two purposes: enhancing educational opportunities or facilitating greater use of library services for the economically disadvantaged or handicapped individuals.

• The list of authorized activities seems to broaden the purposes of title I, but some of the examples are quite narrow in scope. For instance, could "English instruction" or "summer reading programs for school children" be provided only for the economically disadvantaged or handicapped? What is the relationship of "the development of library collections in rural areas" to title I purposes, and is collection development the greatest need in all rural areas?

• There would be no statutory emphasis on the current priorities of service to the elderly, strengthening major urban resource libraries, strengthening state library agencies, increasing the capacity of libraries to keep up with rapidly changing technologies, or improving service to geographical areas without adequate service; and no funds at all to administer the act.

• Construction or renovation would not be an eligible purpose except for minor structural changes for handicapped access.

• The five-year limitation on funding a project is unnecessary, particularly with increased evaluation requirements, and will lead to artificial distinctions and decreased state and local flexibility.

• No funds would be targeted to college and university libraries. Academic libraries would be eligible, along with all other public or private organizations, agencies, institutions, and Indian tribes, for grants under the discretionary portion of title II for the sole purpose of developing new or expanding existing interstate library networks.

• It is unclear, in title III library research and assessment, how much of the $1 million authorization would be intended for evaluation of federal programs and for directed research and development, as opposed to field-initiated research.

• Federal assistance for fellowships in library science would be eliminated, although training and continuing education related to the purposes of titles I and II would be eligible.
As a library educator, I must elaborate on this last point. The loss of the HEA II-B fellowship assistance would remove one of the very few incentives to recruitment in our field, especially for minorities and specializations in demand. There is a demonstrated shortage of librarians. The 1988-89 Occupational Outlook Handbook cites two main reasons: a larger-than-average portion of librarians will reach retirement age through the year 2000; and the number of graduates of master's degree programs in library science has dropped to less than half the level of the mid-1970s. In 1974 there were 6,370 graduates in library science; in 1986 there were 3,538.

Shortages of librarians are expected to continue through the end of the century in certain areas of strong demand: children's and young adult services, school librarianship, cataloging, and minority studies and services. The number of minority librarians with master's degrees declined 40 percent between 1979 and 1984, paralleling the decline in HEA II-B funding. Librarians are also in demand in medicine and law and in government documents and records management. People with backgrounds in the sciences, including computer science, math, foreign languages, engineering, and business also are needed.

In addition, fully 15 percent of the approximately 550 faculty in our graduate schools of library and information science are 60 years of age or older. Replacement faculty are essential. At the January meeting of the Association for Library and Information Science Education, only 26 persons were available to fill more than 50 faculty openings.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, ALA recommends:

- Reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act as currently focused.
- Such improvements or technical amendments as are needed to meet urgent needs or improve the efficient working of the Act.
- An amendment to LSCA title I to clarify that grants of title I funds to multi-type library systems result in improved public library services.
- An increased emphasis on the use of technology to improve library services and access to information in all formats.
- A component within LSCA to accommodate the needs within the states for preservation of library materials.
- Increased authorization for LSCA VI library literacy projects to accommodate the demonstrated need.

I would be pleased to respond to any questions, or to provide further information for the record. Thank you for the opportunity to provide the views of the American Library Association.
RESOLUTION ON REAUTHORIZATION OF
THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

WHEREAS, The Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) benefits,
directly or indirectly, more than 15,000 public libraries in the
United States through improved, expanded, and new programs
and services, and the construction, remodeling, and renovation
of public library buildings; and

WHEREAS, Schools, colleges and universities, and other institutions and
organizations are also recipients through cooperative library
networking services and shared resources with public libraries; and

WHEREAS, LSCA-stimulated cooperative services are reaching out to the
unserved and underserved, minorities and ethnicities, illiterates and
illiterates, the physically handicapped, the institutionalized, the
disadvantaged, the elderly, those needing materials in various
languages, and Native Americans; and

WHEREAS, Prompt reauthorization is required in the first session of the
101st Congress before the LSCA expiration date of September 30,
1989; and

WHEREAS, A second White House Conference on Library and Information
Services has been authorized for convening by September 30,
1991, providing a natural focus for long-term, nationwide review
of federal library legislation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Library Services and Construction Act be reauthorized
as currently focused, with such improvements or technical
amendments as are needed to meet urgent needs or improve the
efficient working of the Act; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That any extensive changes in the focus of the Library Services
and Construction Act be predicated on library community
consensus of user need and consensus recommendations of the
second White House Conference on Library and Information
Services; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the American Library Association pledge its support and
assistance to the appropriate congressional committees in
achieving a timely and effective reauthorization of the Library
Services and Construction Act.

Adopted by the Council of the
American Library Association
Washington, D. C.
January 11, 1989
(Council Document #34)
Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you, Dr. Summers. Mr. Strong?

STATEMENT OF GARY E. STRONG, STATE LIBRARIAN OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. STRONG. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, and members of the committee.

I am Gary Strong, the State Librarian of California. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to testify before you today with enthusiastic support for the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act.

The California State Library has a long and respected history of supporting the development and provision of library services to California's 28 million people. In this past year alone projects funded under the Library Services and Construction Act benefited directly more than 3 million people across the entire state.

On March 11 of this year over 200 adult learners and family members gathered at Laney College in Oakland, California, for the first Bay Area Adult Learner Conference. The purpose of that conference was to provide a forum for new readers to share skills and ideas and learn new ways to deal with problems and to make plans for future projects.

Many of the sessions were planned by and conducted by adult learners in library literacy programs. This celebration of success and information sharing was funded by a grant under LSCA.

This triumph, I believe, demonstrates the human values and uniqueness of the Library Services and Construction Act. The federal program for public libraries has allowed each state to meet its individual library development goals.

Initially states established libraries in areas where there were no libraries. As services developed, states began to address specialized and outreach services, and most recently states have begun to address retrofitting the services which respond to people's needs in an era of information, ethnic diversity, high technology and the global economy.

The California Literacy Campaign, I believe, is an excellent example of how LSCA works. The California State Library started the campaign in 1984 with $2.5 million of LSCA dollars, funding twenty-seven public libraries to provide direct adult learning services in literacy.

At the conclusion of this initial development effort the California legislature appropriated funds to the CLC, an action which brought over $25 million to now over seventy-seven library jurisdictions, providing learning services to adult learners. That is leveraging.

The California Literacy Campaign would not exist today if there had not been LSCA dollars and the flexibility to start it.

I think there are three areas where I feel the Library Services and Construction Act most effectively assists the states. The first is the encouragement of individual innovation and creative problem solving. Local public libraries are striving to cope with service delivery improvement in the face of serious reductions, and at the same time the state is experiencing rapid population growth and an unparalleled increase in the diversity of its population. Through our LSCA grant funding competition, public libraries are supported
and encouraged to apply for funding to test and develop ideas and to implement service programs which will improve the level of service to their rapidly changing communities and within the constraints of the new fiscal reality that we face.

The California State Library has undertaken a variety of programs to help libraries adapt to and incorporate new information technology.

The ability to fund projects addressing statewide library issues is the second major strength of LSCA. In my written testimony I have included a number of examples that I feel are exemplary.

A new initiative which the California State Library is undertaking is a major new development effort which we believe will assist public libraries in addressing the library and information needs of the burgeoning ethnic and racial populations of California.

I have committed $3 million from the Library Services and Construction Act this year alone to support community library service grants programs, one portion of a four-pronged partnerships initiative that we have undertaken.

What we often find is the fact that libraries do not have the capital to retool their services, to retrain their staff and to upgrade their collections. Through a series of training opportunities, needs assessment, community coalition building and partnerships and tremendous hard work, public libraries will be able to undertake the changes necessary within individual communities to better serve California's multicultural society.

California's ethnic and racial diversity and projected growth is only one facet of this situation. The range and scope of diversity is another, along with the fact that there are no new funding sources.

We feel that we must assist local libraries in redirecting and retrofitting their local services provided at the community and the neighborhood level. The California public library community has expressed this need to us several times.

Local libraries will be expected to commit the same level of funding, at least, to these new services that was previously allocated. I believe that LSCA in this case will make a tremendous difference.

The encouragement of libraries of all types to work together in a resource sharing environment is the third area that I believe addresses the importance of funding under LSCA.

Planning has been underway for several years for the development of a multitype library network which will link and serve all types of libraries in California.

Consensus is not easily reached on how to achieve this goal, yet each subsequent set of discussions has brought us closer. Targeted grant programs encourage multitype communication and cooperation undertakings at the local level.

We have now initiated a three-year planning process to create a multitype network that will be funded with state monies and LSCA monies are critical to this support for the planning process and the demonstration of service improvements that we believe will result.

I have also attached to my testimony the technical amendments that COSLA, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, are requesting, and I would particularly like to note and support the preservation aspect of those amendments.
Again, let me express my appreciation for the opportunity to testify before you today. I can assure you that the funding received by the state of California through the Library Services and Construction Act is critical to the continuing development of quality library services. 

LSCA must not be viewed as a small amount of funding and therefore expendable. LSCA is a public good. I believe it must be viewed for its impact, for its continued opportunities, that it encourages the leverage of additional state and local funds toward the development of libraries as an integral part of our democratic government that supports and helps allow for full participation by all of our citizens in our communities.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Gary E. Strong follows:]
Senator Pell, Congressman Williams, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I am Gary E. Strong, State Librarian of California. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to testify before you today with enthusiastic support for the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act. The California State Library has a long and respected history of supporting the development and provision of library services to California's 28 million people through the state's 169 public library jurisdictions. The State Library also facilitates and supports cooperation and networking among these public libraries, 175 academic libraries, over 900 special libraries, and thousands of school libraries. The Library Services Act and later the Library Services and Construction Act has enabled the California State Library to develop and improve library and information services to all of California's residents. In this past year alone, projects funded under the LSCA directly benefitted more than 3 million people across the entire state.

On March 11, 1989 over 200 adult learners and family members gathered at Laney College in Oakland for the Bay Area Adult Learner Conference, "New Readers Sharing Their Success." The purpose of the conference was to provide a forum for new readers to share skills and ideas, learn new ways to deal with problems, and make plans for future projects. It was to be a time to celebrate success and momentum for continued success. The 50 workshop leaders and conference volunteers organized a conference that was a truly successful experience. Seventeen workshops were planned and greetings were received from First Lady Barbara Bush, Governor Deukmejian, Senator Pete Wilson, California State Assembly Member Tom Bates, and the California State Librarian. Many of the sessions were planned by and conducted by adult learners from library programs. This celebration of success and information sharing was funded by a grant from LSCA funds.

This triumph demonstrates the human values and uniqueness of the Library Services and Construction Act. Since passage of the Library Services Act in 1957, the federal program for public libraries has allowed each state to meet its individual library development goals. Initially, states established libraries in areas where there were no libraries. As services developed, states began to address specialized and outreach
services, and most recently states have begun to address retrofitting services which respond to people's needs in this new era of information, ethnic diversity, high technology, and the global economy.

The California Literacy Campaign (CLC) is an excellent example of how LSCA works. In California, literacy issues have been surfacing for 20 years. Public libraries across the state were increasingly struggling with the fact that more adults in their communities were unable to enjoy the direct benefits of information due to their inability to read at a functional level. Consequently, the California State Library started the Campaign in 1984 with $2.5 million in LSCA monies funding 27 public libraries to develop adult literacy learning services. The emphasis was to provide literacy learning services in the library setting, not to pass the funding through to someone else.

At the conclusion of this initial development effort, the California legislature appropriated funds to the CLC, an action which has brought over $25 million to now over 77 library jurisdictions providing literacy services to adult learners. These services add a unique learning niche which complement those provided by adult education, business and industry, community colleges, and community-based organizations. A particularly unique facet of the CLC is the referral component. More than one-third of the adults going to libraries for service are referred to other agencies who can more appropriately meet their needs.

The California Literacy Campaign would not exist today if there had not been LSCA funds to support our initiatives. This small amount of "seed" money triggered not only new funding for library services, but assisted local public libraries in diversifying their local programs to meet a tremendous need even before the national attention that literacy is now receiving. We are continuing to use LSCA monies to experiment and test new ideas such as how best to use computers for literacy instruction, literacy services to prisoners, identification and testing of literacy programs in languages other than English, and for training of literacy workers and library staff so they can better recognize the signs of illiteracy. But the ongoing program support for literacy comes from state general funds.

There are three areas in which I feel the federal Library Services and Construction Act most effectively assist the states. These areas are individual innovation and creative problem-solving, statewide library development, and libraries of all types working together. Each area will be developed by each state differently and this allows for the creative development of programs which meet the unique differences among us. I cannot speak forcefully enough of the value of LSCA as a "state-based" program which allows each state to develop the programs which meet particular and special state and local needs.
The encouragement of individual innovation and creative problem-solving is the first area. In California, local public libraries are striving to cope with service delivery improvement in the face of serious reductions resulting from the taxpayer's revolt in the State. At the same time the state is experiencing rapid population growth and an unparalleled increase in the diversity of its population. Through our LSCA grant funding competition, public libraries are supported and encouraged to apply for funding to test and develop ideas and to implement service programs which will improve the level of service to their rapidly changing communities and within the constraints of this new fiscal reality. These projects have allowed a local public library to "try out an idea" and then incorporate the successful aspects into their service program.

The California State Library has undertaken a variety of programs which help libraries adapt to and incorporate new information technology into their service programs. In a number of instances, this support has assisted a library in convincing its funding body to provide the additional monies needed to more fully implement and use new technology in providing enhanced access to resources. In many cases, the appropriate use of new technology to accomplish routine tasks has freed very precious staff resources to help the public.

Recently funded projects have included outreach to Black children in a disadvantaged section of Sacramento, a books by mail program in rural Monterey County, improved collections and services for the developmentally disabled patients at Agnews State Hospital, the listing of important Mexican American collections at Stanford University on the statewide database, the duplication and sharing of Native American materials at the Lowie Museum at the University of California at Berkeley with local tribal areas, and the technical assistance of an on-site consultant to the County of Shasta to aid them in restoring county library services. Without the support of LSCA monies few of these projects would have been undertaken. The strength of this type of project is that it provides a local library with the incentive to stretch its ability to be creative in a constrained fiscal environment.

There have been several unusually successful programs, many of which have been recognized as exemplary programs by the United States Department of Education, the American Library Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, and other such organizations.

LSCA funds have also underwritten the cooperative undertakings of groups of libraries of different types. In an area east of Los Angeles, university and college and
public libraries have banded together in a mutual aid pact for recovery assistance in the event of earthquake or other calamity striking any one of them.

The ability to fund projects addressing statewide library issues is the second major strength of LSCA. Over the past several years, we have targeted a number of areas which have been supported. These initiatives have included:

**ASIA (Asia Shared Information and Access).** This multi-year program has provided assistance to libraries in acquiring and cataloging books and other library materials in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese for over 50 libraries. The program provides a cost-effective means of addressing the special need for libraries to acquire and make available books in languages other than English.

**Rural Libraries Materials Grants.** Funds totalling $383,000 were awarded to small city and county branch libraries outside a metropolitan (SMSA) area for purchase of library materials. A similar Sparse Population Materials Grant program provided $358,000 for the purchase of adult and children's non-fiction books for small city and county branch libraries.

**Children's Materials Collection Development.** Funds totalling $1,565,000 were awarded to community libraries in urban areas with significant concentrations of ethnic minority and disadvantaged children for the purchase of children's materials to meet the service needs of special populations of children.

**Older Adult Materials Collections.** Funding totalling $1,215,000 were provided to hundreds of branch libraries serving populations of older Californians. This program was also supported with numerous workshops on developing library service programs to the elderly.

**California Opportunities for Reference Excellence (CORE).** Funds totalling $1,370,000 provided basic up-to-date reference collections in English, Spanish, and Asian languages to hundreds of small branch public libraries and provided training for thousands of front-line library staff in basic reference service skills.

**Adult Microcomputer Literacy.** Funds were provided to establish 12 microcomputer resource centers and partially fund public use microcomputers in 89 public libraries.

**Online Conversion of Holdings.** Funds totalling $186,053 were awarded to individual libraries of all types to convert card catalog records to machine-readable format and so make them accessible for interlibrary loan. The
program targeted subject collections in areas of need for resource-sharing; Asian language and Spanish language materials are two examples. Matching funds provided by successful applicants brought the total amount of monies supporting this resource sharing activity to $467,356.

The importance of the LSCA program is that it provides funding to libraries focused on the critical needs of citizens of that specific area. The application and reporting process are tailored to the individual projects so that even the smallest public library could apply for materials grants and so that non-public libraries unfamiliar with the LSCA grant process were able to compete successfully. Many public libraries in California were able to apply for LSCA funding for the first time because the bulk of the paper-work was handled at the State Library.

In some states, it is more effective to operate some of these programs from the state library agency to benefit smaller public libraries. In California we have enhanced the collection of local history and genealogy materials at our Sutro Branch in San Francisco. This very large collection provides interlibrary loan service to all public libraries of the state instead of encouraging the development of costly collections in each public library.

A new initiative which the California State Library is undertaking is a major new development effort which we believe will assist public libraries in addressing the library and information needs of the burgeoning ethnic and racial populations of California. Based on a commissioned study completed by the RAND Corporation\(^2\) and recommendations from the State of Change Study Group\(^3\), the State Library has initiated a bold new program that we call Partnerships for Change. This effort is being developed with monies allocated under the Library Services and Construction Act.

I have committed $3 million from the Library Services and Construction Act this next year to support the Community Library Services Grants Program, one portion of the four-pronged Partnerships initiative. What we often find is the fact that many libraries do not have capital to retool their services, to retrain their staff, and to upgrade their collections. Through a series of training opportunities, needs assessment, community coalition building and partnerships, and tremendous hard work, public libraries will be


able to undertake the changes necessary within individual communities to better serve California’s multicultural society. California’s ethnic and racial diversity and projected growth is only one facet of this situation. The range and scope of diversity is another along with the fact that there are no new funding resources. We feel we must assist local libraries in redirecting and retrofitting the service provided at the community and neighborhood level, and the California public library community has expressed this need. Local libraries will be expected to commit the same level of funding to these new services that was previously allocated. LSCA funds make a tremendous difference.

The other components that we will address under Partnerships are the development of alternatives for ethnic resource and information centers, public awareness, and forums for change. The Forums for Change component will address the development of public policy and a broader awareness and understanding among public officials, including librarians, of the issues facing libraries as a result of such rapid and immediate change in the populations to be served by our well established public library delivery system.

In light of the program I have just outlined, it is important to stress that we have also placed special emphasis for public library construction funded under LSCA Title II to those facilities that will serve large concentrations of ethnic and racial populations or older Californians. Often available new funding goes to support library construction in fast growing portions of a service area, while those facilities which serve communities in transition are left to fall into disrepair. Through this LSCA emphasis, we hope to better target precious Title II funding for the greatest benefit. We find that Title II funds, used wisely, can leverage significant additional funding from local sources.

The encouragement of libraries of all types to work together in a resource sharing environment is the third area we are able to address with funding under the Library Services and Construction Act. As a result of early program development and the establishment of the public library systems with support from LSCA, the California Library Services Act was passed in 1978. This legislation provided state support and encouragement of the sharing of public library resources outside a given jurisdiction. Today, the CLSA provides several million dollars each year to reimburse libraries for services they render directly to library users outside their funding jurisdiction and to other libraries through interlibrary loan and interlibrary reference—another example of the value of LSCA as seed money.

Planning has been underway for several years for the development of a multi-type library network which will link and serve all types of libraries in California. With
the issuance of *Strategies for Service*\(^4\), California's long-range plan prepared in 1982, serious discussion among the various library interests in the state began to address how libraries might work together more effectively. Consensus is not easily reached on how to achieve this goal, yet each subsequent set of discussions brought us closer. In September of 1988, 700 librarians met and concluded that discussion could stop and planning could begin to establish a multitype library network. This decision would not have been possible without funding available from the Library Services and Construction Act. Targeted grant programs encourage multitype communication and cooperative undertakings at the local level. LSCA funds underwrote the dissemination of information on what networking is and what it could be in California through seminars, reports, and conferences. We have now initiated a 3-year planning process to create a statewide multitype network that will be funded with state monies, and LSCA monies are critical in their support of the planning process and the demonstration of service improvements that will result.

While calling for a reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act, the California State Library along with the library agencies in the other states and territories recognize that we are engaged in tremendous change. We want to reinforce, however, that this has been the situation during the 32 year life of the Act and the flexibility and versatility of the Act remains its greatest strength. The Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA, Inc.) continually reviews the Act and has determined that several technical amendments will provide the changes needed to correct certain deficiencies. I am providing text of these suggestions as an attachment to my testimony for your information and consideration. One of the key technical amendments suggested by COSLA, Inc. addressed the need for additional coordination of programs addressing the preservation of the resources all libraries hold in trust for the nation's people. I urge the committees to carefully examine this proposal.

Again, let me express my appreciation for the opportunity to testify before you today. I can assure you that the funding received by the State of California under the Library Services and Construction Act is critical to the continuing development of

\(^4\)Three publications document the planning efforts of California libraries in developing an effective multi-type network. They are:


All titles are available from the California State Library Foundation.
quality library services. LSCA must not be viewed as a small amount of funding and therefore expendable. LSCA is a public good. I believe it must be viewed for its impact, for the continued opportunities that it encourages through the leverage of additional state and local funds, and toward the continued development of the library as an integral part of our democratic government that supports and helps to allow for full participation of all in our communities.

In California, LSCA has played a vital role in helping libraries adapt to an increasingly diverse and rapidly changing political, economic, and technological environment. All of the available evidence points towards a future in which the pace of these changes will accelerate. Our public libraries help people find and use the information they need to be successful in this increasingly challenging environment. LSCA is an ideal tool to ensure that libraries can continue to meet the challenges of the future.
1. Periodic Review and Revision of Maintenance of Effort. A provision for periodic review and restatement of the maintenance of effort/matching floor for Title I is needed to allow states to report levels of State and local expenditures more closely related to the ISCA program in the State(s) as outlined in the long-range program required in Section 103. The reauthorization might provide for such a review and restatement every five years, in 1990 for the first instance.

We recommend that the following be inserted as (b) in Section 7 -

PAYMENTS: "(b) in 1990, and every fifth year thereafter, each State Library Agency is authorized to review its expenditures under the programs from State and local sources and file, as may be needed, a statement to establish a current, revised expenditure level to be used for measuring maintenance of effort for succeeding years, provided the new expenditure floor meets the requirements of the following subsection."

What is now subsection (b) dealing with the Federal share would be renumbered and become subsection (c). It may also be necessary to make a parallel technical amendment to section 7 (a) (1) (b) and Section 7 (a) (2).

2. Ratable Reduction of MURLS grants in the event of reduced appropriations. A provision should make it possible for ratably reducing Title I grants to Major Urban Resources Libraries (MURLS) to the extent that Federal allocations to the State are reduced. A similar provision was enacted in 1985 for the Title I services to the physically handicapped and institutionalized persons. Such a provision for the MURLS program is important should appropriations be reduced as a result of Gramm-Rudman requirements or sequestering by the Administration. It can also be important to States in which allocations may be reduced because of population changes currently or in the 1990 census.

We recommend that the following underscored language be inserted in the paragraph that follows clause (7) in Section 103:

"No State shall, in carrying out the provisions of clause (2) of this section, reduce the amount paid to an urban resource library below the amount that such library received in the year preceding the year for which the determination is made under such clause (2), except that such amount shall be ratably reduced to the extent that Federal allocations to the State are reduced or that the 1990 Census shows the population of a city has decreased."
3. Preservation. We recommend a Title III-B authorizing a preservation cooperation program in which state library agencies would work with libraries, archives, historical societies, scholarly organizations, and other agencies in planning, education and training, coordinating, outreach and public information, and service programs to ensure that endangered library and information resources are preserved for future generations. Such a Title III-B would complement the interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing already underway in Title III and it would build upon the work of the Library of Congress and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Preservation needs are so great that some estimate a need for $12.5 million annually through LSDA program. We recommend that the current Title III program continue and be expanded, with:

(1) Increased authorization (and appropriations) of at least $7.5 million for the Title III Interlibrary Cooperation and Resource Sharing program to enable any library to provide access to information in electronic form made possible by new information and communications technologies, and

(2) a Title III-B which would provide $100,000 for each State (and $20,000 for each of the five outlying territories) targeted toward cooperative preservation work (requiring a Title III-B $5.1 million authorization).

In this way, each State could address the technology and resource sharing needs in Title III and could carry out the preservation program in cooperation with the National Endowment for the Humanities and other organizations. It should be possible for a State which needs to expend more than $100,000 for the preservation program to use part of its regular Title III funds for preservation, depending upon its technology needs and overall priorities.

Language authorizing a Title III-B might be inserted as follows:

Section 4 - AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION. (a) (4) "for the purpose of making grants as provided in Title III-B, $5,100,000 for each of the fiscal years, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994."

Section 305 (under TITLE III - INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND RESOURCE SHARING GRANTS TO STATES FOR INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND PRESERVATION PROGRAMS. "Section 305. - Title III-B Preservation Cooperation Program. (a) The long-range program and annual program of each State shall include a statewide preservation cooperation program in which the state library agency works with libraries, archives, historical societies, scholarly organizations, and other agencies, within or outside the State, in planning, education and training, coordinating, outreach and public information, and service programs to ensure that endangered library and information resources are preserved..."
systematically. The state's long-range program shall identify
the preservation objectives to be achieved during the period
covered by the basic and long-range plans required by section 6
and preservation plans shall be developed in consultation with
such parties and agencies as the state archives, historical
societies, libraries, scholarly organizations, and the public.
The state library agency may contract part or all of the
preservation program to other agencies or institutions."

"Section 306. Use of Funds. Grants to States under this title
shall be for the purposes of— (a) planning and interagency
cooperation in preservation of endangered library and
information resources, (b) education, training and internships
(c) a preservation coordinator and such other staff and
resources as may be needed for coordinating and providing
preservation services."

The authorization section (Section 4) would need to be amended to
increase the authorization for the current Title III program by $7.2
million, and provide the $5.1 million for Title III-B.

4. Coordination between U.S. Education Department discretionary grants
and State programs under ISCA. The Act should require that the Secretary
of Education develop and use a grant application notification process that
enables the State Librarian to comment on the degree to which
applications from within the State for Higher Education Act II-D and ISCA
V and VI are consistent with the State Plans that Congress requires in
Sections 6 and 304 of the Federal Library Services and Construction Act.
Since such State plans are developed in consultation with the Secretary of
Education, the Secretary should administer Federal discretionary grant
funds in such a way as to assure that the Federal grants made to libraries
in the States are consistent with those plans.

We recommend that the following language be inserted as
subsection (h) in Section 6 - PLANS AND PROGRAMS: "The
Secretary shall coordinate programs under ISCA Titles V
and VI and Higher Education Act Title II with the State
programs assisted by the Federal Library Services and
Construction Act, and shall afford to the head of the
State Library Administrative Agency the opportunity to
comment on any application for such program before an ISCA
Title V, ISCA VI, or HEA Title II-D grant is made, in
order to assure that such grants from the Secretary are
for purposes consistent with the long range program
required under Section 6 (d) of this Act."
5. Relationship between public libraries and multitype library systems. Recognize that grants of Title I funds to multitype library systems result in improved public library services.

We recommend the following be inserted as part of Section 102 (a) dealing with Title I:

"In carrying out its program to accomplish the purposes of Title I, States may make subgrants to library systems or networks which include other than public libraries provided the intent of the grant is to improve services to library patrons."
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Chairman Williams. Our thanks to both of you.

Dr. Summers, you mentioned, as did Mr. Strong, the matter of the preservation of brittle books.

Do you have a suggestion as to what we could change in the Act to assist with preservation, and do you have a suggestion as to in which title we should put that authorization language? Should it be in the Cooperation and Resource Sharing Title III or perhaps in Title I?

Dr. Summers. I don’t think we have a preference on that, Mr. Chairman. There are in Title III the opportunities for interlibrary cooperation, and we certainly recognize that the preservation problem is one that affects all types of libraries.

It probably would be effective to place the authorization language there, so that it would be clear that the states could best address this problem in a cooperative manner to serve the needs of all libraries.

That would be the preference of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, as well, is that it be incorporated either within the provisions of Title III or a Title III-B portion that would address preservation very specifically. That allows us at the state library agency level to better coordinate those activities among all types of libraries and to insure that we develop plans that address the problem uniformly and cooperatively, rather than support the development of plans among various types of organizations that may, in fact, not mesh and work toward a common preservation goal within each of the states.

Chairman Williams. Mr. Strong, as you know, the administration’s proposal would eliminate the maintenance of effort and matching requirements.

What would the effect be, in your opinion, if those requirements were eliminated—the effect, that is, in your state of California?

Mr. Strong. I think we would be under even increasing pressure to reduce the amount of state funds, particularly that go to support library services.

Chairman Williams. Would that be accomplished?

Mr. Strong. I think it could be, given the particular fiscal constraints that the legislature is facing.

We have been able to use the maintenance of effort capability or requirement within LSCA to maintain our funding levels. We have not received significant increases in the amounts of funds that have come to the state library with the exception of the addition of some direct per capita grants, but with respect to the programs that we have used to support LSCA in terms of our maintenance of effort, with the loss of that maintenance of effort requirement I believe we would suffer a severe reduction in our state funding requirements.

Chairman Williams. Finally, Dr. Summers, you mentioned appropriate service to the elderly in the United States. How do you suggest LSCA be modified to insure that library services and resources are made increasingly available to older Americans?

Dr. Summers. Well, as you know, Mr. Chairman, we in Florida have a high degree of elderly citizens.
Chairman Williams. We have one of your citizens, Mr. Pepper, here, you know, so we know all about the elderly problems in Florida and throughout America.

Dr. Summers. I think that there need to be a multiplicity of activities there. Older citizens have difficulty frequently in reaching libraries, and so we need library branches for depositions and collections in or near their homes.

We need to provide service to the bedridden or institutionalized. Frequently it is books by mail. We need special materials for visually impaired people and the acquiring of materials of special interest to older Americans.

So I think the Act provides, as it has provided, great opportunities for us to reach elder citizens, but I think the problem there is one of financial support. We really need funding in the title of the Act that is focused on the elderly and we need to be able to use that program effectively to serve them. It is a very growing need that we face.

Chairman Williams. Thank you. Chairman Pell?

Senator Pell. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Summers, I welcome you. You were once on the staff of the Providence Public Library and I am glad you are here today.

I want to thank you and the American Library Association for their resolution endorsing the joint resolution which I have introduced, promoting a national policy in the use of acid-free permanent paper.

I note with pleasure, too, that our Chairman, Congressman Williams, has introduced the measure in the House. On the Senate side I am glad to report that we have twenty-nine co-sponsors on this resolution.

I have a couple of questions in connection with that. I am very interested in the Library of Congress as my father was once a member of the joint committee on the libraries as I am now. They have a process where they sort of gas the books in a big gas chamber at a cost of about five dollars for each book.

I was just curious what your reaction was to that process and if there is any other way of getting rid of acidity. Also, I came across a statistic that about one-fourth of the books in research library collections are at risk of being lost because of being printed on acidic paper, which has been in general use since about 1850. That doesn’t make sense, because most books have been printed since 1850, the three-fourths of the books that are available.

I just would like to get your reactions to those questions.

Mr. Summers. Thank you, Senator. As you know, the Library of Congress has taken a great initiative in discovering and researching the problem of acidic paper.

The de-acidification process, or the mass de-acidification process, they are working on is still in the developmental stages. It is a costly process per item, but of course in any technical process, as we increase the number of items that are used the cost goes down, so we hope that that or some other process can be developed that will allow us to have lower cost mass de-acidification.

The Library of Congress has also provided leadership in looking at alternatives to preservation materials in other formats. That may in the long run prove to be the more viable solution.
We probably will never be able to de-acidify all of the books that ought to be preserved and we will need to find ways to preserve those materials in other formats so that they can be reconstructed or remade available as they are needed.

We think that we need to go forward in both of these areas and certainly your bill on the use of acid-free paper in government and the declaration of that as public policy can be a major effort to giving us a reversal of this situation, so that it doesn’t continue in the future.

Senator PELL. What would be your thought as to the number of books that are affected? Is it one-fourth or three-fourths? Which rough estimate would be more accurate?

Mr. SUMMERS. Well, my information, I think, is that virtually all of the materials published since 1850 until the development of non-acidic paper, which was probably fifteen years or so ago, are at risk. Now, they have all been stored in varying conditions, so some are in better condition than others, but ultimately virtually all of that material will self-destruct.

Senator PELL. Do either you or Mr. Strong have a view about the efficiency of the gas method that is being used, or do you know of any other methods that can be used?

Mr. SUMMERS. There are several other processes that have been developed and there is some controversy within the technical field about the various economics of those. I think it is a bit early to make a determination as to which of those is clearly going to be, in the long run, the most economic process.

Senator PELL. Thank you. Mr. Strong, speaking for the ALA, what is the general reaction of your communities nationally to the new proposed Act as opposed to the old one?

Mr. STRONG. I am not speaking for the ALA. Mr. Summers was. Senator PELL. I’m sorry. I have it confused.

Mr. STRONG. That’s okay. I would like to comment on that, if I might.

Senator PELL. That’s right. You are from California, the most populous state we have.

Mr. STRONG. We have a few people to work with. As I indicated at the beginning of my testimony, I am enthusiastically in support of the reauthorization of LSCA.

We have used it effectively over its entire life and differently in each generation of the development of our library services. I am concerned that we continue to support a broad range of library development and not separate out either people or institutions and hold them apart from general growth and development of an entire state’s intellectual community.

I am concerned that that is—we have been allowed within LSCA to meet our state’s needs and they differ from California to other states. I am concerned that the Act proposed by the administration further segments out parts of our populations.

I believe, unlike, I think, some others, that in order to keep accounting for the service to economically disadvantaged and whatnot, that may in fact put us into some record keeping that might not allow us to provide services but to concentrate only on the record keeping aspects of it.
Senator Pell. Thank you very much indeed. I would ask unanimous consent that we insert in the record the question of the resolution in the state of Rhode Island concerning the acid-free papers and also a copy of the resolution of the American Library Association.

Chairman Williams. If there is no objection.

[The material to be supplied follows:]
WHEREAS, It is now widely recognized and scientifically demon-
strated that acidic papers commonly used in documents, books, and
other publications for more than a century are self-destructing and
will continue to self destruct; and

WHEREAS, Rhode Islanders are facing the prospect of continuing to
lose state and national historical records, including government
records, faster than salvage efforts can be mounted despite the dedi-
cated efforts of many libraries, archives and agencies; and

WHEREAS, There is an urgent need to prevent the acid paper prob-
lem from continuing into the indefinite future by means which already
exist, inasmuch as acid free permanent papers with a life of several
hundred years already exist and are being produced at prices competi-
tive with acid papers; and

WHEREAS, Most government agencies do not require the use of per-
manent papers for appropriate state records and publications; and

WHEREAS, Paper manufacturers have stated that a sufficient supply
of acid free papers would be produced if publishers would specify the
use of acid free papers; and

WHEREAS, Senator Claiborne Pell has introduced a joint resolution
in the United States Senate to establish a national policy on perma-
nent papers; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the members of this senate of the state of Rhode
Island and Providence Plantations urge that a state policy on the use
of acid free papers for the printing of state publications be esta-
lished; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the secretary of state be and she hereby is
authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this
resolution to the Governor, the Director of the Department of Adminis-
tration, the Director of the Division of Purchasing and the Joint Com-
mittee on Legislative Affairs.
WHEREAS, A joint resolution to establish a national policy on permanent papers, S.J.Res. 394, was introduced in the Senate in October 1988 by Senator Claiborne Pell (D-RI), Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and

WHEREAS, Senator Pell has announced his intention to reintroduce the resolution early in 1989, and similar legislation may be introduced in the House; and

WHEREAS, The American Library Association urged publishers and federal, state and local governments to use permanent paper for books and other publications of enduring value in a resolution passed by the ALA Council on January 13, 1988, (1987-88 CD #34); and

WHEREAS, The ALA resolution noted that about one-fourth of the books in research library collections have become so embrittled that pages will break or crumble with use, and that hundreds of millions of dollars will be spent to salvage brittle materials if they continue to be printed on the acidic paper in general use since about 1850; and

WHEREAS, Extensive research conducted over the past several decades has demonstrated that alkaline papers have a significantly longer shelf life than acidic papers; and

WHEREAS, Production of alkaline paper in the U.S. has increased steadily within the last two years, is expected to double over the next two years, and is priced competitively; and

WHEREAS, S.J.Res. 394 would resolve that it is the policy of the U.S. that federal publications of enduring value be produced on acid-free, permanent papers and would specifically: (1) recommend that federal agencies require use of permanent paper for publications of enduring value; (2) recommend that federal agencies require use of archival quality papers for permanently valuable federal records; (3) recommend that American publishers use permanent papers for publications of enduring value, voluntarily comply with national standards, and note use of acid-free papers in publications and listings; (4) recommend that reliable statistics be produced on current and needed production of permanent papers; (5) recommend that the State Department make known this national policy to foreign governments and international agencies; and (6) require that the Library of Congress, the National Archives and Records Administration, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library jointly monitor progress and report annually to Congress; now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, That the American Library Association strongly support S.J.Res. 394, to establish a national policy on permanent papers, and its successor measures; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the American Library Association express its appreciation to Senator Claiborne Pell, and offer support and assistance to Senator Pell and the chief sponsors of similar measures in the 101st Congress in establishing as national policy that federal records, books, and other publications of enduring value be produced on alkaline papers.

Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association
Washington, D. C.
January 11, 1989
(Council Document #37)
Chairman Williams. Mr. Owens?

Mr. Owens. As you might have heard earlier, I regret the fact that the president has chosen to take a rather oversimplified approach in his initiative on education and leave out libraries as being an important component in that approach.

Could you help us by documenting some ways, and maybe you can’t do that now but I would be happy if you could later on in writing submit to us some ways which document the interconnection between public library services and the formal education effort that takes place in our public schools and in our colleges and universities.

What kinds of demands are being made on you? Whether the president sees it or not, I think the public perceives you as being a major resource for their students, students in elementary and secondary schools as well as students in college.

What kinds of demands do you have that you think you can document and make the case that libraries definitely should be included in the initiative that any president takes to help education?

Dr. Summers. Mr. Owens, as you know, the public library is a major educational institution in any community.

Last year we did a study at Florida State University on behalf of our state library of the contribution that public libraries make to education, and that study is now being replicated in about three other states.

I certainly would be happy to make available to the committee a copy of that study, because it clearly demonstrates in the area of literacy and in the area of services to preschool, school age and young adults that the public library makes a maximum contribution to the education of our citizens.

I think that the education of children is a broad problem in any community and we are concerned about the children who join the large army of homeless of people in this country when the school closes and come to the public library.

One of the efforts that many states have underway is to use LSCA and local dollars to attempt to address that problem and to improve the quality of library services to children through the public library.

There are many efforts underway, and we certainly would be happy to document many of those.

Mr. Owens. Your study sounds exactly like what we could use and I would love to have a copy of it.

Just one question, Mr. Strong. When I visited California some time ago and first met you, you raised the question that has been on my mind about the possibility of having the Library of Congress’ resources made more readily available to state libraries. I wondered if there had been any progress in that.

Considering the fact that we are emphasizing in this bill networks and sharing and the Library of Congress has the most to share and in many cases has certainly encouraged networks, have we had any movement forward in terms of the kinds of things that we are able to move from the Library of Congress down to the level of the state libraries?
Mr. STRONG. I am beginning to see some real breakthroughs in that. The planning process, as you know, is underway at the Library of Congress.

I had the privilege of serving on the National Advisory Committee to the Librarian of Congress, and it was again one of the issues that I brought to attention during the course of that discussion.

The American Memory project and the Celebration of the States projects that are being undertaken by the Center for the Book are small first steps in that direction.

I think further attention to the National Referral Network with respect to the provision of reference services and using the Library of Congress more effectively by the various states to answer questions for which we cannot find answers or to have the resources within the respective states—and I understand that proposals are coming forward to begin those pilot projects very soon.

Mr. OWENS. So you are satisfied that we are making progress?

Mr. STRONG. I think we are making progress. I am not sure I am satisfied that it is going fast enough.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Poshard?

Mr. PosHARD. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to follow up somewhat on what Mr. Owens was just commenting on.

Mr. Strong, in your testimony you indicated that one of the more important ways that the federal program can most effectively assist states is in the encouragement of individual innovation and creative problem-solving and individual attention to education of children.

Mr. Summers, you indicated in your testimony reference to the Summer Library programs in your state and the innovative programs that are available through your system to encourage children to read. I think this is of major importance in this country today, given the lack of reading ability among many of our children.

In view of that charge for the library systems in this country, how do we reconcile that with the tremendous shortage of librarians right now?

It is my understanding that over the past ten years we have had a decrease of about 45 percent in the numbers of people that are graduating in library science. Where are we going to get the people to do these kinds of fundamental educational programs that are so closely associated with our library systems? Should the federal government play any role in beginning to emphasize the need for more librarians and a role in perhaps helping people to access those programs more easily?

Mr. STRONG. I would like to respond to that first, if I may.

I feel very strongly about that as state librarian. I see every day when I travel the state, when I go into neighborhood branches, when I go in particularly into school libraries, most of which in our state are now run by volunteers and PTA groups—it is a very serious issue for us.

We are doing, I believe, some small things. First, we started in 1976 and we have continued each year, with tripling of funds this year, a minority recruitment scholarship program. We provide scholarship assistance under LSCA directly to minority candidates
entering graduate school in library science. They in turn go out and add to the number of minority librarians that are able and capable of serving in a variety of our communities across the state. We also have begun doing much more continuing education training along with other providers in the state.

Thirdly, two years ago, again recognizing the needs you have identified, we worked with our state association very closely and have developed a recruitment package. The image of librarians is always an issue. I happen to think we are darned good people. Salaries are not the greatest in the world, but they are still very good.

We began telling the story of what librarians do in society, what information’s role is in society, and trying to attract young people to the profession, and we quit talking about libraries diving off the edge, but talking about the key and important role that they play and moving more effectively to recruiting young people into library and information science careers.

Mr. PosHARD. Are you satisfied that you are meeting with some success in that venture, then?

Mr. STRONG. We are meeting with some success. It is kind of like the answer I gave Major Owens. I think we are doing some things. I don’t believe we are doing enough yet, primarily because of lack of funds.

I wish we could get into every high school. We had posters this last year and bookmarks and brochures. We have gotten into many more recruitment nights in high schools than ever before, but still it is a small portion of what we could be doing.

Dr. SUMMERS. Thank you for your question, Mr. Poshard.

The American Library Association has been very concerned about that problem. We went through a period of decline in the 1980s when truly the number of library positions fell, because our public investment in libraries fell off.

Things are on the upswing, particularly at the local and state levels. We do have increased demands. ALA has a major recruitment effort underway that is featuring publicity on the problem and efforts to address it. Innovative states like California and others are undertaking state efforts, frequently LSCA funded. We think we are beginning to make progress. I might add that these declines in the numbers of libraries have directly paralleled the declines in our investment in the Higher Education Act Title II-B library programs, which have been severely reduced, and consequently the number of people we can reach has declined, particularly minority people.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Goodling is unable to remain with us, and he has asked that his statement be placed in the record. Without objection, we will do that.

[The prepared statement of Hon. William F. Goodling follows:]

Openig Statement of Hon. William F. Goodling, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. Chairman, as a long time supporter of libraries, I am pleased to be here today, at this joint hearing with our Senate colleagues on the Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities. The Library Services and Construction Act is important Federal legislation. The LSCA is the largest Federal program of assistance and supports the services of some 15,000 libraries nationally.
In Pennsylvania, we have a strong library system, and this morning we will be hearing the testimony of Sara Parker, the State Librarian of Pennsylvania.

Ms. Parker has been our State Librarian only a short time—since June of 1988. Prior to that time, she was State Librarian of Montana, and I am sure that Pat Williams, Chairman of the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee, will join me in welcoming Ms. Parker to our joint hearing today.

Somehow, there seems to be a Pennsylvania-Montana connection in the library community. Ms. Parker is the second State Librarian in Pennsylvania to have served in the same position in Montana, and two of Montana's State Librarians have previously served as librarians in Pennsylvania. It seems an equal trade, and I look forward to hearing your testimony today, Ms. Parker, and to working with you to strengthen Pennsylvania's libraries and services in the future.

Chairman Williams. If there are no further questions, we are very pleased that both of you came and—oh, Mr. Hayes, you are still with us. I thought I saw you get up and leave. Truly, I am sorry.

Mr. Hayes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Williams. You thought I was taking that penalty box that you put yourself in permanently, didn't you?

Mr. Hayes. It is hard for me to leave the room with my obesity without being noticed.

[Laughter.]

I do have one—I don't know whether it is a question or a request for some elaboration to Dr. Summers.

In dealing with the administration's proposed legislation which we are discussing, you said, "I will not take time here to summarize the provisions of the proposed legislation, but I would like to indicate a few problem areas."

In listing those problem areas there, I would like maybe some further explanation on at least two of them—I guess they are somewhat interrelated—specifically dealing with Title I.

You said half of the Title I funds will be allocated in proportion to poverty populations rather than total populations, with as yet uncalculated effects on current state allotments and programs. Could you elaborate on that a little bit?

Dr. Summers. The present Act allocates funds according to the state's population and the proposed Act would relate that allocation to the proportion of the population in poverty.

We have not as yet seen a calculation of what those amounts would be to each of the states, so we don't know what the dollar impact on each state would be under that proposal.

Mr. Hayes. You go on to say that state and local flexibility would be considerably narrowed. The proposed Title I lists only two purposes—enhancing educational opportunities or facilitating greater use of library services for the economically disadvantaged or handicapped individuals.

You seem to be somewhat reaching a conclusion that you would wind up getting less.

Dr. Summers. I think that is our concern, but beyond that is the fact that this Act's greatest strength has been its flexibility to adapt to the needs in each state and each locality. The witnesses before us spoke about the need for targeting of federal dollars. The Act now provides for targeting and it makes that targeting decision at the state level.

I think we believe that is the appropriate place to make it, rather than in the Act itself or at administrative discretion.
Mr. Hayes. You wouldn't disagree with the fact that we are dividing up scarcity. There aren't enough dollars.

Dr. Summers. No, sir, I don't disagree with that at all.

Mr. Hayes. You talk about the poverty population. They are the ones who usually wind up getting the shortest attention when it comes to what we are trying to do in the library programs.

I would hope that you are not saying that, because the administration is proposing to reach out to them, that this is going to deprive those who may be in a little different economic position from them.

Dr. Summers. No, sir. I don't believe that we are saying that LSCA dollars should not be focused on the needs of disadvantaged citizens and I don't believe that the record we have developed to date demonstrates that that is happening. We have a very good record of state-based library programs addressed to the needs of disadvantaged citizens.

Mr. Hayes. Then you agree with me that it would be to our advantage, both of us, to put our shoulders to the wheel, to try to get more money through this administration, rather than to get into a debate over who gets more and who doesn't, you know.

Dr. Summers. Absolutely. That is the root of the problem, is the scarcity of the resource, not the way it has been addressed.

Mr. Hayes. That's right. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Williams. Again, our thanks to this panel. We appreciate your being with us.

Mr. Strong. Thank you very much.

Chairman Williams. The four witnesses of the third panel will come forward. They are Ms. Parker, Mr. Beck, Ms. Elliott and Mr. Abrams.

Well, Sara, as you know, Congressman Goodling stopped by to say hello to you as a fellow Pennsylvanian, but I want to welcome you here as a fellow Montanan. I think I can accurately portray it inasmuch as you were our state librarian for most of this decade and we were, of course, sorry to see you leave—delighted with your replacement, but we would rather have both of you.

It is nice to see you here, Ms. Parker. Welcome. We will be pleased to have your testimony.

STATEMENT OF SARA PARKER, STATE LIBRARIAN, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Ms. Parker. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I am someone who can certainly testify to the diversity of the program in the various states. I want to testify today about Title VI, the Library Literacy Programs.

Public libraries have a long and very distinguished history of efforts in adult education and literacy which goes back into the nineteenth century. An inventory was done in 1988 and it found fifty-two different kinds of literacy activities going on in public libraries.

Libraries contribute to the public understanding of illiteracy and offer a wide range of educational activities. This includes the recruitment and training of volunteers. It includes the provision of collections of materials. It includes being founding members of coa-
litions and often libraries act as central coordination of recruit-
ment and referral for the illiterate.

I would ask you to remember the words of the Senator, and li-
braries truly are both without stigma and a neutral place in which
no value judgment is made.

Under Title VI the need has always been twice the amount of
available funds. Each year the grants submitted in this discretion-
ary program have become more numerous and more competitive
for the limited amount of dollars.

Title VI has had great impact at the state level, particularly in
the formation of statewide coalitions to bring all players in literacy
together. The 1988 Montana grant to the state library is an exam-
ple of that.

In 1986 the state library of Pennsylvania obtained a grant and
used it to produce a manual of literacy options for local libraries.

The projects under Title VI are clustered into four major types of
activities: public awareness, the provision of materials, tutoring,
the training of volunteers and other people to work with adult
learners.

Authorization of this title and the authorization levels for the
funds within it need to increase. Libraries use both Title I and
Title VI to leverage other funds. We are grateful that the Depart-
ment acknowledges that there is a federal role in literacy and we
particularly appreciate this as a congressional priority.

I would say to you that the needs are great and there is need for
rapid action on the reauthorization so that no programs may be
disrupted and the literacy efforts may continue.

Let me speak to two Pennsylvania projects which illustrate, I
think, the diversity.

Crawford County is a rural county in western Pennsylvania. It is
multiethnic. Meadville is the largest community and in this liter-
acy effort nine libraries worked together in a county in which it is
estimated that there are 12,000 people who cannot read and write.

A small beginning was made locally in 1983. A Title I grant in
1985 began county efforts. Title VI grants obtained have provided
for a full-time coordinator, materials in all nine libraries, volun-
teers in each community and television recruiting.

A Crawford County person, newly literate, writes, "Three weeks
ago I drove to Virginia and didn't have any trouble reading maps
and road signs. Before I learned to read I really didn't enjoy my
vacations. I felt very disgusted with myself. I had to depend on my
wife or son to read the maps and road signs. I saw an ad on televi-
sion about people who couldn't read. They gave me a number to
call and I called it."

The Free Library of Philadelphia is in a city in which it is esti-
mated that between 200,000 and 500,000 people are illiterate in a
population of 1.6 million. Adult educators have told the Free Li-
brary of Philadelphia that what they need are books and resource
materials to use to teach adults.

Literacy efforts in that library began in 1965 and continue
strongly under a Mayor's Coalition of Literacy. English as a second
language has always been a part of that project. A Title VI grant
provided for the compilation and the publication of a curriculum
guide for English as a second language, which has been distributed nationwide.

It is important, you know, that based upon this guide $75,000 of literacy funds appropriated by the legislature of Pennsylvania are being used in Philadelphia to purchase the multiple copies of the materials evaluated in the guide.

One of the phrases used in adult education that I am impressed by is that there is a need for a cumulative sequence if we are to have lasting and permanent change. Nowhere is this more important than in the nation's literacy efforts.

I urge you to act promptly to reauthorize the Library Services and Construction Act, to continue the emphasis on literacy as a congressional priority through Title VI, to expand the authorization levels and to continue the good work that is going forward as a result of both Title I and Title VI activities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Sara Parker follows:]
Statement of
Sara A. Parker, State Librarian
STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
before the
Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
and the
House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
April 11, 1989

I am Sara Parker, State Librarian of Pennsylvania. Thank you for the opportunity to testify before your subcommittees on the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act and specifically the importance of Title VI-Library Literacy Programs.

Public libraries have a long and distinguished history of efforts in adult education and in ensuring a literate society. Adult learning was an important part of the structure of public library service by the 1900's. Many public libraries are noted for the work done with immigrants in the early decades of this century and support of settlement houses, evening schools and other efforts to ensure all could read and write the English language.

A survey report on libraries and literacy prepared for the U.S. Department of Education in May 1988 found 52 separate literacy activities going on in public libraries. From these, specific roles and missions of libraries in literacy emerge.

Libraries contribute to the public understanding of the nature of illiteracy and ways to increase adult literacy. They plan and conduct educational activities for adults seeking to become literate. They also recruit and train volunteers.

Libraries play key roles in providing collections of literacy materials for those learning to read, for new readers, for the tutors who teach and for those who manage literacy programs. Provision of materials includes the preparation and dissemination of both print and electronic materials including basic education microcomputer software.

Libraries also have been founding members and strong participants in literacy coalitions. They often serve as central coordination points for recruitment and referrals for both literacy students and volunteers.

As institutions, libraries are well suited to be an important force in the literacy movement. Libraries celebrate the uniqueness of each individual person and tailor services to the needs of individual users. For libraries, literacy activities are part of a constellation of library services, all of which are intimately related to reading and obtaining information. For the illiterate, libraries are without stigma. They are neutral places in which value judgments are not made about abilities or handicaps.
In the first three years of the LSCA Title VI program, 1,318 applications have been received and 708 funded. In 1989, 531 applications have been received and the U.S. Department of Education estimates approximately 224 can be funded. Need has always been over twice the amount of available funds. The program becomes more competitive each year. Shrinking dollars and reaching the top of the authorization are now critical concerns.

There is strong evidence in analysis of these grants that one of the most important features of Title VI Projects has been the coming together of all agencies who work with literacy. Seventy-eight percent of the first year grantees reported this kind of activity. Particularly important are those grants which have had statewide impact in providing for the establishment of coalitions at the state level. The 1988 grant to the Montana State Library is an example of this. Projects such as the one awarded the State Library of Pennsylvania in 1986 which produced a manual for libraries on planning adult literacy services encourage efforts in local libraries. Many of the grants have provided personnel, always difficult under existing library budgets and critical in managing volunteer efforts.

Projects have clustered into four major types: those for public awareness of the problems of illiteracy; the provision of materials; tutoring those who cannot read; and training volunteers and others to work in literacy efforts.

New trends which are emerging are: intergenerational activities which hope to break the cycle of illiteracy by teaching parents to read and encouraging them to read to children; services to the handicapped, especially learning disabled adults; and the uses of new technology to help build literacy skills. Service to those in institutions, particularly prisons, is also an emerging trend. A grant to the State Library of Pennsylvania in 1987 produced a manual for developing literacy programs in correctional institutions.

As you consider the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act, I ask you to provide for the continuation of Title VI as an important acknowledgement of and commitment to a federal role in enabling libraries to work in literacy. The provision of a separate title identifies to all libraries and to all agencies working with libraries, the Congressional priority for keeping a literate society.

The authorization level for the Title needs to be increased. Libraries have shown much creativity in using both Title I and Title VI to leverage other funds and to expand efforts into new areas. The needs are great and rapid action for reauthorization of the program is needed to continue the momentum that has been achieved.

There needs to be increased coordination between this Title administered as a discretionary grant by the U.S. Office of Education and the state-based programs under the other Titles of LSCA. The act should require the Secretary of Education to develop and use a grant application process that enables the State Librarian to comment on the degree to which applications are consistent with the State Plan. I have attached to this testimony language which could be inserted as Subsection (h) in Section 6 - PLANS AND PROGRAMS to ensure this coordination. This would also ensure coordination of Title VI grants with whatever funds may be available from state revenues.
Grants to two Pennsylvania libraries demonstrate the importance of literacy activities under LSCA and the diverse services and projects funded under this program.

The Crawford County Federated Library System led by the Meadville, Pennsylvania, Public Library is an organization of nine independent libraries banded together to share resources and to serve the diverse needs of a multi-ethnic, economically varied, rural county. The Read program began in 1983. Approximately 700 adult county residents did not attend school beyond the third grade and it was estimated there were 12,000 functionally illiterate adults in Crawford County. Concerned citizens banded together to form the Crawford County Literacy Council. The Council began a small Laubach program, a group of volunteers was trained and one-on-one tutoring of students began in the Meadville Public Library. A LSCA Title I grant was awarded in 1985. This enabled the program to expand county wide. Through the Title VI discretionary grants, a full-time coordinator is responsible for the program. Book collections of high interest, low level materials are established in each of the nine libraries and the training of volunteer tutors has occurred in every community having a library.

Most important, LSCA Title VI funds have enabled the program to begin television advertising to recruit students. Ads are played at many times during the day and evening, including prime time. During the first year of advertising, student enrollment increased 300%.

A Crawford County person, newly literate, writes,

"Three weeks ago I drove to Virginia and didn't have any trouble reading maps and road signs. Before I learned to read I really didn't enjoy my vacations. I felt very disgusted with myself. I had to depend on my wife or son to read the maps and road signs. I saw an ad on television about people who couldn't read, they gave a number and I called it. When I called, the lady wanted me to come in and talk with her at the library. When I went to the library and walked up to the doors, I was scared. After I went in I felt much better. I arranged to take lessons from a private tutor at no cost to me. I only had to pay for the books. At first I was very nervous when I met my tutor. She was very understanding, easy to work with and very nice. Reading keeps getting more fascinating. I like to read now."

A Title VI project also took place at the Free Library of Philadelphia. Estimates of the number of functionally illiterate adults vary and range from 200,000 to 500,000 people in a city with a population of 1.6 million. In 1965, the Free Library of Philadelphia began addressing adult illiteracy. They found a number of agencies and organizations were already hard at work teaching and tutoring adults. The library, it was decided, could best serve the Philadelphia community by supplementing rather than duplicating the services already in place. What they needed, adult educators said, were books and resource materials. And so the Free Library of Philadelphia began the process of locating, reviewing and buying books.
From the beginning, the Reader Development Program has provided English-as-a-second-language materials. To strengthen this effort, the Free Library of Philadelphia applied for and received a Title VI grant to hire three consultants to produce a curriculum guide for English as a second language. That guide is now published and has been made available to other libraries throughout the United States.

How federal and state funds work together is shown in this Philadelphia project. State funds in the amount of $75,000 are being used to purchase the multiple copies of materials which were reviewed and recommended by the guide.

William S. Learned writing to librarians in 1924 spoke of adult education and the "cumulative sequence necessary to give it significant and lasting value." If we are truly to address illiteracy as a matter of public policy and to have as our goal a literate society, it is necessary that we have that "cumulative sequence." Title VI is important to give libraries the ability to begin and continue to make substantive contributions within the cumulative sequence.

I hope you will take prompt action and reauthorize the Library Services and Construction Act this session to ensure essential statewide and local library service programs, including literacy projects, continue without disruption.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you.

Attachment
ATTACHMENT

Recommended Addition to
Library Services and Construction Act

Subsection (h), Section 6
PLANS AND PROGRAMS

for the
Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities

and the
House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education

We recommend that the following language be inserted as subsection (h) in Section 6 - PLANS AND PROGRAMS; The Secretary shall coordinate programs under LSCA Titles V and VI and Higher Education Act Title II with the State programs assisted by the Federal Library Services and Construction Act, and shall afford to the head of the State Library Administrative Agency the opportunity to comment on any application for such program before an LSCA Title V, LSCA VI, or HEA Title II-D grant is made, in order to assure that such grants from the Secretary are for purposes consistent with the long range program required under Section 6 (d) of this Act."

Sara Parker
State Librarian
State Library of Pennsylvania
April 11, 1989
Chairman Williams. Thank you. Mr. Earl Beck is the Chairman of the Mississippi Library Commission at Grenada.

Mr. Beck. That's correct.

Chairman Williams. Do you say Gren-AH-da?

Mr. Beck. Gren-AY-da. It was Gren-AY-da until the invasion of Gren-AH-da.

[Laughter.]

Chairman Williams. Well, we are pleased you're here, Mr. Beck. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF R. EARL BECK, CHAIRMAN, MISSISSIPPI LIBRARY COMMISSION.

Mr. Beck. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today about public libraries. As chairman of the Mississippi Library Commission I know that LSCA funded projects are vital to a rural state like Mississippi. Also, as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the County Library in a city of 12,000, I want to tell you the impact that these funds have on the folks back home.

LSCA Title I funds are used in Mississippi to insure that public library materials are available to the disadvantaged. This includes low income populations like Sharkey and Tunica Counties in the Mississippi delta, literacy programs at the state penitentiary that teach prison inmates to read, and special local projects aimed at serving the elderly and minorities.

At the Elizabeth Jones Library in Grenada, this means that our staff has been able to serve some very special patrons. Some of these examples include Mrs. Ethel George of Grenada, who reads five to six novels every week of the year.

Now, I know this doesn't sound too spectacular until you know the rest of the story. Mrs. George is 101 years of age and can only read large print books that we got with LSCA funds earmarked for the elderly.

Again, on a statewide basis, LSCA Title I has funded out nationally recognized book sharing network. The Library Commission coordinates a program that makes the books and materials in every Mississippi public library available to every single library patron in the state. This ongoing resource sharing project lets us get more for our money.

A patron in Tupelo, which is our most northern location or library in the state, can borrow a book from Biloxi, which is our most southern location.

In my home town of Grenada this means that the Elizabeth Jones Library staff can help a junior college student like Rhodean Tillman research her term paper on Mississippi native Miss Leon-tyne Price and her role in the civil rights movement.

It means that we can get English-to-Chinese primers and English books so that Mary Evans can tutor a Chinese immigrant who wants to speak and read English so that he can work in the family restaurant in Grenada, Mississippi.

As president of my state's third largest financial institution, I am keenly aware of our need to develop the job skills of our youth...
and to share the knowledge of our colleges and universities with business leaders across the state.

LSCA funds are used to develop the technology of the university libraries so that they have been added to the statewide book sharing network used so successfully by the public libraries.

This makes the holdings of all of the universities available to the library patrons and gives college students access to the books and materials in all the public libraries.

To me at my local library in Mississippi this means that we are able to respond to some very special needs. When our mayor, L.V. Boone, and I were working with executives from Newsprint South we were able to borrow some technical materials on building odorless paper mills. We needed that paper mill and the 220 new jobs that it would offer Grenada County, but we needed for it to be odorless.

This is a fine example of how the library was able to assist the economic development back home.

Gentlemen, LSCA funds have an enormous impact on the library services available to people in Mississippi and continue to provide books to homebound elderly, Braille services to the blind and resource materials to the promising college students.

For these reasons I urge you to again reauthorize the Library Services and Construction Act for the next five-year period.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of R. Earl Beck follows:]
Testimony of R. Earl Beck before the Joint Hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts & Humanities and the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education regarding the Library Services and Construction Act.

Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today about public libraries. As chairman of the Mississippi Library Commission, I know that LSCA funded projects are vital to a rural state like Mississippi.

As chairman of the Board of Trustees of the county library board in a city of 12,000, I want to tell you the impact these funds have on the folks back home.

LSCA Title I funds are used in Mississippi to insure that public library materials are available to the disadvantaged. This includes low income populations like Sharkey and Tunica Counties in the Mississippi Delta, literacy programs at the state penitentiary that teach prison inmates to read, and special local programs aimed at serving the elderly and minorities.

At the Elizabeth Jones Library in Grenada this means that our staff has been able to serve some very special patrons.

Mrs. Ethel George of Grenada reads five or six novels every week of the year. That doesn't sound too spectacular until you know the rest of the story. Mrs. George is 101 years old and can only read large print books that we get with LSCA funds earmarked for the elderly.

Again, on a statewide basis, LSCA Title I has funded our nationally recognized book sharing network. The Library Commission coordinates a program that makes the books and materials in every Mississippi public library available to every single library patron in the state. This ongoing resource sharing project lets us get more for our money. And a patron in Tupelo can borrow a book from the Biloxi library collection.
In my home town of Grenada, this means that the Elizabeth Jones Library staff can help a junior college student like Rhodean Tillman research her term paper on Mississippi native Leontyne Price and her role in the Civil Rights Movement.

It means that we can get English to Chinese primers and language books so that Mary Evans can tutor a Chinese immigrant who wants to speak and read English so he can work in the family’s restaurant in Grenada, Mississippi.

As President of my state’s third largest financial institution, I am keenly aware of our need to develop the job skills of our youth and to share the knowledge of our colleges and universities with business leaders across the state. LSCA funds are used to develop the technology at the university libraries so that they have been added to the statewide book sharing network used so successfully by the public libraries. This makes the holdings of all the universities available to public library patrons and gives college students access to the books and materials in all the public libraries.

To me at my local library in Mississippi, this means that we are able to respond to some very special needs.

When Mayor L.V. Boone and I were working with executives from Newsprint South we were able to borrow some very technical materials on building odorless paper mills. We needed that paper mill and the 220 new jobs it promised to Grenada County. But, we needed it to be odorless. This is a fine example of how the library was able to assist the economic development back home.

Gentlemen, LSCA funds have had an enormous impact on the library services available to the people of Mississippi and can continue to provide books to homebound elderly, Braille services to the blind and resource materials to a promising college student. For these reasons, I urge you to again authorize funding for the Library Services and Construction Act for the next five year period.

Thank you very much.
Chairman Williams. Thank you. Ms. Elliott is the Director of the St. Joseph’s Public Library in St. Joseph, Missouri. We are pleased you are with us.

STATEMENT OF DOROTHY ELLIOTT, PRESIDENT, MISSOURI LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, AND DIRECTOR, ST. JOSEPH PUBLIC LIBRARY, ST. JOSEPH, MISSOURI.

Ms. Elliott. Thank you. Good morning. My name is Dorothy Sanborn Elliott and I am the president of the Missouri Library Association as well as the Director of the St. Joseph Public Library in St. Joseph, Missouri.

I deeply appreciate being asked to present my views on the role technology plays in the operation of a public library and to suggest how LSCA might be modified to reflect the technology needs of public libraries.

A public library is no different from any other public institution or private company in that technology has changed how we do business.

We now are able to store and retrieve information, to catalog our holdings, to print text at dizzying speeds and to handle a dissemination of our holdings electronically.

Yet, because of the use of technology, what public libraries do is changing perhaps more rapidly than how they do it. Since the passage of the Library Services Act in 1956 and the Library Services and Construction Act in 1964, the capabilities and, indeed, the very form of public libraries have changed with the introduction of new technologies.

Fortunately, the LSCA amendments of 1984 recognized that the expanding role of libraries now includes, among other things, sharing resources and materials among a wide variety of libraries.

Public libraries are also now acknowledged as community information centers which should utilize improved and new technologies to meet the increasing need for information services and educational resources of Americans in a rapidly changing world.

The 1984 amendments also stipulated that the basic state plan should provide that priority be given to programs and projects that increase service and access to services through the effective use of technology.

I mentioned earlier that technology is affecting what we do almost more than how we do it. Before LSCA public libraries were collections of materials in mostly print format, for use by a local constituency only.

Now they are more methods of access to materials in both print and electronic formats which may or may not be housed in their own facilities.

The limitation of the print format is often timeliness and technology allows the public library to obtain and use information while it is still current.

At the same time, technology allows for rapid duplication of parts of useful information in print format and transmission across great distances to other libraries.
The public library which I represent has benefited from several LSCA grants, which are improving our abilities both to loan and to borrow materials.

Over a year ago an LSCA grant was used for the creation of a magnetic tape containing the merged records of the book holdings of the St. Joseph Public Library, which serves approximately 72,000 residents of the city of St. Joseph, and the Rolling Hills Consolidated Library, which serves approximately 30,000 residents of the annexed portions of the city of St. Joseph, Andrew County north of St. Joseph and rural Buchanan County.

These records also have been added to an LSCA funded statewide data base in compact disk format, which can be accessed by LSCA supported microcomputers and CD-ROM equipment placed in 107 qualifying public libraries in Missouri.

In addition, the St. Joseph/Rolling Hills tape will serve as the basis for a joint integrated automated system, making our combined holdings accessible to both rural and urban users alike.

This outside support has served as an incentive for our two library boards to sign an agreement to form a new regional library, the River Bluffs Regional Library, which will make better use of our combined resources.

Yet progress has its problems. Telling people electronically about what is available in our collections increases the use of these collections. Another penalty of technology is that you become dependent on it, and furthermore commitment to technology is a commitment to replacement costs.

One of the problems with the restrictions on LSCA funds is that it is considered seed money. The local library then is left with the responsibility of raising a child.

Should you modify LSCA to reflect the technology needs of public libraries? If you modify it, increase the authorization for all appropriations, especially for interlibrary corporations.

LSCA should support not only the development of the collections of major resource libraries, but the use of these collections as supported by technology.

The most important thing for the Congress to do is to save LSCA. LSCA grants have, partly through the use of technology, enabled libraries like the River Bluffs Regional Library to cross jurisdictional boundaries, to reduce costs, to broaden access to materials and to coordinate the purchase of our resources.

In drought-stricken northwest Missouri we could not have made the progress we have made without federal help. Public libraries in Missouri are supported primarily by local property taxes. In our area the value of farmland is declining and the library tax base is stagnant, yet this is at a time when information is proliferating faster than ever before.

Technology is still expensive, yet without public access to it this country will see a continually widening gap between the information-rich and the information-poor, no progress in the war against illiteracy and a decreasing ability to sustain economic development both at home and abroad.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Dorothy Elliott follows:]
Good morning. My name is Dorothy Sanborn Elliott, and I am the president of the Missouri Library Association as well as the director of the St. Joseph Public Library in St. Joseph, Missouri. I deeply appreciate being asked to present my views on the role technology plays in the operation of a public library and to suggest how LSCA might be modified to reflect the technology needs of public libraries.

A public library is no different from any other public institution or private company in that technology has changed how we do business. We now are able to store and retrieve information, to catalog our holdings, to print text at dizzying speeds, and to handle the dissemination of our holdings electronically. Yet because of the use of technology what public libraries do is changing more rapidly perhaps than how they do it.

Since the passage of the Library Services Act in 1956 and the Library Services and Construction Act in 1964, the capabilities and indeed the very form of public libraries have changed with the introduction of new technologies. Fortunately, the LSCA Amendments of 1984 recognized that the expanding role of libraries now includes, among other things, sharing resources and materials among a wide variety of libraries. Public libraries also are now acknowledged as community information centers which should utilize improved and new technologies to meet the increasing need for information services and educational resources of Americans in a rapidly changing world. The 1984 amendments also stipulated that the basic State plan shall provide that priority be given to programs and projects that increase services and access to services through effective use of technology.

I mentioned earlier that technology is affecting what we do almost more than how we do it. Before LSCA public libraries were collections of materials in mostly print format for use by a local constituency only. Now they are more methods of access to materials in both print and electronic formats which may or may not be housed in their own facilities.

The limitation of the print format is often timeliness, and technology allows the public library to obtain and use information while it is still current. At the same time technology allows for rapid duplication of parts of useful information in print format and transmission across great distances to other libraries.
The public library which I represent has benefited from several LSCA grants which are improving our ability both to loan and to borrow materials. Over a year ago an LSCA grant was used for the creation of a magnetic tape containing the merged records of the book holdings of the St. Joseph Public Library, which serves approximately 72,000 residents of the City of St. Joseph, and the Rolling Hills Consolidated Library, which serves approximately 30,000 residents of the annexed portions of the City of St. Joseph, Andrew County north of St. Joseph, and rural Buchanan County. These records also have been added to an LSCA-funded statewide database in compact disc format which can be accessed by LSCA-supported microcomputers and CD-ROM equipment placed in 107 qualifying public libraries in Missouri. In addition, the St. Joseph-Rolling Hills tape will serve as the basis for a joint integrated automated system making our combined holdings accessible to both rural and urban library users alike. This outside support has served as an incentive for our two library boards to sign an agreement to form a new regional library, the River Bluffs Regional Library, which will make better use of our combined resources.

Yet progress has its problems. Telling people electronically about what is available in our collections increases the use of those collections. Another penalty of technology is that you become dependent upon it, and, furthermore, commitment to technology is a commitment to replacement costs. But one of the problems with the restrictions on LSCA funds is that it's considered "seed money." The local library, then, is left with the responsibility of raising the child.

Should you modify LSCA to reflect the technology needs of public libraries? If you modify it, increase the authorization for all appropriations, especially for interlibrary cooperation. LSCA should support not only the development of the collections of major resource libraries but the use of those collections as supported by technology. But the most important thing for the Congress to do is save LSCA. LSCA grants have, partly through the use of technology, enabled libraries like the River Bluffs Regional Library to cross jurisdictional boundaries, to reduce costs, to broaden access to materials, and to coordinate the purchase of our resources.

In drought-stricken Northwest Missouri we could not have made the progress we have made without federal help. Public libraries in Missouri are supported primarily by local property taxes. In our area the value of farm land is declining, and the library tax base is stagnant. Yet this is at a time when information is proliferating faster than ever before. Technology is still expensive, yet without public access to it this country will see a continually widening gap between the information-rich and the information-poor, no progress in the war against illiteracy, and a decreasing ability to sustain economic development both at home and abroad.
Chairman Williams. Thank you, Mr. Abrams?

STATEMENT OF GEORGE H.J. ABRAMS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SENECA-IROQUOIS NATIONAL MUSEUM, AND PRESIDENT, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, SENECA NATIONAL LIBRARY, ALLEGANY INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. Abrams. Good morning. My name is George Abrams and I am an enrolled, full-blood member of the Seneca Nation of Indians. Currently I am Executive Director of the Seneca-Iroquois National Museum on the Allegany Indian Reservation, which has a research library as part of its library services, and I am chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Seneca Nation library.

In addition, I am a Trustee of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation in New York City, whose Huntington Free Library and Reading Room contains one of the country's greatest resources on the subject of the American Indian.

Until recently, I was also a member of the Advisory Board of the D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, Newberry Library, Chicago.

I would like to thank the committees for the opportunity to address the members on the subject of tribal libraries. Today I would like to briefly address my impressions of the major importance of the Library Services and Construction Act to tribal libraries and the community that they serve.

Universally I have been urged by all of the Indian Library people whom I have contacted in anticipation of today's presentation to stress the vital importance of the LSCA to the Indian people.

Without LSCA support in both construction and services, most Indian communities would be without library services.

I have been asked to state in the strongest terms possible the indispensable role that LSCA has played and will play in the continuation of tribal libraries across the country.

As many of you may already be aware, LSCA provides financial support for generally from 160 to 170 separate tribal libraries from New York to Alaska and from Alabama to California.

In addition to the construction of tribal libraries, there are three other major areas funded by LSCA which are critical to the ongoing programs of the libraries: one, the area of purchase of materials and assisting in the updating of available resources; two, areas such as the development of research data bases involving tribal documents, collections of photographs, materials regarding world history and the conservation of vitally important library documentary collections; and three, the supplemental training of Indian Library personnel.

The above areas are critical in assisting the various tribal libraries and providing much-needed services to the client population.

It is sometimes difficult to fully appreciate the conditions under which most tribal libraries function. At Navajo it is not unusual for a patron to have to travel 100 miles to the nearest library, often over the most primitive of roads.

In other instances many tribes are not only geographically isolated, but their libraries are also vastly underfunded and understaffed.
or housed in much less than satisfactory surroundings or staffed by dedicated but untrained personnel.

It is important to state that, while many tribe recognize the vital significance of libraries and which to provide financial assistance to establish tribal libraries, for most it is impossible to underwrite the total cost of such facilities, especially when considering all of the other services that tribes are increasingly being asked to assume.

In the state of New York and perhaps three or four other states there is a line item within the state budget allocating money for the general operating support of tribal libraries. This is a fortunate situation, because otherwise it would be virtually impossible to provide services without that support.

At the present time in the state of New York there are three tribal libraries: the Akwesasne Mohawk, the Tonawanda Band of Senecas and the Seneca Nation of Indians. While LSCA provides only two percent of the total library budget, nevertheless that money is vital to the continuing operations of tribal libraries and their services within the state.

The critical nature of LSCA money to the existence of our tribal libraries is critical. Operationally, tribal libraries have established a vital cooperative relationship with library organizations within their areas. This interaction has greatly assisted the individual tribal institutions in expanding their services, but also being able to call upon the larger, more well established institutions for assistance in many technical areas.

These areas range from grantsmanship to bookkeeping, training of personnel, computerization of collections, book ordering and many other services. However, not all of the needs can be met.

The reliance on cooperation with non-Indian library organizations has opened new areas for common concerns and interests, has established positive relationships between the communities. It also has identified and stressed the need for educational programs in the library sciences for Indian people.

It is perhaps best indicated by the fact that there are currently only two or possibly three American Indian Ph.D.s in the library sciences in the United States.

Formal education and training programs in the library sciences need to be stressed as career goals for our American Indian young people.

Finally, it is also important to state that Indian libraries are becoming vital research centers for both Indian and non-Indian students. The collections of Indian interest books and periodicals, films, takes and programs are attracting not only Indian people but also non-Indian people who are patrons of Indian libraries from nearby communities.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that such collections and resources within local Indian libraries are fulfilling a felt multicom- munity need for library resources that is generally not available in surrounding community libraries.

The continuing and growing need of LSCA is strongly evident in Indian country. I hope that the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities and the House Subcommittee on Post-secondary Education will be able to enhance the services provided
to this segment of our population by increasing funding to tribal libraries.

Once again, thank you for this opportunity.

[The prepared statement of George H.J. Abrams follows:]
TESTIMONY OF GEORGE H. J. ABRAMS,
Executive Director, Seneca-Iroquois National Museum, and
President, Board of Trustees, Seneca Nation Library,
Allegany Indian Reservation,
Salamanca, New York 14779
(716) 945-1738

American Indian Libraries.
Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and
Humanities, and the House Subcommittee on
Postsecondary Education.
Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA).
Rayburn Office Building, Room #2175
Washington, D. C.
11 April 1989.
Good morning. My name is George Abrams and I am an enrolled, fullblood member of the Seneca Nation of Indians. Currently, I am Executive Director of the Seneca-Iroquois National Museum on the Allegany Indian Reservation, and am President of the Board of Trustees of the Seneca Nation Library. In addition, I am a Trustee of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, whose Huntington Free Library and Reading Room contains one of the country’s greatest resources on the subject of the American Indian. Until recently, I was also a member of the Advisory Board of the D’Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, Newberry Library, Chicago.

I would like to thank the committees for the opportunity to address the members on the subject of tribal libraries. Today, I would like to briefly address my impressions of the major importance of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) to tribal libraries and the communities that they serve. Universally, I have been urged by all of the Indian library people whom I have contacted in anticipation of today’s presentation to stress the vital importance of the LSCA to the Indian people. Without LSCA support in both construction and services, most Indian communities would be without library services. I have been asked to state in the strongest terms possible the indispensible role that LSCA has played and will play in the continuation of tribal libraries across the country.

As many of you may already be aware, LSCA provides financial support for generally from 160 to 170 separate tribal libraries from New York to Alaska, and from Alabama to California. The range of support has extended from a service request of $596.00 to construction projects of several hundred thousand dollars.

In 1989 LSCA granted basic support to 159 tribal groups and Hawaii. The average award was $3,629. In the 1988 funding year 175 basic grants were made, averaging $3,550. In addition, 17 special projects were funded ranging from $20,000 to $164,000. In 1987 there were 183 basic grants awarded to Indian tribal libraries, averaging $3,572, and 17 special projects ranging from $16,000 to $177,000. And in the previous year, 1986, there were 165 basic grants made to 165 tribal groups; with 17 special projects ranging from $596.00 to $143,000. There have been 15 new tribal library constructions in nine states during this period, including one in my home state of New York.

In addition to the construction of tribal libraries, there are three other major areas funded by LSCA which are critical to the on-going programs of the libraries: 1) the area of purchase of materials, assisting in the up-dating of available resources, 2) areas such as the development of research data bases involving tribal documents, collections of photographs, materials regarding world history, and the conservation of vital library documentary collections, and 3) the area of supplemental training of Indian library personnel.
The above areas are critical in assisting the various tribal libraries in providing critically needed services to their client population. It is sometimes difficult to fully appreciate the conditions under which most tribal libraries function. At Navajo, it is not unusual for a patron to have to travel 100 miles to the nearest library, often over the most primitive of roads. In other instances, many tribes are not only geographically isolated but their libraries are also vastly underfunded and understaffed, are housed in much less than satisfactory surroundings, or staffed by dedicated but untrained personnel. It is important to state that while many tribes recognize the vital significance of libraries and wish to provide the financial assistance to establish tribal libraries, for most it is financially impossible to underwrite the total costs of such facilities, especially when considering all of the other services that tribes are increasingly being asked to assume.

In the State of New York, and perhaps three or four other states, there is a line item within the state budget allocating money for the general operating support of tribal libraries. This is a fortunate situation because otherwise it would be virtually impossible to provide tribal library services without that support. At the present time, in the State of New York, there are three tribal libraries, the Akwesasne Mohawk, the Tonawanda Band of Senecas, and the Seneca Nation of Indians. While LSCA provides only 2% of the total library budget, nevertheless that money is vital to the continuing operation of tribal libraries and their services within the state. The critical nature of LSCA money to the existence of our tribal libraries is critical.

Operationally, tribal libraries have established a vital cooperative relationship with library organizations within their areas. This interaction has greatly assisted the individual tribal institutions in expanding their services but also being able to call upon the larger, more well established institutions for assistance in many technical areas. These areas range from grantsmanship, bookkeeping, training of personnel, computerization of collections, book ordering, and many other services. However, not all of the needs can be met.

The reliance on and cooperation with non-Indian library organizations has opened new areas where common concerns and interests have established positive relations between the communities. It also has identified and stressed the need for educational programs in the library sciences for Indian people. This is perhaps best indicated by the fact that there are currently only two, or possibly three, American Indian Ph. D.'s in the library sciences in the United States. Formal education and training programs in the library sciences need to be stressed as career goals for our American Indian young people.

Finally, it is also important to state that Indian libraries are becoming vital research centers for both Indian and non-Indian students. The collections of Indian interest books and
periodicals, films, tapes, and programs, are attracting not only Indian people but also non-Indians who are patrons of Indian libraries from nearby communities. It is becoming increasingly apparent that such collections and resources within local Indian libraries are fulfilling a felt multicommunity need for library resources that is generally not available in surrounding community libraries.

The continuing and growing need for LSCA is strongly evident in "Indian country." I hope that the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, and the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education will be able to enhance the services provided to this segment of our population by increased funding to tribal libraries.

Once again, thank you for this opportunity.
Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Because our time is becoming increasingly limited, I would like to ask three of you questions and, if I may, I am going to request that you answer me in writing.

So, first, Ms. Parker, in your testimony you mentioned several emerging trends in literacy efforts—the breaking of intergenerational trends, better service to the prisons and the handicapped and use of new technologies.

I wonder if you would put in writing for me some specific recommendations with regard to the modification of the Act to accommodate those trends, because after all we do want to write the Act in a way that meets the coming decade rather than reflects the past decade.

Ms. Elliott, you talked about the importance of technology in allowing libraries to expand their services. Likewise, could you make some specific recommendations if you are able to reach them with regard to how changes in the Act could accommodate the availability of new technology and also reflect the needs created by the availability of that technology.

Finally, Mr. Abrams, you have been very helpful in telling us about the importance of the Act to American Indians. In discussing the Act with a number of tribal and Indian Library leaders, perhaps you have developed some specific recommendations about how the Act might better continue to serve those important needs. If so, we would appreciate having that in writing.

I thank each of you for taking the extra time that I know will be required to respond in writing.

Mr. Pell?

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Congressman Williams, Mr. Chairman.

Just as a matter of general information to Dr. Abrams, is there a Seneca language and books printed in the Seneca language?

Mr. ABRAMS. Yes, there are.

Senator PELL. About how many books would be the total number printed in the language?

Mr. ABRAMS. Specific books, I would say, probably within the area of twelve publications. There have been, however, newspapers that have been published for a considerable period of time going back into the mid 1800s in the Seneca language.

The general corpus of material in the Seneca language is quite large.

Senator PELL. Is it an Iroquois language?

Mr. ABRAMS. Yes, it is.

Senator PELL. It is the same? It is a subtribe of the Iroquois, isn't it?

Mr. ABRAMS. Iroquois is a generic term covering a number of tribes. The Seneca is one of them, the others being Kiuga, Onandaga, Mohawk and Oneida.

Senator PELL. Thank you. And the Seewanois, do they have their language?

Mr. ABRAMS. Pardon me?

Senator PELL. Seewanois? No, they do not. Thank you.
Mr. Beck, it is estimated that I think about 96 percent of our people have access to libraries. Would that be true in Mississippi or is there more of a problem with access?

Mr. Beck. Yes, I think it would be true in Mississippi. We have been very fortunate in that we have been able to continue to expand our library services to all of our people.

Senator Pell. Good. Thank you, no further question.

Chairman Williams. Mr. Owens?

Mr. Owens. I just want to thank Mr. Beck for a very concrete example of where libraries made a contribution to economic development in industry in terms of finding information on odorless paper mills.

I also want to ask Ms. Elliott and any other members of the panel to make available to us in writing—there probably are studies that show the value we receive from updated technology, modern information technology, in terms of improving our ability to provide information through networks.

Without a doubt the members of Congress know the value of it. We all have up-to-date, state-of-the-art systems in our campaigns and in our offices, you know, word processors, computerized mailing lists and all that modern technology can offer. We know the value of it, but we continue to balk and want to keep educational institutions and libraries in the dark ages.

These systems cost money, but in exchange for that money you get a great value and you get some kinds of services that you can’t get in any other way.

I would like to know if there are studies or, if you don’t know right now, please forward to us any studies which show, you know, the cost of not just buying the equipment initially, which is being proposed by some members of our committee—a one-shot amount of money to allow purchase of modern information technology—but, in addition to the initial purchase, the personnel to keep it operating and the need to update it periodically. I would appreciate seeing that.

Also, the interrelationship between the provision of the new technology and the demand, the impact on demand, and the kinds of things that you have found, that have been found, from experience to be more in demand once the electronic capability is there to access it—it would be very useful for us to know those kinds of things.

In general, I think it should be guided by the fact that somewhere, at some time in the future, we are going to make a breakthrough here on Capitol Hill with the administration and the Congress and make them understand that these modern costs that everybody accepts in the case of Congressional offices and in the case of the Pentagon, weapons systems, these modern costs also apply to libraries and educational institutions.

The sad fact is that we are here today discussing a bill that authorizes a level of $181 million. The administration is proposing that it be cut from $181 million down to $137 million.

Either one of those figures is less than the cost of one B-1 bomber—one B-1 bomber—and they keep falling out of the sky. They are not working. We keep buying them but they are not
working. One B-1 bomber costs between $200 million and $250 million.

So we should try to force things back into perspective. It would be helpful if we had some studies or some information to document the costs and show what is really necessary to get good value, to give the kinds of services that we need.

I have no further questions or comments, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Poshard?

Mr. Poshard. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just one quick question to Mr. Beck. Mr. Beck, you could respond in writing to this, because I think it might be something you would want to think through.

I appreciate you as a business leader also having such an extensive participation in libraries and information and education.

Let me ask you as a business leader to articulate for us ways in which you see the business community assisting, as well as perhaps other kinds of philanthropic organizations, assisting in helping us monetarily or through whatever other fashion might be available in building a better library system in this country.

I think there is a connection there that is needed—closer cooperation, better facilitation—but I don’t know what it is, perhaps some sort of incentives that the government could give businesses for participating.

If you could do that I would very much appreciate it.

Mr. Beck. Thank you. I would be pleased to.

Mr. Poshard. Thank you.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Hayes?

Mr. Hayes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to comment.

I think the testimony of all four of the witnesses has been very helpful. I would like, however, just to call Mr. Abrams’ attention to the fact, if you notice in the testimony of the Deputy Undersecretary, he has made a pretty definite commitment to the fact in his statement that there is money being set aside for Indian tribe libraries.

Now, what you are saying is that you need more money, is that right, without knowing the amount that is being set aside and using the figures that my colleague Owens suggested in terms of the reduction from $181 million, which we requested, the reduction is to $137 million.

So it looks like you are going to be suffering from the sharks as we are in other areas. Following that same scenario, Congressman Owens, we could use some nonlethal aid to help our libraries as we debate the issue of whether or not we are able to send or are going to send, and it looks like we have got bipartisan support in sending $4.5 million per month to the aid to Contras when we need to aid our own citizens, our own people who need our help, particularly as it relates to education.

I just wanted to add that to what you said.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Ms. Elliott, before this panel departs, I want to make the point to you that your congressman, Tom Coleman, is out in Missouri while you are here. He is actually flying back and had hoped to be here in time to greet you, but Tom was tending to business, probably in St. Joseph, while you were here.

Ms. Elliott. He is in St. Joseph.
Chairman Williams. Well, we are delighted you are all with us. Thank you very much.

Our final panel are Ms. Thompson, Ms. Hatch and Mr. Morrison.

Senator Pell. I would like to extend a special word of welcome to Mrs. Thompson. I was just in her library last Saturday and I wish her well. She has taken on this responsibility recently and we are very excited at having her.

Ms. Thompson. Thank you, Senator.

Chairman Williams. Likewise, I want to welcome you, Ms. Thompson. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF MS. DALE THOMPSON, DIRECTOR, PROVIDENCE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Ms. Thompson. Thank you. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Dale Thompson and I am the Director of the Providence Public Library in Providence, Rhode Island.

The Providence Public Library is an urban library serving a population of over 150,000 in the city. As the principal public library for Rhode Island, we serve certain library needs throughout the state.

I am grateful to have the opportunity to report on the impact of LSCA funds, because in the current year the Providence Public Library has five programs with over a $260,000 level of LSCA funding.

I am going to give you some examples of the benefits derived by individual members of the public from these programs. After I give you the examples, I will explain the workings of these programs, because many of them complement existing services.

These examples, which I am pleased to report, are: some time in 1989 a group of parents will end the cycle of nonreading parents unable to encourage their children to read raising nonreading children.

A high school student motivated to write a well researched term paper on Shakespeare will sit down at a terminal in his school library and find available to him thousands of books on Shakespeare at the local public library.

Thousands of Rhode Island library users will be welcome to borrow millions of books located in public libraries all across the state using one statewide library card.

Residents of an isolated neighborhood in Providence will proudly walk through the doors of a recently renovated bank building that is their new branch library.

All of these disparate activities have one common thread. They are supported by funding from the Library Services and Construction Act.

The Providence Public Library Family Literacy Program, for example, targets two inner city communities where there are large populations of nonreading and limited English speaking adults with preschool children.

Participants will be invited from agency waiting lists, using the names of parents who have reported being unable to attend literacy classes because of child care problems. The parent comes with the child to the library, eliminating the need for child care, and
bringing parent and child to a convenient location in their own neighborhood.

While the parent works with a tutor, the children have a story time. The parent then selects children's books that are written on whatever level they can read. If the parent cannot read at all, the staff helps the parent learn how to select a picture book and share it with the child.

The parent then can be motivated to learn to read and serve as a model for their child, while introducing them to the pleasure and importance of reading together.

Maintaining the traditional card catalog is probably the most labor intensive function performed in libraries today and perhaps the least cost effective. Computerization has had a dramatic impact on the catalog. It has permitted libraries to condense the record of their holding onto compact disks. This past year LSCA funds allowed the public libraries in Rhode Island to share a common data base of their holdings to produce such a portable catalog.

Not only is the library staff freed from tedious, time consuming jobs, but the catalog is available for use in schools, institutions and academic and special libraries.

This is a giant step forward in facilitating the sharing of library resources throughout the state and meeting the information needs of all Rhode Island citizens.

Most public libraries have their fiscal ups and downs. During a particularly difficult time in the early 1980s, the Providence Public Library was forced to close one of its branch libraries. The residents of the area never gave up their desire for neighborhood library service. The area is now on an upswing and part of the revitalization plan includes a branch of the Providence Public Library. City funds have been used to buy a centrally located former bank building and federal LSCA funds are available for renovation of this historically important building, including making it handicapped accessible.

As the principal public library, the Providence Public Library provides in-depth and specialized reference services to the entire state. Again this year we will be using MURL money provided through LSCA Title I to major urban resource libraries to provide a link to national information data bases.

Local small businesses particularly rely heavily on this kind of information we are able to provide them using these resources.

I began this presentation with four examples of how individuals will benefit from library programs funded by LSCA. In the most direct sense, LSCA grants are not grants to institutions but to individuals. They allow the public library to do best what it alone can do—enhance the lives of those who choose to use its services and really make a difference in the quality of life of the community.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dale Thompson follows:]
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Dale Thompson and I am the Director of the Providence Public Library in Providence, Rhode Island. The Providence Public Library is an urban library serving a population of over 150,000 in the city and, as the Principal Public Library for Rhode Island, we serve certain library needs throughout the state.

I am grateful to have the opportunity to report on the impact of LSCA funds because in the current year the Providence Public Library has five programs with over a $260,000 level of LSCA funding.

I am going to give you some examples of the benefits derived by individual members of the public from these programs. After I give you the examples I'll explain the workings of these programs because many of them compliment existing services. These examples, which I am pleased to report are:

Sometime in 1989...

* a group of parents will end the cycle of non-reading parents, unable to encourage their children to read, raising non-reading children;

* a high school student, motivated to write a well researched term paper on Shakespeare, will sit down at a terminal in his school library and find available to him thousands of books on Shakespeare at the local public library;

* thousands of Rhode Island library users will be welcomed to borrow millions of books located in public libraries all across the State using one state-wide library card;
Residents of an isolated neighborhood in Providence will proudly walk through the doors of a recently renovated bank building that is their new Branch library.

All of these disparate activities have one common thread: they not only are supported by funding from the Library Services and Construction Act, but reflect the statutory priorities established for the funding of projects that will break new ground in the provision of library service. Of the constellation of programs provided by the modern urban library, very few are totally funded by federal dollars. The impact of that support, however, allows the library to act instead of just reacting and is felt on a daily basis by the individuals we serve.

The Providence Public Library's Family Literacy Program, for example, targets two inner city communities where there are large populations of non-reading and limited English speaking adults with pre-school children. Participants will be invited from agency waiting lists, using the names of parents who have reported being unable to attend literacy classes because of childcare problems. The parent or grandparent comes with the child to the library, eliminating the need for childcare and bringing parent and child to a convenient location in their own neighborhood. While the parent works with a tutor, the children have a story time. The parents then select children's books that are written on whatever level they can read. If the parent cannot read at all, the staff helps the parent learn how to select a picture book and share it with their child. The parent then can be motivated to learn to read and serve as a model for their child while introducing them to the pleasure and importance of reading together.

Maintaining the traditional card catalog is probably the most labor intensive function performed in libraries today and perhaps the least cost effective. Computerization has had a dramatic impact on the catalog. It has permitted libraries to condense the record of their holdings on to compact discs. This past year, LSCA funds allowed the public libraries in Rhode Island, who share a common database of their holdings, to produce such a portable catalog. Not only is library staff freed from tedious, time consuming jobs but the catalog is available for use in schools, institutions and academic and special libraries. This is a giant step forward in facilitating the sharing of Library resources throughout the state and in meeting the information needs of all Rhode Island citizens.

My part of the country is known for its fierce independence. When I first moved to New England ten years ago, I was struck by this go-it-alone attitude. Coming as I did from California, where library systems and shared resources have a long tradition, I understood the value of cooperation among libraries.

The economic incentive that allows the Providence Public Library, using LSCA funds, to provide shared cataloging for a single
A statewide database has made a tremendous difference in the working relationships of all public libraries in Rhode Island. A central computer, located at the Providence Public Library, allows the linking of resources and encourages joint decision making to an extent never dreamed possible just five years ago. The result for Rhode Island residents is that they have access to all these collections by using one state-wide library card.

Most public libraries have their fiscal ups and downs. During a particularly difficult time in the early 1980's, the Providence Public Library was forced to close one of its branch libraries. The residents of the area never gave up their desire for neighborhood library service. The area is now on the upswing and part of the revitalization plan includes a branch of the Providence Public Library. City funds have been used to buy a centrally located former bank building and federal funds are available for renovation of this historically important building, including making it handicapped accessible.

As the Principal Public Library, the Providence Public Library provides in-depth and specialized reference services to the entire state. Again this year, we will be using MURL money, provided through LSCA Title I to major urban resource libraries, to provide a link to national information databases. Local small businesses rely heavily on the kind of information we are able to provide them using these resources. A few weeks ago, a man came in with a threatening letter from an attorney telling him to stop using a particular trade name on his business cards and in his advertising. He couldn't afford a lawyer and he wanted to know if this company really had a trade name like his. We ran it through the Trademarkscan in DIALOG; were able to verify the legitimacy of the letter; and, the man was able to make an informed decision.

I began this presentation with four examples of how individuals will benefit from library programs funded by LSCA. In the most direct sense, LSCA grants are not grants to institutions, but to individuals. They allow the public library to do best what it alone can do; enhance the lives of those who choose to use its' services and really make a difference in the quality of life of the community.
Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. Ms. Hatch is a librarian with the Southwest Kansas Library System in Dodge City.

STATEMENT OF JANE HATCH, DIRECTOR, SOUTHWEST KANSAS LIBRARY SYSTEM AND DODGE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY.

Ms. HATCH. Hello. I appreciate being asked to be here today.
The information access programs financed through the Library Services and Construction Act as it is presently structured are a lifeline to the geographically isolated.
I have been asked to talk about rural libraries and I believe I can do that well because I work with a group of libraries in a twenty-one county area in southwest Kansas that is a land area as large as Rhode Island, Connecticut and Massachusetts combined. Our closest urban centers are Wichita, 150 miles away, Kansas City and Denver, 350 miles away, and Amarillo, Texas, 240 miles away. We understand distance where we are.
Our largest county that we serve—someone in the previous testimony was talking about serving a community of 30,000. That is our largest county. Our smallest has 1,800 residents.
We have experienced great stress through the decline in the agricultural markets and also the oil production declines. In that period of great stress our libraries have been experiencing increasing demands as they are asked to support economic development and diversity efforts, to retrain adults into new areas, to support locally generated classes and satellite classes coming from many other states into our schools, plus the reading and listening needs of our preschool children through octogenarians, and all the topics that everyone is hearing about in radio and television and the print media.
The only hope to meet these roles and serve the special populations of physically disabled, visually impaired, and language or literacy impaired is to have the help of the LSCA partnerships that LSCA has been so good in building among types of libraries between local, state and regional organizations.
It is only through this cooperative effort that such libraries with very small tax bases can begin to approach these varied problems, because, of course, the farm manager, student or manufacturer in a small town like Minneola, Kansas, population 725, are just as sophisticated and varied as someone who lives in Kansas City, Chicago, Boston, and yet Minneola with its very small rural tax base operated last year on $9,300 of local funds.
It is especially difficult now, as we change the kinds of information and build that balance between developing print appreciation and the ability to read and use print and enter into the global information network that is now available using computers, compact disks, telephone modems and satellite—and yet, that agricultural producer, manufacturer or student in the very smallest rural community needs access to that global information network just as badly as anyone else.
Those costs are high. The costs for the equipment are high—$4,000 to $5,000—the replacement costs for that equipment—as it ages now in four to five years, we are talking now about libraries that are used to using typewriters that are twenty years old, and
now we are introducing technology that will have to be upgraded and replaced in four to five years to make it available and able to enter into this global market place.

Compact disk offers tremendous possibilities for small libraries to have much more information available than ever possible before, and to have it in a format that people can come in and use and browse in that information. It is in that ability to browse and look around that you take disparate pieces of data and put them together and create new knowledge. That is terribly important in an economy that needs to diversify, needs to go in new directions.

Title III of LSCA offers and insures convenient local access to that global information network through the variety of both partnership of many types of libraries and the access into what is now an international global environment.

I hope that Title III will be increased so that that kind of access at a local level can be insured, but that only helps if local public libraries have enough financing to keep their doors open, and so the access and the information and the funding that goes to public libraries is very important.

Another area I can speak to with specific examples is the funding for construction, especially for small rural libraries.

Communities of this size have a very difficult time retiring bonds. Their tax base is quite low. I have seen, and I have brought examples, of projects in two of our communities where not only have the LSCA funds built bricks and mortar construction in a library, but it turned communities around. It gave people an opportunity to dream and say, something could happen.

Through the library construction project the community came together and decided that it could be a can-do community, where something could change. It was in the process of the review of the application, the validation of that application by a statewide body that said, yes, you do have a need, something needs to be done. It gave those local individuals something to rally around and they raised money.

No one thought they could. The librarian had a dream. She would not have even thought it possible without the LSCA construction funds being available.

This is an area where LSCA makes a difference on Main Street in rural America. It is visible and it matters.

The preservation issues I heard discussed are very important, but I would hope that we would balance both print preservation with nonprint. In our area, local history is now being recorded through the visual medias much more than print, because our local rural newspapers have been hard hit by the economic depression and none of us has the resources available or the technical expertise to know how to save this kind of resource.

My vision is for local libraries of all types to have satellite equipment, computer and modem and telefacsimile access plus the funding for the telephone and the satellite communications so that we can all participate interactively.

This allows for interactive government. Our senator, Senator Kassebaum, has begun doing this by satellite transmissions from here. I would like to see that done in the supportive environment of the local library, so that as discussion goes on the information
can be faxed to those individuals who are asking questions, and they have it on site and they can do it as an interactive, rather than a sit-and-listen, sort of operation, so that cultural exchange—our trading partners in an agricultural and oil-based economy are other states, but other nations, so that interaction can happen on Main Street in rural America, so that we understand the culture of those trading partners.

All of this needs to happen in a place that already has the image of the place of democracy in a local community.

Local public libraries carry that image now and LSCA has been very important in insuring that that image is made available to all people in the community, regardless of location, regardless of economic status, regardless of physical or language or literacy disability.

I hope that LSCA will be continued and be allowed to grow and expanded in its funding, so that mission can be better fulfilled.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Jane Hatch follows:]
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The resource sharing and information access programs funded by the Library Services and Construction Act are a lifeline for residents in our region. The titles of this act provide critically needed support for public library operations, regional and statewide networking, and services to special needs populations which create the ability for residents in the smallest communities and most remote rural settings to have access to worldwide resources through their libraries. Barriers of geography, limited financial resources, language, literacy, physical disabilities or facility barriers of space or handicap accessibility are bridged through LSCA. I have been asked to evaluate the impact of the Library Services and Construction Act on rural Kansas library service. As the director of a twenty-one county multitype regional library system serving rural communities on the high plains, it is my honor to convey the information access concerns of the citizens in my region. The Southwest Kansas Library System, geographically the largest of the seven regional systems in Kansas, encompasses 14,374 square miles stretching from 100 miles north or the Oklahoma Panhandle to 173 east of the Colorado border. The land area of the regional system is equal to Rhode Island, Connecticut and Massachusetts combined. The headquarters resource library in Dodge City is 330 miles from Kansas City, 275 miles from Topeka, 150 miles from Wichita, 346 miles from Denver and 241 miles from Amarillo, Texas. These are the closest urban centers.

Kansas is a rural state with many small communities. Of the 309 public libraries only four are urban or municipal libraries by the LSCA definition while 288 (87%) serve communities of 5,000 or less and 139 (45%) serve communities of 1000 or less. Within the Southwest Kansas Library System the most populous county has 30,200 residents and the least populous has 1800 residents. The system includes 30 public libraries, 33 school districts, 3 community colleges, 1 private liberal arts college and 1 special library.

The smaller communities in the regional system are struggling with the negative financial impact of declining land values, reduced oil and gas production, and the effects of the 1981 dramatic shift in federal fiscal policy. These current stresses are superimposed over the two consistent risk factors in an agricultural based economy - weather and commodity prices. The combined negative effect of these factors means rural communities have a declining tax base to fund library services at a time when demand for information to support efforts to diversify the economy, remain competitive through more effective agricultural technology, expand adult retraining efforts, enhance educational offerings provided locally or by satellite, improve literacy and English skills, respond to the varied topics covered by the media and satisfy the recreational and listening needs of preschool children to octogenarians is dramatically increasing. The materials circulated through the Southwest Kansas Library Network, for example, increased from 184,202 items in 1986 to 223,103 items in 1988. This increase in demand came at a time when no significant increase in local budget was possible.

The information needs of a farm manager, student researcher or manufacturer in Minneola, Kansas, population 725, are as sophisticated and varied as the needs of a resident in Kansas City, Chicago or Boston. Minneola Public Library is more than 150 miles from the nearest urban center and operates on an annual local budget of $9,300.00. Without the additional operating funds provided by the partnership of state and LSCA dollars and the resource sharing networks financed with LSCA dollars, the citizens of this and many other small yet vital communities would have very limited information options. By fostering regional, multitype library cooperation, providing planning and trend analysis through the Kansas State Library, resource sharing development through the Kansas Library Network Board, developing the computerized statewide resource location called the Kansas Library Catalog and providing telecommunications to transmit requests for materials among libraries, residents in Minneola may browse the citations for 2.1 million print and non-print titles located in Kansas or access the 19 million citation identified in the international OCLC database. No single library in the twenty-one county area could afford an international service such as OCLC. Through the regional cooperation of many libraries and the support of the Kansas State Library such tremendous international access can be available.
The mutually supportive environment among libraries of all types which LSCA encourages may be one of the greatest benefits. Cities, school districts and businesses tend to develop competitive relationships that block mutual progress. LSCA has made possible mutually supportive multitype library planning and dialogue. A good example is the Kansas Library Network Board comprised of practitioners and state level policymakers representing the seven types of libraries identified in state statute. This LSCA funded division of the Kansas State Library promotes mutual understanding of concerns each type of library faces and develops innovative solutions to the problems identified. The regional systems promote a similar diagnosis and problem solving role in each region of the state. Through cooperation a very effective network at local, regional and state levels has made it possible for a rural citizen to receive information far beyond the resources housed in the local library. LSCA through the programs administered by the Kansas State Library has also created an awareness of the ethical responsibility of every library service program to attempt to meet the needs of all residents regardless of age, financial status, ethnic background or physical limitation.

Perhaps the most visible demonstration of LSCA making a difference on rural main street can be seen in the success of the Title II Construction Projects. From 1987 to 1989 eighteen Kansas libraries completed 19 construction projects ranging from entirely new buildings to handicap accessible doors. In the Southwest region one of the most dramatic projects was constructed in 1985-86 in Minneola. The part-time librarian and the Green Thumb sponsored assistant had a vision of what the library could become. At one of the worst economic times in recent years these two women were able to so effectively share their vision of a public library that could finally seat all the children coming to storytime and have adequate wiring for a computer that they galvanized an entire community into action. The community raised $31,434.00. I have brought a notebook librarian, Letha Smith prepared on the community events, personal pledges, and other fundraising events used to raise the local match for the LSCA grant. I happened to be in the Minneola library late one afternoon when the grain elevator manager brought in an unprecedented $2,000.00 donation to the fund drive from the Co-op Board. This usually taciturn man who was an infrequent user of the library himself, delivered an eloquent testimonial on the value of community pride and the embodiment of the democratic process represented by the public library in a small town. The result of the library project is a new “can-do” spirit and sense of positive achievement in that town shown by several subsequent community improvement projects and much greater participation in the state level political process by new leadership that emerged during the library fund drive. That type of community development would not have happened if the LSCA funds were not available and help in applying were not available from the regional system and State Library. The grant gave the librarian the hope to dream, gave the community a goal to rally around and validated the worthiness of the project through the statewide application process. Communities of under 5,000 people have so few potential sources for construction funds. Yet some of the very best, most personal and most important library service is delivered in these small operations close to the pulse of the community. Bucklin, Kansas, population 777 saw what their neighboring community, Minneola, did and proceeded to raise $20,140.00 to restore a turn-of-the-century retail building into a library. The project is a cooperative effort between the Masonic Lodge and the city. Fifteen people, including the mayor, hospital administrator and citizens representing 31 different organizations got on the senior citizen bus at 5 a.m. the morning of the LSCA hearing in Topeka. They wanted to bring the message that libraries make a difference on main street! Liberal, Kansas, population 16,076, raised over $738,000.00 to complete a major library addition because they were able to secure $141,000.00 in LSCA funds. The amount of the grant was important but more significant was the planning, the development of community awareness and the validation of need the grant award brought to the project. Librarian Diane Slater says no community dollars from the $400,000.00 pledged by the city to the remaining $338,000.00 raised by private donation would have come forth without the LSCA seed grant.

The increasing population of rural older Americans and the physically disabled residents in the southwest Kansas counties make the Talking Book Service and the Title I Services to Older Americans funds fill critical needs. The physically limited individuals these programs serve have virtually no other options for recreation or information needs. The Homebound Coordinator in Dodge City delivers up to
40 paperbacks per week to one bedfast resident who fills her time transcending her physical limitations by traveling vicariously through books. The Talking Book Consultant may drive 200 miles roundtrip to help a new user begin to use the equipment. The tearful thank you, letters from appreciative family and calls of appreciation for these services make every mile and every hour invested worthwhile. Nursing home activity directors in many of our long term care homes have only $30.00 to $40.00 per month to use for resident activities. Many of our libraries have devised innovative services to help serve the nursing home resident. The grants to systems and local libraries from the State Library through LSCL funds help serve these users who can not come to the library.

The racial mixture in Southwest Kansas mirrors trends nationwide. The diversity of ethnic heritages has created new needs for materials in foreign languages and new needs for staff training in multicultural services. Services to residents of Hispanic and Southeast Asian origin have dramatically increased in the past five years. Sample school enrollment figures for September 20, 1988 reveal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>Student 8460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City</td>
<td>4447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulysses 1666</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation for the funding for Title V - Foreign Language Materials would be most welcome.

Kansas has a functional illiteracy rate of 9% affecting nearly 152,000 adults and their families. These individuals are prevented from being as productive as they could be by limited reading ability. They will become an increasing burden on the literate wage earner unless reading skills can be improved as employment continues to require more technical reading skills. The diesel mechanics and autobody courses at Dodge City Community College, for instance, is a state of the art program directed to vehicles that rely more on computers and electronics than traditional tools. Both trades were considered "hands-on training" fields only a few years ago. Included in the 152,000 total are 45,000 individuals 60 years or older. The total elderly in southwest Kansas counties is higher than the state average. This means the potential client group for literacy training among the rural older citizens appear to be quite high. The Kansas State Library has a very effective Literacy Coordinator to assist volunteer literacy programs in libraries. Working with libraries, Adult Basic Education, industrial training programs and minority support groups this individual tries to coordinate library efforts to be most effective. It is a massive problem for one part-time individual to approach in a state with the physical distances Kansas offers. Together with the regional systems the public libraries are making beginning attempts to meet this need.

THE CRITICAL AREAS OF CONCERN FOR RURAL LIBRARIES ARE:

The cost of equipment and subscriptions to provide current information in the digitally stored electronic environment is beyond the financial reach of most small, rural libraries. Digital storage and magnetic tape offer fantastic potential for even the smallest libraries to have much more information available in a small amount of space and regardless of distances to larger collections. The computer, modem and CD-ROM (compact disk-read only memory) player make all the records in the education research database from the Department of Education available on two small silver disks. A vast array of information, especially in the quickly changing scientific and technical subjects so important to farming, oil production and manufacturing, are appearing only in digitally stored mediums. Without the equipment and the training to use the equipment many users of libraries in small communities will be denied access to this information. The computer equipment costs between $3,500.00 and $4,500.00 with CD-Rom capabilities and the annual subscriptions for the CD-Rom stored subscriptions range from $600.00 to $4,000.00. On a $9,000.00 budget these costs are prohibitive. Yet rural residents far from resource centers need this information to browse, explore and create that serendipitous combination of facts that creates new knowledge. More emphasis in Title III on providing all libraries, school, public
and academic, with the equipment and training to offer these new electronic formats to the public is vitally needed.

Rural residents in areas of low population density pay a premium price for telephone service. The large Bell Systems were not interested in rural telephone service for many years so small independent rural phone companies filled the need. They offer very good service but the complex pattern of small exchanges with varied types of technological upgrading make data communication by telephone in our area a major challenge. To retrieve the electronically stored data, transmit interlibrary loan requests or access many remote databases the telephone transfer of data is essential. A computer, telephone modem and the telephone line are absolutely necessary tools for information access today. Rural areas have several specific problems due to distance and sparse population when reliance on computer equipment becomes a necessity. Training time is costly and labor intensive since many of the computer related problems require on-site assistance from consultants who may drive four hours to remedy a problem that takes one half hour to identify once on-site. Equipment maintenance is a problem since service may be hundreds of miles away. The telephone rate structure and lack of fiber optic cable makes cost and reliability a problem. The cost to provide per minute telephone transactions is presently denying some libraries in our state access to the interlibrary loan network because local budgets can not bear the cost. A study of telephone rate comparisons is attached.

Satellites offer real potential for negating the distance barriers. Several schools in southwest Kansas are offering one or more classes taught from locations in other states. It is exciting to see students in Johnson, Kansas taking Japanese Conversation or Computer Assisted Design via satellite from Texas. Neither the school or public library have the supplementary materials to support the wide range of classes now available. My vision is to see every library linked by computer, satellite, telefacsimile and modem with data traversing the miles from one city, state or country instantly. The technology exists today. The need exists today. The weather or crop condition in South America or Russia effects the livelihood and decision making of Kansas farmers today. Discoveries in Saudi Arabia or Alaska impact the oil producer in Liberal, Kansas, very immediately. A new process reported in Germany or Japan can impact the plastics manufacturer in Fowler, Kansas. The time span for reaction and innovation is so short today. Rural residents should not be penalized from access to this information because they choose to live in a rural community. The need for information is especially critical for those who have accepted the challenge to produce the grains and livestock that feed this nation and contribute significantly to this nation's exports. People can no be competitive in agriculture or any other endeavor today without up-to-the-minute information.

The library is a visible representation of democracy in every community. The library's emerging role in the community is to collect significant local and state documents necessary for local citizens and provide access to the world's information resources. The library also gathers, organizes and disseminates local history. At no time has technology offered greater assistance to libraries to fulfill this role. Placing this information in context become a major challenge. Yet preservation of print has become a significant problem when paper self-destructs and new printed books costing $17.00-$30.00 break at the spine after a single circulation. For small budget libraries the impact of this poor quality is especially devastating. A second preservation issue concerns non-print. History is now recorded on magnetic tape as television and radio increasingly become the medium of record. Rural newspapers have been hard-hit by the agricultural depression as main street businesses close. Few libraries have the resources or the technical skills required to archive local electronically recorded news. The public library has a special opportunity to participate in the democratic process. If equipped with satellite downloading capabilities, telefacsimile to transmit documents instantly by telephone and provided with affordable telecommunications the library could be the link to reintroduce the public to the legislative process. The librarian is often very familiar with the community, the library is a neutral site already associated with democratic images and free speech issues. The concern from both state and federal legislators is that the man-on-the-street in apathetic and not involved. This often comes from individuals feeling they do not understand the issues or have no way to participate in the process. Perhaps this could be helped if interactive town meeting by satellite hosted in public libraries were a
Libraries are the institution that empower people to be the best they can be—the most creative, productive and aware. Government can help by continuing to fund existing programs such as LSCA that have fostered productive partnerships. The multinational and multistate nature of existing information sources require that the federal government be the agency which insure that all libraries, in all areas can participate. Additional funding is needed for the multitype resource sharing programs to insure that all libraries can have the equipment, training and communications access to empower all citizens regardless of geographic location, finances, language, literacy or physical condition to be linked to the global information network.
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Federal support of library service in Kansas has been and continues to be critically important to the majority of citizens who use libraries in Kansas. Conversely and of equal importance, a strong library and information service network throughout the United States is critically important to the federal government.

The federal government has a vested interest in an effective library and information service in Kansas and in the rest of the United States. These information services help an informed electorate to participate in the processes of government and they encourage a well educated, productive society. A literate, informed, productive citizenry is essential to the support and functioning of our democratic method and tradition in government. Effective library services are fundamentally important to these considerations. Effective libraries are fundamental to Kansans.

The programs supported by Title I of LSCA have provided assistance for basic operations of under-funded public libraries and they have supported the cost-effective interlibrary sharing of needed information. The programs have helped extend information service to the blind and physically handicapped and they have improved information service to the institutionalized.

The projects supported by Title II of LSCA would have been very difficult - to nearly impossible without the stimulus for building improvement and construction which this program gives.

Title III has encouraged libraries of different types to undertake programs of mutual support and cooperation. These programs have also encouraged innovation in information service planning and delivery.

Title VI has encouraged the state effort and investment in the provision of basic reading skills training for adults and has encouraged local libraries, individuals and other appropriate agencies to work with the literacy program.

All of these programs and new initiatives have been dependent upon federal funding. This very modest federal investment has given back to the federal interest a better informed and educated Kansas public and a more effective, productive, tax-paying citizenry. Kansas citizens and the federal government both have benefited from the Library Services and Construction Act.

We appreciate this important support.
## LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT: THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR LIBRARIES IN KANSAS 1987 – 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE I</th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public library services to areas with inadequate services</td>
<td>$430,653</td>
<td>$588,002</td>
<td>$511,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically handicapped</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>122,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State institutional library services</td>
<td>39,509</td>
<td>39,509</td>
<td>39,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major urban resource libraries</td>
<td>42,995</td>
<td>42,995</td>
<td>46,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening metropolitan librarian services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to the elderly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,473</td>
<td>81,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>21,787</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>33,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance forward</td>
<td>231,371</td>
<td>35,809</td>
<td>38,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$888,815</td>
<td>$888,815</td>
<td>$889,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TITLE II

| Public library construction | $270,172 | $270,164 | $266,133 |

## TITLE III

| Establishing, expanding and operating library networks | $0 | $87,195 | $206,258 |
| Planning for statewide resource sharing | 192,449 | 116,124 | 0 |
| Total | $192,449 | $203,319 | $206,258 |

## TITLE VI

| Literacy | $25,000 | $0 | $25,000 |
TITLE I — Public library services to areas with inadequate services

(State-federal Grants-In-Aid to Local Libraries, Continuing Education and State Development)

Increased hours open, increased number of volumes owned, increased numbers of periodicals and nonprint owned, increased participation in regional systems of cooperating libraries, increased full-time staff equivalency, enhanced system services and programs, and provided direct assistance to library literacy programs and continuing education programs.

IMPACT: Without federal funds for libraries, collection development at local library and at regional system levels would not be directly supplemented nor encouraged.

Some salaries could not be paid at state or at local levels.

Federal funds have made it possible for all Kansans who so desire to have minimal access to public libraries.

Libraries have been enabled to improve the number of hours they are open to the public, especially in evenings and on weekends.

Consultant assistance has been made available and enhanced through regional systems of cooperating libraries and through the continuing education and staff development plan.

Over 1,400 library employees, library directors and library trustees, as well as staff of regional systems, have participated in the continuing education and staff development plan.

A literacy coordinator has established and helped maintain library literacy programs statewide, as well as sponsor the VISTA Action Literacy Corps for Kansas.

TITLE I — Physically handicapped

(Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Regional and Sub-regional Libraries)

IMPACT: The Regional library program for blind and physically handicapped persons in Kansas is supported in part with federal funds which are protected by the maintenance of effort at the state level.

Access to library materials through Talking Books to blind, physically handicapped, visually impaired, and learning disabled individuals regardless of where they live in the state is guaranteed.
The Reader Enrollment Access and Delivery System (READS) is being completed in Kansas partially funded by federal funds.

**TITLE I -- State institutional library services**

Increased professional staff, increased interlibrary loan participation, improved facilities and services, enhanced collection development, provided access to the State Audiovisual Center at Wichita Public Library, and provided continuing education opportunities to staffs.

**IMPACT:** Federal funds have purchased books and library materials, periodicals, audiovisual equipment, supplies, and other necessary items to supplement state institutional budgets for libraries that serve the institutionalized.

Use of federal funds in the past have encouraged the increase of professional staff, increased interlibrary loan cooperation, and encouraged the enhancement of facilities and services.

Use of federal funds assures free access to the State Audiovisual Center.

Use of federal funds have made the acquisition of automation possible at institutional libraries for the institutionalized where it would not have been available otherwise.

Use of federal funds has encouraged program development -- cultural, recreational, informational, educational and legal -- which would not be done without federal support.

Use of federal funds has provided workshops, seminars, and in-services to staffs providing library service to the state's institutionalized on a regular basis.

**TITLE I -- Major urban resource libraries**

Expanded collections to extend services to patrons beyond MURLs service areas and improved one or more special collections in every MURL.

**IMPACT:** Federal funds have assisted the three eligible libraries -- Kansas City, Kansas, Wichita and Topeka -- develop projects to strengthen the capacity of those public libraries to meet the demands for information from citizens throughout their relevant service areas and/or from other libraries -- which is especially important in a state with so many citizens and public libraries in rural areas.
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TITLE I -- Strengthening metropolitan libraries

Expanded collections of the metropolitan public library to extend services to patrons beyond its service area and improve one or more of its special collections.

IMPACT: Federal funds made it possible for the metropolitan Johnson County Library to receive funds that incorporated Major Urban Resource Centers received.

TITLE I -- Services to the elderly

 Improved library services for older Americans in Kansas.

IMPACT: Programs for older Americans at libraries of all sizes, at the seven regional systems' headquarters and through the State Library have been enhanced through the use of federal funds.

TITLE I -- Administration

Carried out statewide planning and evaluation as well as administer the L.S.C.A. program for Kansas.

IMPACT: Federal funds have enabled the State Library not only to distribute the program funding in the most equitable way possible but also to prepare long-range and short-term plans to best implement programs to provide library service.

Also, these funds help to monitor and to improve the systems of reporting and planning statewide.

TITLE II -- Public library construction

Constructed new buildings or acquired, expanded, remodeled or altered existing buildings including initial equipment for either new or expanded buildings; access for the handicapped; energy conservation, new technologies and historic buildings.

IMPACT: From 1987 to 1989 a total of 18 libraries have received L.S.C.A. Title II grants to pay the federal share of 19 different construction projects ranging from completely new buildings to merely making an entry or restroom accessible to handicapped persons. Few of these would have been possible without the federal share.
TITLE III -- Establishing, expanding and operating library networks

Increased access to the Kansas Library Catalog (formerly the Kansas Union Catalog), created and maintains the Kansas Union List of Serials, created and maintains the KIC Interlibrary Loan Network, used technology to improve and enhance interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing and funded some Kansas Library Network Board activities.

IMPACT: Many of the enhanced interlibrary loan systems in Kansas, especially those which have been improved by technology, were made possible using federal L.S.C.A. Title III funds.

The above-referred programs are all vital to the present operation of resource sharing or have been expanded from earlier methods or established through the use of federal funds.

Two major projects recently funded by the Network Board are an online database project providing funds for school libraries to conduct computer searches and the KANFAX Network, a group of 16 libraries of all types which acquired and use telefacsimile machines though federal funding.

TITLE III -- Planning for statewide resource sharing

Network Board activities and the Kansas planning group.

IMPACT: The Kansas Library Network Board has actively encouraged local, regional and statewide resource sharing through planning efforts by disseminating federal funds to planning projects.

The Kansas Planning Group -- consisting of members of the Network Board, the regional system administrators and other representative persons -- worked together to develop long-range goals and objectives for the entire state and libraries of all types within the state so that each can participate and enhance its own library through cooperation and resource sharing. Those libraries are implementing this long-range plan during 1989.

TITLE VI -- Literacy

Grants to the Kansas State Library and local public libraries

IMPACT: The L.S.C.A. Title VI grants awarded to Kansas libraries have enhanced the literacy programs in local libraries and on a statewide basis. The State Library and local libraries serve as resources for the entire state.
This report describes the Kansas Library Network Board's 1988 activities, and outlines its plans for 1989.

The Board is a division of the State Library. The Board's mission is to improve the quality of library and information services available in all Kansas communities, large and small.

To accomplish this mission, the Board strengthens key components of our state's library network such as the Kansas Library Catalog. The Board also sponsors the KANFAX telefacsimile network and other programs to improve library and information services across our state.

With continued backing from librarians across Kansas, and from Governor Hayden and the Legislature, the Board hopes to build on the successes outlined here for the benefit of all Kansas communities, large and small.

Kathleen Ruth Bradt,
Network Board Chair

Library Networking

Today, people judge library and information services not only on what their library has, but on how quickly it can get them what they want. The faster the better.

With more than 50,000 new book titles published every year, no library can own copies of everything, and most libraries do not have copies of most things. So Kansas libraries have to rely increasingly on networking to fully serve their clients.

Library networking—two or more libraries working together to accomplish more than they can do alone—is based on the recognition that no single library can meet the entire range of its users' needs.

An example of library networking is interlibrary loan, which enables libraries to borrow items for their users that are unavailable locally.

The aim of library networking arrangements in Kansas is to provide users with prompt, convenient access to the information they need, even if it's only available in distant libraries.

Just as Kansans must work smarter to compete in today's world, our state's libraries must cooperate in new ways to provide even better service.

The Network Board assists these efforts by promoting the development of more effective networking arrangements to benefit citizens in all Kansas communities, large and small.
Fax is ideally suited for Kansas, since it enables libraries to send information to each other in seconds.

KANFAX Library Telefacsimile Network

It used to take several days for western Kansans to obtain interlibrary loan materials through the mail from libraries in eastern Kansas.

*But not anymore.* Now, thanks to the use of telefacsimile, library users across our state can obtain these items within 24 hours.

Telefacsimile, or fax, permits libraries to send photocopied documents to each other in seconds.

Fax is ideally suited for sending information that people need right away: The specification a business owner has to have to complete a bid proposal; that statistic a local official needs for a presentation; or an article a student needs now.

In 1987, the Network Board initiated KANFAX, one of the nation's first statewide library fax networks.

After inviting proposals from interested libraries, the Board used federal funds to award eight fax grants in December 1987. The Board extended nine more grants in June 1988, and KANFAX began operating this July.

By the end of 1988, libraries in 14 communities will participate in KANFAX:

- Barton County Community College (Great Bend)
- Bethany College (Lindsborg)
- Colby Community College
- Emporia State University
- Fort Hays State University
- Johnson County Public Library
- Kansas College of Technology (Salina)
- Lawrence and Leavenworth Public Libraries
- Marymount College (Salina)
- Pittsburg State University
- Kansas University
- Other KANFAX participants include the State Library as well as the Central (Great Bend), North Central (Manhattan), South Central (Hutchinson) and Southwest (Dodge City) regional library systems.
Kids think online database searching is 'really neat'... the response has been excellent.*

--JoAnne Wahrman,
Goodland High School

Online Searching Grants

In contemporary society, with its ever-expanding universe of knowledge, knowing where and how to find information is a vital skill. Equipping students with the information seeking skills they need to survive in today's world is a basic assignment for Kansas school libraries.

But it's no easy assignment, because today, students need to know how to access the information available not only in books, but from a multitude of sources.

Online searching permits students to use computer databases, huge files that have the latest information on virtually any subject. Online searching is ideal for rural schools because it brings them information that used to be available only in the largest libraries. And the costs are nominal, thanks to the special rates available to schools from database vendors.

Although pupils in many U.S. schools have access to online searching, only a handful of Kansas schools offer this service.

In 1988, the Board awarded grants to expand the availability of database searching in Kansas schools. These projects will cultivate a population that is accustomed to using the full range of our state's information resources.

These grants will also increase the number of school libraries that participate in networking, affording more Kansas students with the benefits of library resource sharing.

The Board has awarded online searching grants to the Girard Middle/High School, as well as high schools in Goodland, Hays, Hugoton, Nemaha Valley (Seneca), Perry LeCompton, Prairie Heights (Jennings), and Wichita.

Kansas is the first state to provide grants to school libraries for online search services.
Interlibrary Loan Development Program

From AIDS to computer literacy, from drug education to economic development—libraries across our state have used Interlibrary Loan Development Program funds to develop collections that address issues of concern to Kansans.

The ILDP provides grants to libraries that agree to make their collections available statewide via interlibrary loan.

ILDP grants encourage continuing involvement in resource sharing by interlibrary loan resource centers, which handle much of our state’s interlibrary loan traffic.

These grants also encourage more libraries to join the statewide library network.

In the first four years of this program, the Board has extended 274 ILDP grants to libraries in 102 Kansas communities.

Here are a few examples of how the ILDP has benefited citizens across our state, in communities large and small:

*A school library in Perry used its ILDP grant to buy books and videos on substance abuse, helping Kansas students “just say no” to drugs.

* The Coffeyville Community College Library used its grant for career education materials, which help students make the best possible career choices.

* The public library in Colby used an ILDP grant to boost the library’s literacy program, helping adults attain the reading skills necessary to function in contemporary society.

The ILDP is one of the Kansas State Library's most popular services.
"I'd like to thank the Network Board for broadening our horizons!"

--Carla Swope, Basehor Community Library

The aim of library networking is to provide users with prompt, convenient access to the information they need, even if it's only available in distant libraries.

Other Network Board Services

Kansas Library Card

This statewide identification, now accepted by more than 150 academic, public, school and special libraries, enables Kansans to use libraries across the state much as they use their own local libraries.

The Kansas Library Card is one of only a handful of statewide reciprocal borrowing programs in the U.S. It exemplifies the spirit of cooperation that characterizes the Kansas library community.

Replacement Fund

What happens if an item loaned through interlibrary loan is lost? The fear of losing materials used to keep some libraries from participating in resource sharing programs.

But not anymore. Now, thanks to the Materials Replacement Fund, items lost through interlibrary resource sharing activities are replaced.

If a library loans an item through interlibrary loan or to a Kansas Library Card user, and if that item is lost without compensation from the client, the Network Board replaces it.

In the three years that this program has been in operation, the Board has never received more than 30 claims a year from among the more than 200,000 annual ILL transactions statewide.

This program reaps enormous benefits because it attracts more libraries into the statewide library network, providing Kansans with access to a larger range of library materials.

More than 150 libraries accept the Kansas Library Card.
"The statewide plan is giving us a road map to find a more unified direction."

Jane Hatch, Southwest Regional Library System, Dodge City

Statewide Planning

In 1987, the Network Board and the state's regional library systems sponsored a series of planning sessions attended by 475 librarians and library users from across Kansas.

The Board sponsored the planning effort to develop more responsive programs to assist local libraries in providing better service.

The planning effort is also intended to achieve higher levels of cooperation and coordination among the state's 1,600 libraries to benefit citizens in all Kansas communities, large and small.

The planning effort resulted in the development of a five-year plan for library cooperation in Kansas.

This plan represents the hopes and aspirations of librarians and library users across Kansas. It forms the basis for the Board's activities over the next five years, and is being implemented by the Board and libraries throughout our state.

For example, several regional library systems are sponsoring participatory planning sessions involving all types of libraries. These planning efforts stem from recommendations made in the planning meetings last year.

The KANFAX network also addresses one of the major issues that came out of the planning process: faster materials delivery.

As a result of its planning activities, the Board has a much clearer idea of client expectations, and a closer working relationship with the regional systems.
1989 Network Board Activities

Kansas librarians work diligently to keep pace with a rapidly expanding body of information, increasingly sophisticated technologies, and growing user demands.

In addressing these issues, they look to the Network Board not only for effective management of state and federal monies to benefit all library users in Kansas, but for innovative leadership to help our state's libraries meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

In 1989, the Board will continue striving to provide the best, most creative leadership to strengthen and improve our statewide library network.

To accomplish this aim, the Board will

* Continue implementing the Interlibrary Loan Development Program for the benefit of library users across our state.

* Promote resource sharing and cooperation among all types of libraries by sponsoring improvements to the Kansas Library Catalog, which permits library users to find and use materials in more than 400 Kansas libraries.

* Sponsor at least three activities to provide information and training in the use of new resource sharing technologies.

* Expand KANFAX to at least eight more libraries.

* Sponsor at least seven projects to assist libraries in supporting economic development activities in their communities.

* Fund research and demonstration projects that have the potential to improve statewide library and information services.
The Network Board's mission is to improve the quality of library and information services available in all Kansas communities, large and small.

Network Board Members

The Network Board includes governor-appointed representatives from all types of libraries in Kansas.

In addition, the Board includes representatives from the Kansas Board of Regents and the State Department of Education, as well as the State Librarian.

The Board's members are:

Kathleen Ruth Bradt, Chair
Associate Librarian
Collins Library
Baker University
(Academic Libraries)

James Swan, Vice-Chair
Director
Central Kansas Library System (Great Bend)
(Regional Library Systems)

David Ensign
Associate Director
Washburn Law Library
(Special Libraries)

Duane Johnson
State Librarian
(State Library)

June Level
Media Program Specialist
Kansas Education Department
(Department of Education)

Winifred Lichtenwalter
Director
Leavenworth Public Library
(Public Libraries)

Barbara Paschky
Associate Academic Affairs Director
Kansas Board of Regents
(Board of Regents)

Marilyn Goodrich Peterson
Library Media Specialist
Olathe Rolling Ridge School
(School Libraries)

Henry Stewart
Library Director
Emporia State University
(Regents Libraries)

Keith Trost, Director
Barton County Community College Library
(Community College Libraries)

For Information about Network Board programs and services, call 913/296-3296. Or write the Board in care of the Kansas State Library, Capitol Building, Third Floor, Topeka, 66612-1593.
I am trying to determine the costs to support the interlibrary loan network using ALANET. In recent correspondence from Bruce he suggested using the Telenet time-sharing node to reduce the ALANET connection time from $30.00 to $19.00 per hour. He also encouraged the use of downloading and uploading as described in Technical Bulletins 1 and 2. Paths has implemented the downloading and uploading procedures this week.

The figures which follow assume that messages will be taken off through downloading to a disk, answers to the previous week's transactions will be done and messages for new requests will uploaded all in one telephone call. Paths has done a survey using the available messages on Wednesday of this week. She checked the times on Thursday and found the times to be accurate.

Download 15 messages took 5 minutes
Answering 12 requests took 10 minutes
Uploading 4 messages took 1 minute
Total minutes per day for 71 transactions 16 minutes

I completed an extensive telephone rate survey to determine which Telenet connection would be best to use. A long distance call to Wichita is the most costly. A long distance call to Oklahoma, New Mexico or Arkansas is the least expensive. I got information for a number of states since the location of the Telenet node makes no difference to the electronic mail system. The Sprint rates shown are only available in Liberal, Garden and Dodge at this time. MCI offers lower per minute rates but charges a $12.00 per month subscription fee that negates the per minute saving. The telephone rates are on the next page.

For 16 minutes online the ALANET connect cost would be:

\[
$19.00 \div 60 \text{ minutes} = \$0.31 \text{ per minute} \times 16 = \$4.96
\]

Telephone long distance charges through the least expensive rate available from AT&T would be:

\[
15 \text{ minutes} \times .23 = \$4.05
\]

\[
1 \text{ minute} \times .27 = \$0.27
\]

\[
\frac{.27}{4.05} = .0632
\]

Cost for a 16 minute transmission $4.96
Total for 71 transactions $5.18

Each library will need to determine if the number of messages used for this sample is more or less than the load the library
will experience. One library director was concerned that if they did not use ALANET the system computer would be removed. The computer can still be used for printing ILL requests, record-keeping and other processes. There is no plan at this time to change any computer location.

I know many library directors and boards may be discussing this issue before the statewide meeting January 17. I am supplying this very preliminary cost information as the best I know at this time.

The system will maintain one daily transmission through ALANET until the January 17 meeting. Based upon the information and options presented at the meeting we will determine the next course of action. As soon as more information becomes available I will share it with you.

All legislative alerts will be mailed. Reporting on OCLC numbers, renewals and questions should be done on the Watts line. In the interim, full reports will include transactions will be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SH Bell</th>
<th>Sprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first minute</td>
<td>all additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City to Wichita (316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day rate 8:01 a.m. - 4:59 p.m.</td>
<td>$.51</td>
<td>$.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening 5:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night 10:01 p.m. - 7:59 a.m.</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-state evening and at 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City to Topeka (913)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening (same hours as 316)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City to all Colorado (303)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day rate 8:01 a.m. - 4:59 p.m.</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening 5:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night 11:01 p.m. - 7:59 a.m.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City to Oklahoma (918, 405)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening (same hours as 303)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97-7490 - 89 - 5
Adopted on
Libraries and the Legislature Day
1989

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 6056
A RESOLUTION honoring librarians, library trustees and friends of libraries for their commitment to public service in Kansas.

WHEREAS, Librarians, library trustees and friends of libraries are dedicated and skilled workers in service to the people of Kansas; and

WHEREAS, Libraries are essential to Kansas in providing information to support education, economic development and the high quality of community life throughout this great state; and

WHEREAS, Librarians, library trustees and friends of libraries work to insure the right of every citizen to read, research and develop with free access to information and with personal intellectual freedom; and

WHEREAS, Librarians, libraries and open access to all forms of information are essential to an informed electorate and to the life and function of our democratic society; and

WHEREAS, March 16, 1989, is the annual Library and Legislature Day, sponsored by the Kansas Library Association: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas: That we honor librarians, library trustees and friends of libraries for their commitment to public service in Kansas; and

Be it further resolved: That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to Duane Johnson, State Librarian, Kansas State Library; Marlene Hendrick, President, Kansas Library Association, 1518 West Tenth, Topeka, Kansas 66604; Joyce Funk, President, Kansas Association of School Librarians, 810 SE Croco Road, Topeka, Kansas 66605; Barbara Wunach, President, Friends of Kansas Libraries, 225 West Copeland, Kingman, Kansas 67068; and to the members of the State Library Advisory Commission: Dennis Botley, Ruthanna Danaber, Mary Lofstad, Armita Graber, Bette Jo Roberts, Sam Sheldon and Robert Walter, all in care of Duane Johnson, State Librarian, Kansas State Library, Capitol Building, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

I hereby certify that the above RESOLUTION originated in the HOUSE, and was adopted by that body

March 16, 1989

[Signature]
Chief Clerk of the House.
## NO. 1098. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS—VALUE, BY LEADING STATES: 1986

(In millions of dollars. For year ending September 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMODITY</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All commodities</td>
<td>26,324.7</td>
<td>CA 2,408.0</td>
<td>IL 2,152.1</td>
<td>IA 2,059.2</td>
<td>KY 1,839.3</td>
<td>NE 1,504.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans and products</td>
<td>5,573.4</td>
<td>IL 1,015.9</td>
<td>IA 922.5</td>
<td>IN 491.6</td>
<td>MO 479.7</td>
<td>OH 426.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn and products</td>
<td>4,713.9</td>
<td>IA 889.3</td>
<td>IL 814.1</td>
<td>NE 583.5</td>
<td>IN 393.7</td>
<td>MN 380.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat and products</td>
<td>3,546.2</td>
<td>ND 676.0</td>
<td>KS 643.9</td>
<td>TX 283.7</td>
<td>OK 244.9</td>
<td>CO 204.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice and wheat</td>
<td>1,455.5</td>
<td>KS 233.8</td>
<td>TX 214.9</td>
<td>NE 213.5</td>
<td>IA 75.6</td>
<td>CO 64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animals and meat products</td>
<td>1,356.7</td>
<td>KS 170.6</td>
<td>TX 169.0</td>
<td>KY 168.3</td>
<td>NE 163.7</td>
<td>IA 92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>1,317.5</td>
<td>NC 810.7</td>
<td>KY 245.1</td>
<td>SC 143.3</td>
<td>VA 75.2</td>
<td>GA 91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits and preparations</td>
<td>1,237.0</td>
<td>CA 739.4</td>
<td>FL 223.4</td>
<td>WA 70.8</td>
<td>AZ 45.6</td>
<td>MI 37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables and preparations</td>
<td>1,000.1</td>
<td>CA 416.0</td>
<td>WA 115.3</td>
<td>MI 58.2</td>
<td>WI 53.8</td>
<td>ID 52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>691.9</td>
<td>TX 203.2</td>
<td>CA 169.4</td>
<td>MS 85.3</td>
<td>AZ 53.7</td>
<td>LA 38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>617.5</td>
<td>MI 236.5</td>
<td>TX 101.7</td>
<td>IA 96.5</td>
<td>CA 70.6</td>
<td>MS 46.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes other commodities not shown separately.

Chairman WILLIAMS: Thank you. Our final witness today is Mr. Sam Morrison, who is Director of the Chicago Public Library.

Mr. Morrison, we are delighted you are with us. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL MORRISON, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF LIBRARIAN, CHICAGO PUBLIC LIBRARY.

Mr. MORRISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure for me to be here this afternoon, I think it is now.

The State Library of Illinois had requested that James W. Compton, the President of the Board of Directors of the Chicago Public Library, make a presentation to you today.

Unfortunately, he was unable to be here, and I would like with your permission to read into the record some excerpts from his testimony, which I believe you have before you.

Parenthetically, I would like to indicate, as the Chief Librarian for the City of Chicago, my support for the reauthorization of LSCA. I would make two points there.

First of all, my first professional job—and this is a second career for me—was in a library that was supported by LSCA, providing services to migrants in a rural area of Florida.

Second of all, I have great concern about the proposal of the administration for the replacement of LSCA, particularly with, at least my understanding, elimination of Title II-B.

I would not be sitting here today if it was not for an HEA II-B scholarship that I received at the University of Illinois. Currently, in the Chicago Public Library we are having a large degree of difficulty in recruiting librarians, children's librarians and particularly minority librarians. I believe the elimination of this portion of the HEA II-B would be detrimental to major urban libraries across the state and the country.

Mr. Compton in his testimony has summarized some of the activities that have resulted in the Chicago Public Library as a result of LSCA II-A. I am going to read just a couple of excerpts from his testimony and then I want to bring to your attention in a little bit more detail one of the projects specifically.

Chicago serves the reading and information needs not only of the residents of Chicago, but also those of many library users in the collar counties and beyond. This role, a typical one for large urban libraries, makes us eligible for MURL grants under Title I of LSCA.

We use those grants, which average about $230,000 annually in Chicago, to strengthen collections in the central library in those heavily-used subject areas and to also reinforce the collections in our branch libraries.

For example, with this year's grant we were able to do important preservation work on the deteriorating portions of our Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection, the second largest on Afro-American history and literature in the country.

The major portion of the grant is being spent on core collections of books about deafness, deaf culture and history, deaf psychology and sign language to be placed in each of our branches.
In addition to that portion of money from MURLs, one of our Title VI grants was used in conjunction with this, and I am going to give you more detail about that particular one.

We have also received many other regular Title I grants for library materials, programs and project staff that have enabled us to provide creative and specialized services in areas of great need that we were unable to accommodate under our regular budget.

For example, the Literacy Skills for the Hearing Impaired is a project that is being funded in the amount of $25,000. In the state of Illinois it is reported that the hearing impaired population is in excess of 700,000, and 100,000 of those are deaf. In Chicago there are an estimated 200,000 hearing impaired individuals.

It is well known that most deaf adults have only achieved a third to fifth grade reading level by the time their education has been completed. Only ten percent of young deaf adults read at or above the eighth grade level. In other words, the deaf are functionally illiterate and even the average newspaper is written at the sixth grade level.

This grant is divided into three basic parts: number one, the training of literacy tutors to work directly with the hearing impaired; number two, the purchase and circulation of high/low, high interest/low vocabulary, books; and, three, the purchase and circulation of read-along audiocassette transcripts and kits.

This grant will allow us to provide service by the TDD, closed caption decoders for loan, closed caption videos for loan, will provide staff members with sign language skills throughout the eighty-four branch units of the Chicago Public Library, will provide a captioned film series that will be run at some of our branches at about one series a month, and will provide $10,000 worth of books to be divided among the two regional libraries in the Chicago Public Library System.

Finally, Mr. Compton says, "I have shared with you a few of the current and most recent LSCA projects of which we at the Chicago Public Library are especially proud. As full partners in the federal/state/local partnership for support of library programs for our citizens, we provide for the basic library materials and services for the citizens of Chicago, but we must rely on the federal funds for seed money with which we can reach special constituencies such as the deaf in the project that I have mentioned to you earlier."

In conclusion, let me say that, although LSCA grants allow for experimentation, most of our projects have been very successful and have been absorbed into our regular operations whenever possible.

Along with society at large, libraries are subject to technological, cultural, demographic and other kinds of change and must respond, often rather quickly, to the changing needs of their communities.

This is exactly where the great value of LSCA lies for us. It allows us to seek creative solutions in new and changing service areas for user groups with special needs who need access to information vital to their wellbeing.

LSCA has been the catalyst for innovation in Chicago's library programs. This federal grant program has helped us stretch, and for that we are very grateful. We look forward to continued leadership from Congress.
Let me thank you for the opportunity to speak to you here. If there are questions that I can answer for you about the Chicago Public Library programs specifically, I would be happy to do that.

[The prepared statement of Samuel Morrison follows:]
TESTIMONY
By James W. Compton, President, Board of Directors, Chicago Public Library
Before the
Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
and
House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
Tuesday, April 11, 1989

My name is James W. Compton. I have been a citizen advocate for quality library services for many years, and I am currently President of the Chicago Public Library Board of Directors. I am grateful for the opportunity to testify today on how Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) funds have significantly improved our ability to provide needed library services and materials in a meaningful way for the people of Chicago.

As a major urban public library with large, retrospective, general and specialized collections, CPL serves the reading and information needs not only of the residents of Chicago, but also those of many library users in the collar counties and beyond. This role, a typical one for large urban public libraries, makes us eligible for Major Urban Resource Library grants under Title I of LSCA, which makes these special funds available whenever the Title I appropriation exceeds $60 million. We use these grants, which average about $230,000 annually, to strengthen the collections of the Central Library in the most heavily used subject areas, and also to reinforce the collections in our branch libraries. For example, with this year's grant we are able to do important preservation work on deteriorating portions of our Vivian G. Harch Research Collection, the second largest on Afro-American History and Literature in the country. This major portion of the grant is being spent on core collections of books about deafness, deaf culture and history, deaf psychology, and sign language to be placed in each one of our branches. Further, we are finally able to replace our fragile back files of U.S. patents with microfilm. These patent files are heavily used by the business and manufacturing communities in the city, as well as individual entrepreneurs, designers and inventors. The Chicago Public Library is the only location in northern Illinois where a complete collection of patents is available.

We have also received many other regular Title I grants for library materials, programs, and project staff, that have enabled us to provide creative and specialized services in areas of great need that we were unable to accommodate under our regular budget. In our applications for these grants, we have tried to make a difference in the lives of the poor and illiterate, of recent immigrants as well as established ethnic groups, and of various groups of people with disabilities or impairments. These projects are aimed at all age groups and have as their underlying principle the promotion of reading and learning how to use the library. For example, our Conrad Sulzer Regional Library which, by the way, is serving 80 different language groups, has a project underway called "Enhancing Cultural Literacy Among Middle Grade Students." Here we seek to expand reading motivation through the collection and dissemination of information about the family traditions celebrated by new immigrants. The focus is on the similarities (rather than on differences - a trait common among young people) between many diverse cultures in their celebration of seasons, holidays, and religious observances.

Other Title I programs include a project critical to urban redevelopment called "Jobs for the 'Rust Belt' - Improving Low Tech/High Return Manufacturing Skills." This grant provides a basic core collection in books, films, videos and pamphlets to meet the demand for information on low tech manufacturing and other "blue collar" trades in an area of the City that was hard hit by factory closings. Another grant is used to assist in the mainstreaming of print handicapped children through the selective purchase and placement of

Title I (Public Library Services)
resources to augment the Illinois Network of Libraries Serving the Blind and Physically Handicapped. Several current Title I projects are designed to expand bilingual learning-and Latino literature collections, and to serve the needs for Hispanic health information, Spanish communication skills for library personnel working in predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods, and for survival tips for Hispanics in urban Chicago (about 18% of Chicago's population is Hispanic).

Under Title II, which funds public library construction or renovation projects, we had a $160,000 grant a few years ago that helped us renovate a new site for our North Austin branch library, and we hope for continued assistance in this area.

Title III grants for Interlibrary Cooperation are currently making it possible for us to tackle the enormous task of assessing the library collections not only of the Chicago Public Library, but also in 'libraries affiliated with our system, including academic and school libraries as well as medical, law, museum, government agency, corporate and other kinds of very specialized libraries.

The purpose is to arrive, eventually, at agreements on emphases in collection development which will lead to more efficient utilization of all our collections as well as of our material budgets. We are also using funds under this title for the purchase of telefacsimile machines in order to speed-up delivery of needed pieces of information from one library site to another. Title III grants have further been used to locate magazines and journals in all kinds of libraries in the City online, as well as for building electronic bridges to the collections of other library systems in Illinois.

Finally, we are fortunate in having qualified for grants under Title VI which funds Literacy Programs. While the twin dysfunctions of illiteracy and alienation are critical problems of national scope, in an urban environment it is difficult to identify and reach those individuals in need of tutoring and nurturing basic skills. The Chicago Public Library is currently attempting to better the reading skills of persons in a variety of environments. The Library provides support materials for literacy tutoring programs and is producing a videotape documentary series with volunteer tutors and students, to be used for training new volunteers. Two other exciting literacy projects are the "Austin Literacy Resource Coalition" and "Literacy Skills for the Hearing Impaired." The Austin community is among the poorest and least literate in Chicago. According to a 1986 report by the Chicago Urban Skills Institute, more than 45% of Austin residents 18 years and older do not possess a high school diploma, and 42% of the residents make less than $5,000 annually. This LSCA grant will establish a resource center for literacy programs serving the Austin community, making print and non-print materials available to residents, volunteers, agencies and other local libraries. Another underserved illiterate population is that of the hearing impaired. This LSCA grant project recruits and trains volunteers with the necessary skills for communicating with the hearing impaired and provides materials needed to supplement and reinforce the skills acquired through the tutoring program.

What I have shared with you are just a few of the current and most recent LSCA projects of which we at the Chicago Public Library are especially proud. As full partners in the federal/state/local partnership for support of library programs for our citizens, we provide for the basic library materials and services for the citizens of Chicago, but must rely on federal funds for the seed money with which we can reach special constituencies, under special circumstances. Those are frequently the people who need our services most and who rely on these outreach programs.
In conclusion, let me say that although LSCA grants allow for experimentation, most of our projects have been very successful and have been absorbed into our regular operations whenever possible, following the grant period. Along with society at large, libraries are subject to technological, cultural, demographic and other kinds of change and must respond, often rather quickly, to the changing needs of their communities. That is exactly where the great value of LSCA lies for us - it allows us to seek creative solutions in new and changing service areas where user groups with special needs need access to information vital to their well-being.

LSCA has been the catalyst for innovation in Chicago's library programs. This federal grant program has helped us stretch, and for that we are very grateful. We look forward to continued leadership from Congress.
Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you very much. Mr. Pell?
Senator PELL. I just have one question for Ms. Thompson. I am speaking in a parochial way.
What do you see as the principal needs of the public library you head?
Ms. THOMPSON. I think when I talked about MURL funding for major urban resource libraries, we serve needs not only for the Providence community but for the entire state. Our ability to provide a full range of services to communities that own their own could not provide the sophisticated services that we can provide.
I think that is terribly important for the citizens of Rhode Island.
Senator PELL. Thank you very much. In view of the time I have no further questions.
Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Owens?
Mr. OWENS. I would like to repeat what I said to the members of the previous panel.
You are on the firing line and you know exactly what the value of some of these systems are when you have modern technology introduced. You also know the problems and the cost.
We could like to have more information from you about what realistically are the costs, when you figure in personnel to keep them going and upgrading, et cetera, and, you know, talk about the value that you get from that extra cost.
We would appreciate it in writing.
Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Poshard?
Mr. POSHARD. No questions, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the nature of the problems that the folks have and we certainly want to assist them in gaining that right.
Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Hayes?
Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend the customary welcome to a fellow citizen from the city of Chicago. I wanted you to know that you are an able pinch hitter for James Compton, who I know very well.
To be in this very troubled city at this time, which shares some of the problems that we have in other urban areas of our great nation, where the school dropout problem is one which you very well know is acute in Chicago, particularly in the minority communities.
Certainly our libraries, I think, can be a very helpful and useful area in which we can supplement our educational opportunities for many of our minority kids.
I wish you would pass on to Mr. Compton that I certainly want to commend him for his reference to the grant program as it relates to Title I. He says, "This grant program includes a project critical to the urban redevelopment called Jobs for the Rust Belt."
The unemployment picture is very high, particularly in my first congressional district, and improving low tech, high return manufacturing skills, which we hope to do, will certainly aid in people being able to find jobs and combat some of the other things that contribute to the rise in crime, the trafficking of drugs and these kind of things.
This is something were certainly I think we all need to work together, and we need more money and not less money in this area. I as one congressman have made myself a commitment to do what I
can to arouse the consciousness of the members of this body which I am a part of for the need for really spending money on a priority basis to elevate educational opportunities for our people.

Mr. Morrison. Thank you, Mr. Hayes. I might point out that the grant you refer to is the second one that we have used LSCA funds for. The first grant was in a predominantly white unemployed area and it was very successful. We have now moved that program into a predominantly black area and are trying that program in that area to see if it will be equally successful.

Chairman Williams. I want to thank Mr. Hayes. I want to thank this panel. Your good counsel is very helpful.

I particularly want to thank Chairman Pell and his Senate colleagues from the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, as well as my colleagues from the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee here in the House.

Finally, I want to make note that, although this Act expires in September, our deadline comes before then, because here in the House we must pass the authorization ahead of the appropriation, so if we are going to appropriate money for this Act for next year we have to move very quickly with this reauthorization.

I am hopeful that here in the House and perhaps, Senator, in the Senate as well we can introduce legislation within about a month or so. That will be our deadline, at least here in the House, for the introduction of legislation. I am hopeful that we can then put it on the legislative track that will move it quickly to the House and over to the Senate.

We are delighted that you are all here. Thank you very much.

This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:03 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]
[Additional material submitted for the record follows.]
The Honorable Pat Williams  
Chairman, House Subcommittee on  
Postsecondary Education  
U.S. House of Representatives  
616 House Office Building-Apartment #1  
Washington, DC 20515  

Dear Representative Williams:  

As requested, I am providing some specific recommendations for the modification of Title VI - Library Literacy Programs of the Library Services and Construction Act to accommodate emerging trends.

My first recommendation is that (c) of Section 601 of the Act include as (4) programs which are intended to break the cycle of intergenerational literacy; as (5) which provide literacy programs for the handicapped and the institutionalized, especially those in correctional facilities; and as (6) demonstrate the use of new technologies to reach large numbers of adult illiterates.

Commenting more specifically on the emerging trends in literacy efforts, the language of the Act currently specifies adult literacy programs. The interpretation has been that projects may be funded if they have an intergenerational component, as long as they are not aimed solely at "children". The Adult Education Act is restricted to serving adults and some other federal programs serve only children. Having some flexibility in Title VI would allow public libraries to work cooperatively in a variety of ways depending upon what other agencies and sources of funds are available in their community.

It is important to keep primary emphasis on adults, given the limited funds available. I am writing separately on Senate Bill 399 and House Bill 947, which do not include programs for illiterate adults. Consequently, I believe, these bills which seek to amend Title VI address needs which would be much better handled by increasing authorization levels for Title I where programs serving children are more broadly based.

Literacy programs for the handicapped and for those in institutions, including prisons, are referenced in the materials accompanying applications for Title VI funds. The act might be amended to include substantially state-supported institution libraries as eligible recipients of Title VI funds and also, public library programs which reach illiterates who are handicapped or in local institutions, including community correctional facilities might be added to the act.
The use of new technologies for helping illiterates learn to read and write is limited by the $25,000 ceiling for this category of grants. Computer instruction is expensive and is cost-effective when a large number of adults can be served each day. Public libraries, with their long hours and weekend service, are a natural place for such instruction. Because highlighting technology might cause a rash of applications for purchasing microcomputers without real evidence in need or understanding of their use, it would strengthen programs if selection criteria required a documented need statement. I recommend increasing the grant ceiling to $50,000.

Given you want to write the Act in a way that meets the coming decade, rather than reflects the past decade, I believe a revised Act might place less emphasis on developing awareness of illiteracy, and focus on projects which reach large numbers of illiterates through public library programs.

I also would encourage you to raise the authorization level for the program and add language to the act which ensures the U.S. Department of Education provides closer coordination with programs of the states.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations. It was a pleasure to appear before your committee to testify on this important program.

Sincerely,

Sara Parker
State Librarian
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May 2, 1989

Ms. Colleen Thompson
Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
Committee on Education and Labor
U. S. House of Representatives
616 House Office Building Annex #1
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Ms. Thompson:

This is in response to your memorandum of April 19, 1989 requesting my responses to questions posed to me during the joint House - Senate hearing on April 11, 1989 regarding the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act.

First of all, in regard to specific recommendations to change the Library Services and Construction Act to accommodate the availability of new technology and to reflect the needs created by the availability of that technology, the library community is pleased that the LSRA Amendments of 1984 acknowledge that public libraries should utilize improved and new technologies to meet the increasing need for information services and educational resources in a rapidly changing world. We were also happy that these amendments stipulated that the basic state plan should provide that priority be given to programs and projects that increase services and access to services through the effective use of technology. In this vein, I support the recommendation of the American Library Association as submitted in the statement of Dr. F. William Summers, president of ALA, that an increased emphasis on the use of technology to improve library services and access to information in all its formats be given. In addition, I support the recommendation of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA) as already submitted by California State Librarian Gary Strong of increased authorization (and appropriations) of at least $7.5 million for the Title III Interlibrary Cooperation and Resource Sharing program to enable any library to provide access to information in an electronic form made possible by new information and communications technologies. However, Monteria Hightower, Associate Commissioner for Libraries and State Librarian of Missouri, has asked me to stress to you that it is important that the increased support needed for the use of technology not detract from the needs of the services, programs and projects supported by Title I.
As an aside to this issue, as a recipient of LSCA grants of both Title I and Title III funds for the use of technology to improve our services, our library has experienced problems with the time frames of grant cycles, i.e., the nature of the implementation of technology is such that sometimes projects take longer than originally anticipated. This situation cannot be addressed in the act itself but rather in rules and regulations promulgated by the Department of Education. However, these improvements should not interfere with the appropriations process in general and result in less money being appropriated for an ensuing year.

In response to Congressman Owens' questions about technology, I am enclosing copies of some periodical articles which deal with his concerns. Congressman Owens also asked about ongoing costs of technology as opposed to initial costs. My library is beginning the process of acquiring an integrated automated system which could serve as an example to him. We anticipate first-year costs of approximately $400,000, roughly 28.5% of which is being supported by an LSCA Title III grant. We anticipate that additional yearly costs will run between $65,000 to $100,000, not counting the reallocation of present personnel to deal with the new system.

Finally, although I was not asked on April 11 my thoughts about the proposed Library Services Improvement Act of 1989, I would like to register a response to this proposal. In his testimony Mr. Kolb stated that in the past thirty years the purpose of the existing statute to extend library services to every community has been substantially achieved. This is simply not true in Missouri, where currently 11% of our population is without access to their own tax-supported library service, making the availability of Library Services and Construction Act funds to extend services in unserved areas particularly important. Congressman Coleman's Sixth District is a case in point. Of the 27+ counties in the district, 11 are without countywide tax-supported service. Eight of these counties have one or two tax-supported municipal libraries, but three have no municipal libraries. Second, Mr. Kolb indicated that "the inclination is for a library to serve only its immediate clientele and not to loan its books and materials outside its service area." I think that the evidence which the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education has heard strongly supports the opposite view. As I indicated in my own testimony, several LSCA grants have improved my library's ability both to loan and to borrow materials for all of northwest Missouri. The records of our library have been added to an LSCA-funded statewide database in compact disc format which can be accessed by LSCA-supported microcomputers and CD-ROM equipment placed in 107 qualifying public libraries in Missouri.
Again, I want to thank the members of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor for the opportunity to speak in support of the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Sanborn Elliott
Director and President
Missouri Library Association
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March 13, 1989

The Honorable Claiborne Pell, Chairman
Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee
Russell Building, Room SR-335
1st and C Streets, NE
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc. (LVA) does not support the passage of the Library Improvement Act but supports the reauthorization of the current Library Services and Construction Act. Many literacy programs have begun in libraries across the country and LVA has found that Title VI of the LSCA (Library Literacy Programs) has made possible the organization, continuation, and expansion of many of our programs. The amount of federal money budgeted for adult literacy is relatively small, and eliminating LSCA's Title VI will reduce this amount even further, a consequence that we do not wish to see and feel certain that the new administration, with its stress on education, would not wish to see.

We offer below a few examples to illustrate how crucial LSCA's Title VI has been to volunteer programs. The following projects were funded under Title VI:

- In Browning, MT, The Blackfeet Library Literacy program, operated through the Blackfeet Community College Library, trains tutors, matches them with illiterate adults from the Blackfeet Tribe, provides low-level reading materials for new readers, and coordinates literacy activities reservation wide.

- In Coventry, RI, LSCA funds provide materials and equipment to support and expand Coventry Public Library's ongoing LVA program, which was started in 1980 under an LSCA grant.

- In Huntington Beach, CA, LSCA funds have made possible the redesigning, expanding, and enhancing of LVA-Huntington Valley, and incorporating it into a permanent library-based program.

The LSCA-funded Queens Borough Public Library literacy program in Jamaica, NY, achieved honor in 1988 when student Annie Goolabia was chosen LVA Student of the Year and Borough President Claire Shulman proclaimed "Annie Goolabia Day," with coverage from all major New York City media.

These few examples, chosen from among 224 equally worthy recipients of FY 1988 Title VI grants, will indicate why Literacy Volunteers of America offers its full and urgent support for the reauthorization of LSCA.

Thank you for your attention to this vital issue.

Sincerely,

Arthur Bongiovanni, Chairman

Arthur Bongiovanni, Chairman
In recent years the programs of the Library Services and Construction Act have provided the financial backbone for public libraries. Through LSCA programs, public libraries have made great forward strides in the areas of service, construction, and interlibrary resource sharing. As director of the Boston Public Library, I can attest to LSCA's critical importance to my own institution: $719,000 in LSCA funding was a part of the multiple-source package that has enabled Boston Public Library to cooperate with five other public libraries in establishing the Metro-Boston Library Network, an automated resource-sharing cooperative. Members of our public will soon have easy access to information about the circulating collections of all six libraries (over 3 million volumes) and the ability to borrow any of the libraries' materials with equal ease.

Grants totalling $95,000 from LSCA have made it possible for the Boston Public Library to open an Access Center at the main library for people with disabilities, providing special assistance in meeting their library and information needs. Special equipment and materials for library patrons with visual, hearing, and physical disabilities have been acquired, including a Kurzweil reading machine, a Visual-Tek electronic magnifier, TDD's (telephone typewriters), a computerized voice synthesizer, page turners, and more.

Innovative technology, formats, and materials tailored to the needs of the disabled, and professional staff trained to provide assistance are now in place in great measure because of LSCA and its high priority placed on services to the disabled.

I can also speak for the importance of LSCA funding to smaller libraries across the country. I urge Congress to reauthorize LSCA and to continue existing programs. In addition, I hope you will support a technical amendment establishing a new program to fund the area of preservation. Such a program is vitally needed to counteract the disintegration of paper which threatens to destroy all library collections.
The way in which people view the physical condition of library collections has changed radically in recent years. Old books were once thought to be indestructible; new ones expendable and replacable. In recent years surveys of collections in major research institutions such as The Library of Congress have revealed that approximately 40% of their collections are too fragile to use. Lack of interest in the physical condition of library materials has been replaced by legitimate fear for their long-term survival.

Because of the permanent value and the magnitude of their collections, most research libraries and major urban public libraries have initiated steps to tackle the problem of preservation. Small and medium-sized public libraries have thus far assumed a less aggressive role in this area. There are many reasons for this: coordination on a regional level has generally been absent; funding has been limited; expertise has been lacking. Yet, preservation problems affect all library collections.

Steps to counteract the deterioration of collections in public libraries must include:
- educating librarians in preservation principles and procedures;
- improving environmental conditions in library buildings, thus slowing the deterioration of paper;
- insuring security of collections from water, fire, and theft;
- providing better physical storage and support for collections;
- instituting practices to minimize damage from handling;
- taking necessary measures for disaster preparedness;
- using good quality materials and instituting safe book repair procedures;
- microfilming fragile materials.

I support the March 20, 1989 recommendation of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies to establish a Title III-B of LSCA. This would authorize a preservation cooperation program in which state library agencies would work with libraries, archives, historical societies, scholarly organizations, and other agencies in planning, education and training, coordinating, outreach and public information, and service programs to ensure that endangered library and information resources are preserved for future generations. Title III-B would complement the interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing already underway in Title III and would build upon the work of the Library of Congress and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Thank you.
RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR CONTINUATION OF THE FEDERAL LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT passed at Jan. 8, 1989 COSLA Meeting

Whereas, The Chief Officers of State Library Agencies express their continued support for the Federal Library Services and Construction Act because it enables the States and localities to serve millions of Americans, including those who are disabled, disadvantaged, institutionalized, or without the ability to speak and read English; and

Whereas, the state and Federal partnership assisted by this Act strengthens public libraries, major urban resource libraries, and resource sharing among all types of libraries, and makes possible service important to the economy and to the international competitiveness of the United States; and

Whereas, the Federal role in library services, as defined by the Congress, will continue to be debated and reviewed by the library community and its organizations, the participants in meetings leading to the 1991 White House Conference on Library and Information Services, and the Administration as it presents legislative and budget proposals; and

Whereas, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies emphasize the need to strengthen existing services while developing new services to respond to the educational, informational, and cultural needs of Americans in a society marked by competition and the value of information in every sector of American life;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies urge action to continue and fund the current Library Services and Construction Act so that essential library services will not be interrupted.
The Chief Officers of State Library Agencies urge prompt reauthorization of the Federal Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) so that essential statewide and local library services programs, benefitting millions of Americans, can continue without disruption. The Chief Officers, the State officials who administer the LSCA programs which strengthen public library services, improve library facilities and stimulate resource sharing and use of information technologies among all types of libraries, support a five year reauthorization. Members of Congress recognize the strength and vitality of the LSCA by suggesting amendments that emphasize new national priorities. As Congress considers reauthorization, the Chief Officers recommend that:

- The state and federal partnership, characterized in LSCA by the development of state long range programs, matching funds, and maintenance of effort, be retained;

- The broad scope of LSCA Title I, allowing each state to address varying needs for strengthened and improved library services, be retained;

- Consideration be given to a nationwide response through LSCA to need in each state for a coordinated program for preservation of endangered library and information resources;

- And minor technical amendments be adopted to clarify existing provisions of the act.
Written Testimony
by
Gretchen Wronka, Legislation Chair
of the Association for Library Services to Children,
a Division of the American Library Association

Joint Hearing on the Library Services and Construction Act
April 11, 1989

House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities

I am Gretchen Wronka, Chair of the Legislation Committee of the Association for Library Service to Children (ALSC), a division of the American Library Association. ALSC is interested in the improvement of library services to all children.

Background

Libraries have long been in the forefront of services to young children. The traditional premise on which public library service was based was that one parent was available during the day to bring the child to the library and actively participate with the child in library programs. However, there have been dramatic changes in society which challenge that premise.

Perhaps the most significant is the increase of young mothers in the labor force. By 1985, fifty-four percent of all women with children under age six were working - this includes almost fifty percent of all mothers with infants. This trend is accelerating. In ten years it is predicted that the number of children who will need daytime supervision will increase more than fifty percent.

Consistent with this change, is the growth in the number of young children in day care. Over half of the nation's pre-school children are spending up to twelve hours a day, five days a week, year round in day care. About a third of these children are in day care homes where a single woman cares for up to six to ten pre-school children. Because of legal constraints, insurance costs, the age range of the children and sometimes parental objections, family day care providers and children are essentially home bound. While in day care, traditional library service is rarely available to these children and because of the demands on the time and energy of their working parents, the children are less likely to be taken to a library during the parents non-working hours.

Thus, the changing form of modern society has created a need for extension of traditional library services to children in day care to insure that children in care giving settings have access to information and that books and reading become part of the daily program in day care facilities.

The extraordinary importance of this outreach service is underscored by intensive research focused on the period of early childhood over the last twenty years which shows the particular importance of the years from birth to three in the child's development.

Scientists have concluded that nearly half of an individual's intelligence is developed by age four and demonstrated that the child's very early experience with books, language and being read to is the key factor in becoming a literate adult. Research has shown that the stimulation the child receives during these first few years sets a pattern that is difficult to change in later years.

Added to the growing number of children in day care and the recognition of the great importance of the quality of that care to the child's future is another sobering trend - the povertyization of children.
Senator Daniel Moynihan, Chair of the Finance Subcommittee on Social Security summarized the situation in statements he made before the committee in January/February 1987.

"One child in four is born into poverty, one in five will grow up poor."

Senator Moynihan also pointed out an added dimension to the problem:

Fifteen years ago the birth rate in America fell below the level necessary to maintain the population...and yet, at present, we suffer the impoverishment of 20% of our children...some 12 million children live below the official poverty line. Only 7 million of these are even on welfare and welfare benefits, set by the states, have lost a third of their purchasing power to inflation in the past 15 years.

Research in the area of "intergenerational illiteracy" - the concept that the inability to read is handed on from parent to child - has shown that, children who fail in school and those who leave the system early are, by and large, poor. The child from a non-literate family enters school at a tremendous disadvantage. There are few books and newspapers around the house for the child to look at. Most damaging of all is the message from the home that books and learning are not important. These non-literate parents in turn produce non-literate children and the illiteracy cycle is complete.

The home - which now must include day care for over 50% of the nation's children - is the first and most important learning environment. All parents and day care providers need to understand the importance of reading aloud to children. It is important to recognize that nationally, the average family day care provider earns $4,000-$5,000 annually after expenses. This is equivalent to a $4.00 per hour job, which places the average day care provider in the lowest 10% of U.S. wage earners.

Thus, Library support for the day care provider which makes her aware of the importance of reading to the children in her care and provides books and direction for their use with the children may make a significant contribution to the child's later ability to read.

As the Report of the Commission on Reading states, "The single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success in reading, is reading aloud to children." This is particularly significant because research has shown that reading is the key to school success.

Libraries can make a major contribution to the quality of the pre-school child's experience in day care. ALSC urges the members of both the House and Senate Subcommittees to provide the capability to libraries to initiate services to children in child care settings which ultimately may contribute to the solution of some of societies most pervasive, long term problems.

S.409, Title III, Section 301
Child Care Provider Library Program,
Senator Rudy Boschwitz

Because of the extraordinary changes taking place in our society and the importance of facilitating library cooperation with the many other individuals and organizations serving children, the ALSC strongly endorses S.409, Title III, Section 301 - Child Care Provider Library Program which establishes a federal program of grants to "state and local public libraries for the purpose of enabling such libraries to purchase and deliver children's books, videos, tapes and toys to licensed or certified family based or group child care providers...through the expanded use of bookmobiles."
The following changes and additions to Title III, Section 301 are recommended by ALSC:

- The grants be administered through state library agencies.
- The use of funds be expanded to include other library services to children such as deposit collection and workshops for child care providers.
- Day care centers be included in the language.
- The legislation clearly states that funds appropriated under Title VII, Sec. 701, State and Local Library Grants of the Library Services and Construction Act be in addition to and not diverted from existing LSCA funding.

ALSC Recommendation

The Association for Library Service to Children respectfully requests the Subcommittees' consideration of inclusion of Title III, Section 301 of S.409 - with the proposed changes - in the 1989 reauthorization of the LSCA.

Because funds for states, appropriated under LSCA are not administered so that allotments are specified for services to children, the request is made for the establishment of a separate title VII, authorizing appropriations for library services to children during the process of reauthorizing LSCA.

ALSC urges that emphasis be placed on services to children in day care providing additional funding beyond what is currently recommended under Titles I to VI of the LSCA.

The urgency of the need as well as the opportunity for enhancing the development of pre-reading skills during the child's most formative years underscores ALSC's request for establishment of Title VII - Library Services to Children - in the 1989 reauthorization of the LSCA.

It is also requested that the attached letter of commendation from ALSC, president Marilyn Iarusso to Senator Boschwitz, be included with my testimony.

Thank you for the opportunity to include the recommendation of ALSC in the Subcommittee Hearing Record.
The cost to the Providence Public Library for operating the Cooperating Libraries Automated Network (CLAN) in FY 1989-90 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Equipment</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>137,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel-Administration</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringes</td>
<td>11,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELINET Costs</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday service</td>
<td>3,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>16,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$358,099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost for equipment upgrades has been averaging $250,000. In ten years, these costs will be doubled on a yearly basis.

The projected costs of technology for Rhode Island libraries for the next ten years are as follows:

- **Electronic Mail System for Interlibrary Loan**–$485,000 equipment costs and an annual maintenance cost of $35,000.

- **Telecommunications Equipment**–$1,000,000 plus $160,000 annual maintenance costs.
Facsimile Equipment—$280,000

Equipment and operating costs for Cooperating Automated Libraries Network—$500,000 equipment costs plus annual operating expenses of $633,000.

Access to information is enhanced with the use of technology. Users of libraries in the most rural areas of Rhode Island can have the same access to information that users of libraries such as the Providence Public Library can have. Through the use of technology, libraries can share materials that are not needed on a daily basis by every library; for many libraries this means not duplicating costly materials that may be used only occasionally. With technology, today’s students can learn how to use information effectively; this knowledge will help the student in the future to be more competitive and as a result help to make the American economy more competitive in a global economy. Timely and useful information is not inexpensive, and if we expect individuals to function effectively in any information society and to be productive, this type of investment must be made by the federal government.
May 8, 1989

Ms. Colleen Thompson
Sub-committee on Post Secondary Education
U.S. House of Representatives
616 House Office Building Annex #1
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Ms. Thompson:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you and the Subcommittee with more information about the increasing importance of automation technology in the library field. The continued and increased availability of funding from the Library Services and Construction Act is of paramount importance for the library profession as the primary information providers to our citizenry.

Although computer technology has been common place in other industries for the last several decades, the library field has only begun to utilize automation extensively in the last ten to fifteen years. Utilization of this technology requires the federal support of LSCA funding.

Automation applications fall into several categories, although some systems may combine and integrate different applications. Some systems for individual libraries may also have capabilities for "networking" with other systems, especially bibliographic databases. In general the thrust is to both encourage resource sharing among libraries as well as to improve the efficiency and operations of individual libraries.

The exponential expansion of human knowledge and automation capabilities are accelerating libraries’ needs to have adequate funding for automation projects.

The general applications categories include the following:

1. Library Circulation Systems – to maintain patron records, status of library owned items, etc.

2. Bibliographic Databases – to maintain appropriately formatted records of a library's holdings according to professional standards.

3. Public Access Catalogues – computerized listings of library holdings and the status of those holdings, which can be efficiently and rapidly updated and are easily used by the public in lieu of card catalogues.
4. **Computerized Data Bases** – there are literally hundreds of public and private data bases which are used extensively by libraries to access a variety of reference materials, full texts of newspapers and periodicals, journal articles, statistical data, etc.

5. **Inter-library Bibliographic Networks** – as a part of library efforts to encourage resource sharing on regional and national bases, a variety of bibliographic networks exist among libraries so they can ascertain holdings of other libraries.

6. **Office Automation and Business Applications** – not only do libraries need to effectively utilize office and business automation systems, but the purchasing of books and related materials often requires specialized purchasing and acquisitions systems which are unique to the library field.

The literature on automation in libraries is mounting. I thought you might be interested in the following resources which would help explain and highlight some of the current uses of automation in libraries.

1. The April 1, 1989 issue of *Library Journal* is devoted to articles on the status of the library automation marketplace.

2. The March-April, 1989 issue of *Illinois Libraries*, titled, "Automation: A Sampler", is also devoted to this topic with several excellent articles on specific automation applications in libraries.

3. *Library Technology Reports* is a regular journal published by the American Library Association. It regularly covers automation issues, and is generally considered to be the authoritative journal dealing with library automation issues.

If I can be of any further assistance to you and the subcommittee please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Samuel F. Morrison
First Deputy Commissioner/Chief Librarian

SFM/sef
REV.
Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Subcommittee received considerable testimony in support of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) at a joint hearing on April 11. We ask that this letter be added to the public record of the Subcommittee's consideration for reauthorization of LSCA.

The membership of the Association of Research Libraries is comprised of the largest research institutions in the U.S. and Canada. As a general rule, these research libraries do not receive LSCA funds but the users of research libraries benefit as a result of the LSCA projects in other libraries in their states. LSCA enhances the ability of all libraries, public and private, of a variety of types, to cooperate with one another for the benefit of library users.

LSCA funding of particular interest to research libraries is that which serves to strengthen the ease and speed of transmitting information, including but not limited to electronic links. Networking and document delivery projects empower all libraries to connect with remote sites to identify, send, and/or receive information required for a user. LSCA allows libraries to take advantage of new technologies toward this goal. The future success of library services hinges on the ability of libraries to function simultaneously as sources and switching stations for the electronic delivery of information resources. ARL urges Congressional enhancement of this dimension of LSCA.

ARL also supports a preservation component in LSCA. The deterioration of library materials is not unique to research libraries. A recent National Conference on the Development of Statewide Preservation Programs confirmed that small amounts of LSCA funds have been effectively spent to assist libraries to respond to preservation needs. All types of libraries and archives have a responsibility to be part of the solution to this pressing national problem; a designated component in LSCA would provide incentive to a library to undertake a proactive response.

We also wish to thank you for your leadership in focusing national attention on the importance of publisher use of permanent paper. ARL supports H.J. Res. 226 as the most effective long term solution to the problem of preservation of printed materials.

ARL opposes a recommendation the Subcommittee received that would amend LSCA, and the Higher Education Act Title II, to require a State Library Administrative Agency to assess applications for discretionary grants that are submitted to the Department of Education. "Coordination" of Department of Education grants and State LSCA programs is of course desirable; it happens at present through local planning and cooperative efforts. What evidence has been provided to demonstrate the need for this extension of authority for state agencies?
An amendment such as has been proposed would do more than establish "coordination". It would extend an authority of a State library agency over other libraries, including libraries in private institutions - e.g. federal imposition of an organizational relationship on a state that the state itself chooses not to impose. This is rejected by ARL. We ask that Congress reject it as well.

ARL also opposes the Administration's Library Improvement Act as a substitute for LSCA and HEA Title II. The statement filed with the Subcommittee by William Summers on behalf of the American Library Association contains an excellent list of the problems with the Administration's proposal. I concur with his assessment. The Library Improvement Act fails to recognize the role and needs of academic libraries: in fact, it targets no federal funds at all to academic or research libraries and the only kind of discretionary grants for which these libraries would be eligible is interstate network development.

We would be pleased to discuss any aspects of our comments with you. Thank you for your interest in the libraries of the nation.

Sincerely,

Duane E. Webster
Executive Director

cc: Committee on Government Policies
ARL Board of Directors
April 25, 1989

The Honorable Glenn Poshard
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives
1229 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-1322

Dear Mr. Poshard:

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to your question at the hearing of the Subcommittee of Postsecondary Education on April 11, 1989.

Enclosed is my response to your questions concerning the ways in which business leaders can assist in building a better library system in this country.

Feel free to contact me if I can provide additional information.

Sincerely,

R. Earl Beck
Chairman

Enclosure
RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS BY CONGRESSMAN POSHARD
COMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
REAUTHORIZATION OF LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT
APRIL 11, 1989

Question
In what ways can the business community assist in helping to build better library systems in this country? Are there some sort of incentives that the government could give businesses for participating?

Banks Lead Community Support of Public Libraries

In rural Mississippi, financial institutions have traditionally led community support for public libraries. There is virtually no library board of trustees in the state without one bank officer or staff member serving in a leadership role. In addition, banks in such communities as Grenada and Yazoo City have spearheaded community drives for local library services. In the process they have donated their own funds and persuaded other business men to do likewise. Although such donated funds are tax deductible they are limited and competition for private funds is stiff. I agree with you that a definite need exists for added incentives so the business community can better assist public libraries.

Public Library Construction Paramount

The business community should take the leadership role in the construction of public library buildings. A system of federally sanctioned tax breaks on the purchase of bonds issued by local governments for library construction will encourage the construction of adequate facilities, especially in rural areas. In rural Mississippi alone, 59 new buildings, additions or renovations totaling 416,941 square feet are needed. Meeting this need will require $22,039,150 in private support to be raised in areas that are both rural and poverty stricken. Tax breaks for the purchase of library construction bonds would act as an incentive both for the local governments and businessmen while enriching the entire community for years to come.

A much less attractive alternative to such bonds would be the construction of public libraries by private business concerns and the lease-purchase of such facilities by the local community. This is not a feasible alternative in most rural Mississippi communities. Businessmen, especially those in the financial community, do not find the ownership of such real estate an attractive investment because of the potential time needed to manage the investment. Also, many of the communities in Mississippi that need buildings are not large enough to have local businesses substantial enough to participate in such a program.
Response to the question "What is the value of automated systems - what are the problems and the costs?"

The issues surrounding automation deal with cost of the equipment for initial purchase, cost of the software for a variety of functions, yearly maintenance costs for both equipment and software, and the rapidly changing environment in the computer and digital storage equipment market.

The issue of benefit is difficult to quantify in the same manner as equipment or software cost. The reality is that no library can afford to be without these vital tools. Students in kindergarten and first grade utilize the computer labs. By fourth grade these young people are skilled searchers who expect to be able to use the library's resources through computer access. Business people need data and access to collections which combine terms for targeted searching. This can only be done through the rapid access provided by the tremendous sorting capabilities of a computer.

Infotrac is a computer assisted magazine citation index with data stored on a CD-ROM disk. Readers Guide, the traditional print citation index, includes 200 magazines issued in paper supplements and an annual bound volume. The lapse time between article publication and indexing available in print is 2 - 3 months. Infotrac includes 400 magazines and the lapse time for indexing is 1 month or less. The CD-ROM disk is updated monthly. The Dodge City Community College received Infotrac on a trial basis in February of 1988. Within the second month interlibrary loan requests from that library increased from 17 in Jan. 1988 to 94 in Feb. The user acceptance was dramatic. This library applied for a foundation grant and received Infotrac in March. We have had to limit time per person on the index because there are lines of people waiting. This library has many elementary through post secondary students using the collection for research. These students must learn to use the most advanced tools if they hope to be competitive in the work place.

This library is deeply involved in automating the checkout procedures and providing a computerized public access catalog for user access to the collection. Phase 1 was completed in 1984 with funds from the final funds from a 1982 construction of a new facility. Phase 1 automated the overdue notification and outstanding materials trapping and provided workstations for internal staff use. Cost for the Zenith computer on a state purchase contract was $3,349.00 for a 10 megabyte hard disk with 320k of RAM, a monochrome monitor and network board for the local area network. Software programs now require 640k or more of RAM at an upgrade cost in 1988 of $100.00 per workstation. There are 13 workstations in this building. As we enter Phase II of the automation project the costs were projected as follows:

May 3, 1989
After several years of study a suitably expandable, flexible and functional software package has been found to meet the needs of the DCPL collection. The software has been developed by a firm specializing in library automation named Data Trek, Inc. in Encinitas, California. This vendor was recommended by Jim Messinger when he was here as a consultant. I have had an opportunity to see the system in operation at St. Vincent Vail Medical Education Library in Topeka, KS. The director and staff there had the highest compliments both for the software and the quality and responsiveness of the vendor support. The goals of this proposal are to provide the necessary equipment and software to keep the present overdue process in operation during 1986, provide an adequate file server and upgraded network software to accommodate automation of the clerical functions of circulation, decide on an automation vendor for circulation so that data conversion of the inventory records and patron records can begin, and purchase the bar code labels so that the actual functions of bar coding the materials can be done in 1986. Items #1 and #2 are necessary immediately. The overdue program is inoperable as of this week because capacity has been reached on the existing file server. Elaine den Heed has been performing miracles to keep the system in operation but the equipment and software needs reflected in #1 and #2 are critical. Items #3-6 begin the process of fully automating the circulation process. The remaining items in the proposal set goals for fundraising in 1988 and 1989 to implement the automation of the card catalog.

1. Replace file server on local area network. Make upgrade to network software, upgrade workstations in building to operate on network and provide emergency power supply for file server. Bid from First Capitol Computer is least expensive for file server computer. First Capitol did the installation of the local area network and have been recommended by Zenith Corporation and the Kansas State Library as the most capable firm to install Zenith based local area networks in the midwest.

Cost: $3,197.00

2. Service contract, diagnostic tools and Norton Utility for the R Base software currently being used for overdue procedure. For the year when conversion to the circulation system is proposed and the first year we learn this software package the service contract which offers unlimited customer call-in support is necessary.

Cost: $350.00
3. Conversion of catalog records:
   a. 30,000 records are not in machine readable form. Library of Congress will convert the records for a $300.00 set-up fee and $.02 per record = $600.00. **Total $900.00**

   **Cost: $900.00**

   b. The new contract for the State Union Catalog is with a company named BroDart. The previous vendor charged $.025 per record to extract DCPL holdings from the data base. For the 95,000 titles that would have cost $1,375.00. **With BroDart the cost is $375.00**

   **Cost: $375.00**

4. Purchase of Data Trek Circulation software module to automate clerical functions at circulation. A demonstration package of the circulation software is operating on the main computer at the front desk. The full circulation module will be available for demonstration during the month of December.

   **Cost: $4995.00**

5. Bar codes for 97,000 books and video tapes in the collection. (periodical issues, other a-v items, reference and government documents to be done in 1988 if funds allow) The 97,000 bar codes will do all the multiple copies of books plus the video tapes. This number of bar codes will do the 93,000 books and video tapes now circulating plus 4,000 for 1988 purchases. Price = $30.00 per 1000.

   **Cost: $2,910.00**

6. Imposing indexing for circulation and public access catalog on machine readable records. We estimate that there are 85,000 unique titles in the collection. This is only an estimate until the remaining shelf list card drawers are prepared for conversion. At 85,000 x cost at $.05 per record = $4250.00. Data Trek has agreed to do the necessary indexing for both circulation and public access catalog. The public access catalog records will be archived until we request them. Doing both at the first reading of the records saves an additional $4300.00 to do the public access cataloging at a later time.

   **Cost: $4300.00**
METHOD TO FUND PROPOSAL FOR 1987 EXPENDITURES

$4,253  Unexpended line items in General Fund including Contingency but not including materials balance.

$2,351  Windfall in backtaxes from city! After fearing that full budget would not be available more than budgeted was received! The city will take the necessary steps to insure that the money can be used this year.

$1,300  Interest on the Building Fund CD

644  Equipment line item in Fees Fund

$547  Total needed to fund #1 & #2

$4,000  Purchase Data Trek software for circulation module. Use: $3,000.00 from 1987 Scroggins grant given for automation of circulation system. Utilize gift from Dillons of $648.86 with balance from remaining balance in Fees Fund from 1987 income in January. Balance needed $1301.14

$2,910  Purchase of 87,000 bar code labels - Purchase as many as possible from unexpended line items in Fees Fund from 1987 in January 1988. Take the remaining amount needed from 1987 Circulation. Book Processing and Building Repair lines.

$5,475  Apply to Scroggins Fund for 1988 request. Take balance not received from Scroggins from Building Fund CD.

FUTURE PURCHASES TO IMPLEMENT AUTOMATION PLAN

1988

Bar code readers (3) $1405.00
Portable bar code reader $700.00
Software maintenance

1988 Fundraising Goal

Catalog module $4995.00
Data Bridge module 995.00
Report Generator 495.00

Upgrade hardware capacity for file server after conversion of inventory and patron records. Public access terminals.
Phase II is designed to convert the card catalog automation into machine readable form and fully automatic checkout functions. Already the software program closest has upgraded capabilities now requiring more storage. Costs for this are shown in 1 below. Phase III costs to provide public access to the catalog and possibly replace the 1984 workstations with Macintosh equipment is under consideration at this time. Costs are included on page 7-12. The 1984 workstations are experiencing increasing downtime. This is a problem difficult to quantify but easy to illustrate in terms of staff stress and user dismay. One recent example at the front desk required replacement of video boards in one computer while the unit was sent 150 miles away for service. The cost for replacement of the board $100.00 and 10 days downtime.

The Dodge City library has been planning for this over several years yet seems to be unable to keep up with the rapidly changing requirements. The public library has a $353,311.00 operating budget. In the same period this automation has been underway the circulation of materials has increased from 145,674 in 1984 to 223,103 in 1988 requiring more books, magazines, video cassettes, audio tapes and increased staff.

The regional system faces an even greater problem. The system provides the consulting personnel to install equipment and train library staff. We developed the expertise from existing staff. The time just to reach libraries is significant. The attached sheet "computer consultant" documents travel time only. Computer consulting we have found to be much more labor intensive. The system must supply the equipment because many of our county seat libraries operate on $25,000.00 or less for total operating funds. The cost of equipment and software as shown on the attached automation studies illustrates why such technology is prohibitive for this size of operating budget.
Another factor relating to distance is the cost in time, mileage and lodging to attend meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mileage to Site</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Hour Rate</th>
<th>Mileage Rate</th>
<th>Computer Consultant Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tupsock</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>109.20</td>
<td>60.95</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>108.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td>55.27</td>
<td>44.10</td>
<td>91.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>158.80</td>
<td>94.75</td>
<td>75.60</td>
<td>156.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>78.96</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>130.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>61.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>30.98</td>
<td>64.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bend</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>37.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>91.60</td>
<td>54.61</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>90.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>49.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>61.20</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>62.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>120.40</td>
<td>71.77</td>
<td>57.23</td>
<td>118.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the hours of driving time it is necessary to drive the day before and pay lodging costs and meals for at least one night and often two added nights if meetings are held anywhere except Hutchinson, Salina or Great Bend.
PRIORITIES FOR AUTOMATION -- AUTOMATION APRIL 1989-1992

1. Add enough hard disk space to File Server--Zenith 248 to accommodate the 60,000 records to be delivered this summer.

Possibilities

LanStor (Maxtor Company)
Mr. Gregg Scronce
408-879-0300
1-Maxtor-LAN-2-650-S
687b.00
1-Maxtor-LAN-2-320-S
4480.00

THESE ARE NOVELL CERTIFIED DRIVES--THEY WILL WORK WITH THE MAXTOR WE ALREADY OWN--THEY COME NOVELL READY WHICH MEANS THEY ARE ALREADY COMPOURED. THEY HAVE A NOVELL SPECIALIST ON STAFF FOR PHONE INSTALLATION. NOWELL GIDELL THE 320 WOULD GIVE US 450 USEABLE MEGABYTES OF SPACE HOWEVER, AT THE PRESENT TIME WE NEED 424 MEGABYTES OF SPACE FOR THE CIRCULATION AND CATALOG ALONE.
104 MG FOR CIRCULATION
180 MG FOR CATALOG ALONE
160 MG FOR ULTIMATE SEARCHING MODULE--THIS IS NEEDED FOR PUBLIC ACCESS ESPECIALLY

NEXT RECOMMENDATION:

LEGEND CO.
MR. GETTANI
408-942-1345
2-MAXTOR-XT4300E DRIVES WITH ESDI CONTROLLER-- 4495.00

THESE DRIVES ARE VERY MUCH LIKE THE DRIVE THAT WE NOW OWN. WE WOULD NEED TO TAKE OUT THE DRIVE THAT IS IN THE SERVER AND USE THAT ELSEWHERE. THEN WE WOULD HAVE 860 MG FOR USE ON THE SERVER. THESE DRIVES WOULD NEED MORE INSTALLATION AS THEY DO NOT COME COMPOURED. THEY DO HOWEVER COME WITH ON TRACK DISK MANAGER-N

I PREDICT THE INSTALLATION CHARGE FOR THESE DRIVES WOULD BE SOMEWHERE AROUND 400.00 AS IT TAKES A LONG TIME TO READY THE DRIVES AND THEN RESTORE ALL THE EXISTING FILES TO THEM.

THERE ARE OTHER DRIVES THAT HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED BY DEALERS SUCH AS BCR RECOMMENDS A PRIAM HARD DISK THAT IS FORMATTED TO 330 MG. AGAIN WE WOULD NEED 2 TO GET THE 660 MG AND WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO USE THE DRIVE THAT NOW EXISTS WITH THEM.

WE ALSO HAVE BIDS FROM GREG VOSS LOCALLY TO BUY A 335 MG SCSI DRIVE FOR 3700.00--I DO NOT KNOW IF THIS WILL WORK WITH PRESENT DRIVES

I RECOMMEND THAT WE HAVE AT LEAST 860 MG OF AVAILABLE SPACE BECAUSE WITHIN 1 YEAR WE WILL BE LOADING OUR RECORDS IN MARC FORMAT WHICH WILL INCREASE THE SIZE REQUIREMENT CONSIDERABLY.
2. Add enough ram memory to the Zenith 248 File server to run the Novell network and to run programs.

Possibilities

BOCA RAM+ BOARD FROM WESTERN OFFICE IN COLBY WITH 3 MG RAM ON THE BOARD FOR UP TO 9 MG FUTURE EXPANSION AVAILABLE EXCHANGE CHIPS 1NG.-3

Cost

100.00

884.00

TOTAL (ORDERED)

784.00

3. Alternatives to speed up Zenith 248.

Possibilities

Add ram to board (already covered)
Add high speed hard disk (already covered)
Replace board in server with 3com+ board to accommodate both in and out traffic
Update to a 386 machine
Accessories
Available from First Capital and other vendors

Costs

845.00

3000.00+

4. Add an unlimited Power Supply to accommodate all the computers in the building.

Possibilities

COULD NOT GET PRICES SOON ENOUGH FOR THIS
ESTIMATED COST

Costs

2995.00

5. Absolutely have to have new software, software maintenance and installation money for network.

Possibilities

NOVELL ASSURANCE PROGRAM
THIS ASSURES ALL UPDATES FOR THE NEXT YEAR WILL BE DELIVERED TO US WITHOUT DELAY AS THEY ARE RELEASED. THEY NOW HAVE A VERSION THAT WILL ALLOW THE USE OF A MACINTOSH ON THE NETWORK

Cost

995.00

1000.00

RECOMMEND PER YEAR FOR UPDATES.

SOFTWARE TO ALLOW US TO SHARE THE LOCAL PRINTERS THAT ARE ALREADY A PART OF THE NETWORK.
LANALYZER (ESTIMATE)

995.00

NETWORK ASSISTANT PLUS 395.00 (FIRST CAPITAL COMPUTER)
NETBACK ADVANCED UTILITIES FOR NOVELL (POWERFUL SET OF UTILITIES THAT HELP RUN FILE SERVERS AND RESTORE THEM IF THERE IS A CRASH L jednak PLUS-UTILITY-ALLOWS NETWORK MANAGER TO ASSIST ANY PC FROM THEIR DESK.

195.00

199.00
TO ADD MACINTOSH-AND LASER WRITER TO NETWORK
SOFTWARE
BOARD
CABLE

TO ADD STATIONS TO NETWORK AND GET EXISTING
NETWORK UP AND RUNNING-INSTALLATION TIME
NEED TO USE VOLTAGE METER TO DETERMINE WHERE
EXISTING CABLES CONNECT AND CHECK OUT EACH
WORKSTATION AS IT IS BROUGHT UP ON THE SYSTEM
ALSO NEED 2 ADDITIONAL ETHERNET CARDS
TO ADD PUBLIC ACCESS STATIONS
(NEED TO RUN CABLE-AND SET UP WORKSTATIONS)

SOFTWARE MAINTAINCE FOR CATALOG AND UPDATES
CATALOG
CIRCULATION
DATA BRIDGE
UPDATE TO ULG
FOR CATALOG AND CIRCULATION
SOFTWARE MAINTAINCE IS PER YEAR

SOFTWARE MAINTAINCE FOR RBASE

WORDPERFECT FOR NOVELL
(ESTIMATE)

NEED MODEM FOR THE SERVER-9600 BAUD
(ABSOLUTELY NEED HAYES-FOR MAINTAINCE ON
SERVER LONG DISTANCE AND ON SOFTWARE--THAT IS
THE WAY TECHNICIANS ARE DOING MAINTAINCE NOW)

6. Add 2 more network connections 1 behind the overdue
   computer where OCLC is now presently 1 at Elaine den
   Hoed's Computer.

   Possibilities
   Cost of installation covered in #5
   Estimated cost for cable and terminators
   1 ADDITIONAL WORKSTATION
   (WITH ETHERNET BOARD)
   (THIS COST IS ONLY APPLICABLE IF WE BUY A
   LARGE QUANTITY OF OVER 15 AT ONE TIME)

   Cost
   100.00
   1200.00

7. Add Voice Messaging to the File Server for contacting
   patrons over the phone for reserves and other matters.

   Possibilities
   NO COST AT THIS TIME
8. Add a High Capacity Tape Backup for File Server as we will have an additional 600 mg to back up and don't need to be taking apart the overdue computer all the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibilities</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADIC MULTIPLE TAPE BACKUP DRIVE-8000</td>
<td>7995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIC MULTIPLE TAPE BACKUP DRIVE-4000</td>
<td>5995.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(These drives allow the user to leave the tape backup unattended and can be done at night)

Other possibility is to get board for ADIC tape backup that now is in BPH (absolutely essential in order to operate this unit at two stations) will back up multiple volumes and multiple servers however, it will take an incredible amount of time in any case, we will need at least 30 tapes to back up on 64MGx10 per backup x 3 backups-for safety 877.50

There are other tape backup units available that back up large amounts of data however, the cost is about the same.

9. Trade computers at front desk for terminals and add 1=3 terminals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibilities</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRADE FOR EARTHESTATIONS OR OTHER NON DISK WORKSTATIONS</td>
<td>3600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This price only valid if we buy at least 15 workstations at once)

10. Purchase proper support and software to protect the network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibilities</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COVERED IN #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Add terminals for Sam Shipley and Joyce Smith also need another network connection for Sam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibilities</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADD DISKLESS WORKSTATIONS (IF BOUGHT IN QUANTITY)</td>
<td>2400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD CABLING FOR SAM</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTALLATION 100.00

12. Add Macintosh and Laser Printer to Network for use by all.

Possibilities Cost
COVERED IN #5

13. Change cable on network to optical cable or other cable that will more efficiently meet our needs

Possibilities Cost
WOULD REQUIRE CHANGING CARDS IN MACHINES RECOMMEND THAT WHEN WE GO TO PUBLIC ACCESS COMPUTERS WE IMPLEMENT THIS SYSTEM WITH A DIFFERENT TOPOLOGY ESTIMATED COST 7000.00 LOOKING AT SYNOPTICS THIS ESTIMATE INCLUDES CARD AND CABLE AND CARDS IN WORKSTATIONS

PUBLIC ACCESS EXPANSION

14. Bridge Card for File Server and Cable to Adult and Childrens Area

Possibilities Cost
MAKE A REPEATER ON THE SERVER SO THAT WE CAN REACH THE PUBLIC AREA-SHOULD BE NO PROBLEM--NEED CABLE 11 STATIONS 250.00 TERMINATORS 25.00 ETHERNET CARDS WILL BE INCLUDED IN WORKSTATIONS UNLESS WE DECIDE TO GO TO SYNOPTICS THEN OTHER CARDS WILL BE INCLUDED IN WORKSTATIONS

15. Total of 10 additional terminals to begin with.--For Public Access of the Card Catalog-6 on adult side of library--4 in stack area 2 in reference, 2 at Tables----4 on the childrens side--With 640k, printer port and ethernet card to access card catalog.

Possibilities Cost
EARTHTATIONS OR SIMILAR WORKSTATIONS WITH ETHERNET CARD 12000.00

16. Total of 4 extra printers--ink jet preferably.

Possibilities Cost
PARALLEL PORTS ALREADY ON THE WORKSTATIONS ESTIMATED 1600.00

17. Installation money and hardware and software maintenance.

Possibilities Cost
COVERED IN #6

UPGRADING INTERNAL OPERATIONS--AND EXISTING EQUIPMENT

18. Exchange equipment for Macintosh equipment and additional file server with network hooked up to existing network

Possibilities
ADD MACINTOSH EQUIPMENT IN THE DIRECTORS OFFICE AND THE BOOKEEPER NETWORK MACINTOSHES INTO EXISTING NETWORK
USE MAC II AS THE SERVER FOR MAC NETWORK 3566.00
FOR MAC II
MAC SE FOR OTHER COMPUTER WITH 20 MG HARD DRIVE 2205.00
HARD DISK FOR MAC II-ESTIMATE 4995.00
TAPE BACKUP FOR MAC 895.00
TAPES 200.00

19. Or upgrade existing equipment and run an additional file server to meet those needs.--Need upgrade of computers to terminals and faster processing speed.

Possibilities
UPGRADE THE EXISTING 150'S TO DISKLESS WORKSTATIONS AND MAKE THE SYSTEM A STAR SYSTEM WHERE BY IF ONE STATION GOES DOWN, THE WHOLE NETWORK DOES NOT GO DOWN. WORKSTATIONS 8400.00
IF 2 WORKSTATIONS WERE ALREADY MAC (THIS WOULD SPEED UP PROCESSING TIME AND ALLOW THE WORKSTATIONS IN THE BUILDING TO ACCESS THE NETWORK MORE READILY.) 8000.00