

MINUTES OF MEETINGS

of the

BOARD OF REGENTS

U.S. NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

First meeting, FY 1957..... March 20, 1957

Second meeting, FY 1957..... April 29, 1957

Third meeting, FY 1957..... June 7, 1957

First meeting, FY 1958.....September 23, 1957

Second meeting, FY 1958..... December 9, 1957

Third meeting, FY 1958 May 9, 1958

C O N T E N T S

List of members, Board of Regents, 1957	
Biographical data, members of Board of Regents, 1957.....	4 p.
Agenda and Minutes, meeting of March 20, 1957.....	6 p.
Considerations in Selection of a Site for the New Building.....	8 p.
Agenda and Minutes, meeting of April 29, 1957.....	4 p. TABS A-E
Considerations for Formulation of Loan Policy.....	9 p. Appendix A-C
Agenda and Minutes, meeting of June 7, 1957.....	8 p. TAB A
Interim Policy on Distribution of Publications.....	7 p.
Agenda and Minutes, meeting of September 23, 1957.....	6 p. Attachment
Minutes, meeting of December 9, 1957.....	5 p. TAB A
Agenda and Minutes, meeting of May 9, 1958.....	9 p.

BOARD OF REGENTS
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

February 22, 1957

Ex officio members:

Dr. Leroy E. Burney
Surgeon General, Public Health Service
Major General S. B. Hays
Surgeon General, U. S. Army
Rear Admiral B. W. Hogan
Surgeon General, U. S. Navy
Major General D. C. Ogle
Surgeon General, U. S. Air Force
Dr. William S. Middleton
Chief Medical Director, Veterans Administration
Dr. John T. Wilson
Assistant Director for Biological and Medical Sciences
National Science Foundation
Dr. L. Quincy Mumford
Librarian of Congress

Appointed members:

One-year term:

Dr. Worth B. Daniels
Professor of Medicine, Georgetown University
Dr. Benjamin Spector
Professor of Anatomy, Tufts University

Two-year term:

Dr. I. S. Ravdin
Professor of Surgery, University of Pennsylvania
Miss Mary Louise Marshall
Professor of Medical Bibliography, Tulane University

Three-year term:

Dr. Basil G. Bibby
Professor of Dentistry, University of Rochester
Dr. Jean A. Curran
Bingham Associates Fund, Boston
Dr. Champ Lyons
Professor of Surgery, University of Alabama Medical College

Four-year term:

Dr. Michael E. DeBaakey
Professor of Surgery, Baylor University
Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr.
Professor of Epidemiology, University of Michigan
Dr. Ernest Volwiler
President, Abbott Laboratories

BOARD OF REGENTS

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

February 22, 1957

Brief Biographical Data

BIBBY, Basil G.

b. New Zealand, 1904
BDS University of Otago, 1927
PhD University of Rochester, 1935
DMD Tufts College, 1939
Professor of Dentistry, University of Rochester, 1947-
Address: Eastman Dental Dispensary
800 Main Street East
Rochester 3, New York

BURNEY, Leroy E.

b. Indiana, 1906
BS Indiana University, 1928
MD Indiana University, 1930
MPH Johns Hopkins University, 1932
Commissioned USPHS, 1932
State Health Commissioner, Indiana, 1945-54
Surgeon General, USPHS, 1956-
Address: U. S. Public Health Service
Washington 25, D. C.

CURRAN, Jean A.

b. Michigan, 1893
AB Carleton College, 1916
MD Harvard University, 1921
Dean, State University of New York College of Medicine, 1951-54
Associate Executive Dean, 1954-56
Professor of History of Medicine, 1954-
Advisor Charities Trust of William H. Bingham, 1957-
Address: New England Medical Center
Boston 11, Massachusetts

DANIELS, Worth B.

b. North Carolina, 1899
AB University of North Carolina, 1920
MD Johns Hopkins University, 1924
Clinical Professor of Medicine, Georgetown University, 1933-
Address: 1150 Connecticut Avenue
Washington 6, D. C.

DeBAKEY, Michael E.

b. Louisiana, 1908
BS Tulane University, 1930
MD Tulane University, 1932
MS Tulane University, 1935
Professor of Surgery, Baylor University, 1948-
Address: 1200 M. D. Anderson Boulevard
Houston, 25, Texas

BOARD OF REGENTS
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Brief Biographical Data

- FRANCIS, Thomas, Jr.
b. Indiana, 1900
BS Alleghany College, 1921
MD Yale University, 1925
Professor of Epidemiology, University of Michigan, 1941-
Address: University of Michigan School of Public Health
Ann Arbor, Michigan
- HAYS, Silas B.
b. Minnesota, 1902
BS State University of Iowa, 1925
MD State University of Iowa, 1928
Commissioned U. S. Army, 1929
Surgeon, Japan Logistic Command, 1950-51
Deputy Surgeon General, U. S. Army 1951-55
Surgeon General, U. S. Army, 1955-
Address: Department of the Army
Washington 25, D. C.
- HOGAN, Bartholomew, W.
b. Massachusetts, 1901
MD Tufts College, 1925
Surgeon General, U. S. Navy, 1955-
Address: Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
Navy Department
Washington 25, D. C.
- LYONS, Champ
b. Pennsylvania, 1907
AB University of Alabama, 1927
MD Harvard University, 1931
Associate Professor of Surgery, Tulane University, 1945-50
Professor of Surgery and Chairman, Department of Surgery,
University of Alabama Medical College, 1950-
Address: University of Alabama Medical College
University, Alabama
- MARSHALL, Mary Louise (Mrs J. H. Hutton)
b. Illinois, 1893
Southern Illinois State Normal University, 1913
Library School, University of Wisconsin, 1914
Librarian, Orleans Paris Medical Society, 1920-
Librarian, Tulane University School of Medicine, 1927-
Professor of Medical Bibliography, Tulane University, 1949-
Address: Tulane University School of Medicine
New Orleans 12, Louisiana

BOARD OF REGENTS

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Brief Biographical Data

MIDDLETON, William S.

b. Pennsylvania, 1890
MD University of Pennsylvania, 1911
Dean of Medicine, University of Wisconsin, 1935-1954
Chief Medical Director, Veterans Administration, 1954-
Address: Veterans Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

MUMFORD, L. Quincy

b. North Carolina, 1903
AB Duke University, 1925
AM Duke University, 1928
BS Columbia University, 1929
Director, Cleveland Public Library, 1950-54
Librarian of Congress, 1954-
Address: Library of Congress
Washington 25, D. C.

OGLE, Dan C.

b. Illinois, 1901
BS Eureka College, 1924; University of Illinois, 1927
MD University of Illinois, 1929
Commissioned, U. S. Army, 1929
Deputy Surgeon General, U. S. Air Force, 1949-1953
Surgeon, U. S. Air Forces in Europe, 1953-54
Surgeon General, U. S. Air Force, 1954-
Address: Headquarters, U. S. Air Force
Washington 25, D. C.

RAVDIN, Isidor S.

b. Indiana, 1894
BS Indiana University, 1916
MD University of Pennsylvania, 1918
Professor of Surgery, University of Pennsylvania, 1945-
Address: Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania
3400 Spruce Street
Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania

SPECTOR, Benjamin

b. New York, 1893
MD New York University, 1922
President, American Association of the History of Medicine, 1956-57
Professor of Anatomy, 1933- History of Medicine, Tufts University
School of Medicine, 1939-
Address: 136 Harrison Avenue
Boston 11, Massachusetts

BOARD OF REGENTS

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Brief Biographical Data

VOLWILER, Ernest H.

b. Ohio, 1893

AB Miami University, 1914

PhD University of Illinois, 1918

President, Abbott Laboratories, 1950-

Address: Abbott Laboratories
North Chicago, Illinois

WILSON, John T.

b. Pennsylvania, 1914

AB George Washington University, 1941

MA State University of Iowa, 1942

PhD Stanford University, 1948

Head, Personnel and Training Research Branch,

Office of Naval Research, 1949-52

Program Director for Psychology, National Science Foundation 1952-55

Assistant Director for Biological and Medical Sciences,

National Science Foundation, 1955-

Address: National Science Foundation
1520 H Street
Washington 25, D. C.



NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

BOARD OF REGENTS

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

A G E N D A

First Meeting, March 20, 1957
9:30 a. m.

1. Introductory Remarks - - - - - Dr. Burney
2. Adoption of agenda
3. Election of Chairman
4. Report from the Director, NLM
5. Consideration of site for new building
6. Decision on date of second meeting
7. Consideration of agenda for second meeting

Lunch will be served at the Library at about 12:30 p.m.
Adjournment at about 4 p.m.

BOARD OF REGENTS
of the
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING, FY '57
Washington, March 20, 1957

Members present. BIBBY, BURNEY, CURRAN, DANIELS, DeBAKEY, FRANCIS, HAYS, HOGAN, LYONS, MARSHALL, MIDDLETON, MUMFORD, OGLE, SPECTOR, VOLWILER, WILSON.

Dr. RAVDIN was unable to be present due to previous commitments. Dr. Ains C. McGUINNESS, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, attended the morning session as a guest.

Preliminary. Dr. BURNEY, acting as Chairman pro tem, convened the meeting at 9:30 a.m. He welcomed the Board on behalf of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and on behalf of Secretary FOLSON; expressed the appreciation of the Public Health Service for the willingness of the members to serve on the Board; welcomed whatever advice, counsel, or criticism the members of the Board might wish to offer.

Adoption of agenda. The tentative agenda was adopted without amendment.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

On nomination by Miss MARSHALL, seconded by Dr. MUMFORD, Dr. DANIELS was unanimously elected Chairman of the Board of Regents, and presided over the meeting from this point. Dr. LYONS was unanimously elected Vice Chairman. Dr. BURNEY suggested that the Director of the Library should act as Secretary to the Board, and this was accepted. The Board also took action to endorse the appointment of Colonel ROGERS as Director of the National Library of Medicine.

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR

The Director reviewed the events of the past six months which had been a period of transition in the Library's administrative affairs, now pretty well shaken down. The gross organizational structure of the Library was outlined, and changes in housekeeping and executive offices of the Library were given in some detail.

FY 1958 operating budget. The sum being requested for FY 1958 is \$1,450,000, or almost \$135,000 more than has been available during FY 1957. This may be accounted for roughly as follows:

- \$ 35,000 - for new and replacement equipment, some of which has had to be deferred in 1957 in order to meet other commitments.
- \$ 59,000 - to provide employer contributions to the retirement fund, newly required by law.
- \$ 11,000 - for three new positions which will enable Library to stay open during the evenings, as was the custom prior to 1953.
- \$ 25,000 - for reclassification of existing librarian series positions according to new standards expected to be promulgated by the Civil Service Commission about July 1.
- \$ 5,000 - salaries to cover more than the usual number of working days in the year, plus overtime.

Personnel. The Director briefly mentioned difficulties encountered in maintaining staff levels, described recruiting trips recently undertaken, and spoke of the plan to establish intern positions in the Library.

Program and policy changes. The Act specifies that it is the duty of the Board to make recommendations "on important matters of policy in regard to the Library, including such matters as the acquisition of materials for the Library, the scope, content, and organization of the Library's services, and the rules under which its materials, publications, facilities, and services shall be made available to various kinds of users..." Accordingly the Library staff has prepared, or is preparing, recommendations on loan policy, to include photoduplication, policy on scope and coverage, and policy on distribution of publications, which will be submitted to the Board at an early date for validation and/or amendment. As to programs, the Director stated his conviction that for the next decade the highest priority must be given to the completion of the rehabilitation of the Library, begun twenty years ago.

New Building. 1) Public Buildings Service is almost ready to announce the selection of an architect to be responsible for drawing up plans for the new Library building; 2) there is some difference of opinion between the Bureau of the Budget and the Library concerning the status of plans presently in hand,

the Library being finally of the opinion that these represent diagrammatic preliminary plans rather than schematic plans which are the final step before the ultimate working drawings; 3) the schedule to be met is a tight one if site is to be selected, plans are to be drawn up, and request for construction funds is to be submitted as part of the FY 1959 budget. Questions from the group prompted the Director to state his personal belief that space limitations of 240,000 square feet as proposed in an earlier review of plans by the Bureau of the Budget are fairly reasonable, but that dollar limitations imposed at the same time are no longer reasonable, and that it is likely that the construction of a building of this reduced size will now cost close to the original estimate of \$6 million. A building of this size would provide stack space for about 30 years' growth.

OBTAINING CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Dr. BURNLEY explained that a presidential freeze order is in effect relative to construction of new federal buildings, in an attempt to alleviate inflationary pressures. The new administration building of the National Institutes of Health, the new National Institute of Dental Research, and other PHS buildings in addition to the Library have been affected by this freeze. Dr. McGUINNESS stated that all officials at DHEW are thoroughly aware of the acute problem of the Library, but that under present conditions we must "wait and see." Dr. BURNLEY said that he was unwilling at this time to try to decide what priority the Library would have among all PHS buildings.

General OGLE suggested that it might be helpful to consider asking for construction funds in a bill separate from the normal HEW budget request. Dr. MIDDLETON and Dr. LYONS supported this idea.

Dr. CURRAN and others suggested that because, in the case of the Library, inadequate housing was something more than an inconvenience -- an irreplaceable collection was in jeopardy -- a higher priority for it might be justified. Dr. FRANCIS re-emphasized this point.

General HAYS suggested that the Board go on record as recommending to the Surgeon General of the PHS that the construction of the new library building be placed at the top of his priority list.

Admiral HOGAN commented that the spirit of the Congressional hearings on the Library was that the transfer to PHS was accomplished in order to decrease the competition with other funding.

Dr. DeBAKEY spoke feelingly to the point that in passing the National Library of Medicine Act Congress had clearly indicated its intent that a new building was to be constructed.

Dr. BURNEY explained the distinction between authorization of funds and appropriation of funds. He said he thought that it is important at present to get on with the planning phase.

Dr. VOLWILER observed that freezes, by their nature, eventually result in a thaw. Dr. WILSON counseled patience.

CONSIDERATION OF SITE SELECTION

The CHAIRMAN asked for consideration of site, and was greeted with immediate advocacy of the metropolitan area of Washington. On the other hand, the feeling was expressed that it would be well to give the matter full and extended consideration before arriving at a decision.

Dr. VOLWILER recounted some conversations he had had recently with various Chicago medical men.

In response to questions, Dr. BURNEY said that no requests for consideration of particular areas had been received. Some of the members suggested that some sort of hearings should be held; other members demurred. Dr. SPECTOR recommended postponing a decision until the next meeting. This matter was discussed at very great length. The sense of the meeting which ultimately emerged was for deferment.

(Recess for lunch at 12:30; afternoon session resumed at 1 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN announced that he would get in touch with Dr. Coggeshall for a statement of the position of the Association of American Medical Colleges, and that Dr. BIBBY would be in touch with the deans of the various dental schools.

CONSIDERATION OF SITES

The Board reviewed and discussed the ten various possible sites in the Washington area which have been mentioned during the last decade. The greatest amount of interest was in the following sites:

Capitol Hill. Historically, this was the site strongly advocated just before World War II. The specific location is on East Capitol Street, just beyond the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Library of Congress Annex. The Planning Commission was at one time favorably inclined toward this, because it fits in

with its long-term hopes for developing this area. It would, however, entail the extensive condemnation of private property, at a high price.

Soldiers' Home. The General Services Administration controls the southern portion of the Soldiers' Home tract, consisting of roughly 117 acres. The western part of this, about 47 acres, is now occupied by the new District Medical Center, soon to become operational. At one time there was a plan for locating a VA hospital in the central sector. There are no commitments so far for the eastern sector. Land would cost \$13,500 per acre, payable to the Soldiers' Home proper from the southern tract.

Bethesda, National Institutes of Health. The Glenbrook Golf Course, operated by Montgomery County, is immediately adjacent to the NIH campus, to the south. NIH owns this land, and can dispossess the lessor on 30 days' notice. A suitable site for the Library would be at about the location of the present golf clubhouse. Nothing would be built between that site and Wisconsin Avenue; there is ample room for parking and expansion; the site is available.

Bethesda, Naval Medical Center. The Department of Defense had chosen a site on the southern edge of the Naval Medical Center reservation, on the north side of Jones Bridge Road looking out on the Columbia Country Club to the south, and approximately midway between Connecticut Avenue to the east and Wisconsin Avenue to the west. This site was acceptable on the several counts that the terrain was very suitable for the type of building required, there was an extensive open space around the site for parking and future growth, and it was available. There are two serious drawbacks, however; one is the fact that the building would be located far from main traffic arteries where public transportation is available; the other is the possible conflict in jurisdiction which would be involved. Under the Armed Forces it had been agreed that management control of the Library would be shifted from the Army to the Navy when the new building was constructed on Navy ground. By the same logic, now that management of the Library has been vested in the Public Health Service, it would make sense to put the building on PHS ground. Admiral HOGAN stated, however, that no jurisdictional conflict need arise, as the Secretary of the Navy had stated that he would gladly turn over the property.

CHARACTER OF THE BUILDING

General OGLE said that he would like to see a monumental type of construction, which might at once be symbolic of the importance of the role of the medical sciences and serve as a vehicle of medical education for the people. Dr. DeBAKEY said that while the building should not be luxurious, it should certainly not be miserly. Colonel ROGERS said that he objected to the word "monumental" only in its occasional connotations of "book museum" and "wide marble stairways." He felt that a capable architect, imbued with the purposes, hopes, and aspirations of the Library, could produce a building indicative thereof, and beautiful by virtue of its simplicity, and not in any sense a mere barnlike factory building.

NEARNESS TO A MEDICAL CENTER

Colonel ROGERS stated that he felt that location of the Library near a medical center was very important, not so much from the standpoint of the service which the Library would give to the center, but rather from the standpoint of the stimulus which the center would give to the Library. Miss MARSHALL underlined this point.

FURTHER DISCUSSION

There was a considerable discussion of additional points such as accessibility, distances of various sites from downtown Washington, influence of new communications techniques, and the place of exhibits. The CHAIRMAN suggested, and the members agreed, that it would be well to begin the next meeting with a trip to some of the sites proposed.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date for the next meeting was considered. It appeared that conflicts would arise on almost any date in April, but that on the whole April 29 would accommodate the majority, and this was agreed upon.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m., following which several members of the Board made an inspection tour of the Library.)

Frank B. Rogers

FRANK B. ROGERS
Secretary to the Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

CONSIDERATIONS IN SELECTION OF A SITE FOR THE NEW BUILDING

The problem of site selection for the new building of the National Library of Medicine may be divided in three major parts - 1) area selection; 2) site selection; and 3) location selection. Area determination means area in the gross; it means the selection of the city or metropolitan area near or within which the Library will be located. Site selection is the narrowing of the problem by picking out a particular circumscribed region within the chosen metropolitan area. Location selection means the choosing of specific acreage on the selected site. It is suggested that the first two parts - area and site - are the responsibilities of the Board of Regents; it is further suggested that the third part, location on the selected site, should be left to the discretion of the Library administration, and its parent agency. It is believed that the approach to these problems ought to proceed in the order given.

Part I - AREA

This may be most conveniently approached by posing the question as follows:- Should the site be within the Washington metropolitan area, or should it be somewhere outside this area? The pro-arguments for one will be the con-arguments for the other, and vice versa. The arguments are covered in extenso in the transcripts of the Hearings before the Committee on House Administration. They may be summarized as follows:

In favor of the Washington metropolitan area:

- A 1. The presumption must be for this alternative, which is a continuance of the status quo.
- A 2. The major users of the Library are government agencies within the Washington area. Moving the Library outside the area would disrupt established patterns of service, and leave the agencies without an adequate service for immediate access to needed reference material. (see Appendix A)

- 16
- A 3. The cost of moving a library of this size any distance from Washington would be formidable (for example: estimated cost of moving Library to Bethesda is \$85,000). Money spent on moving would be better spent on facilities, materials, and services.
 - A 4. Moving would mean disruption of the present staff, assembled and trained over the years at considerable cost. The staffing problem is a major problem.
 - A 5. Moving would introduce extraordinary complications in the reciprocal relationship already established with the two other great national libraries, the Library of Congress and the Library of the Department of Agriculture.
 - A 6. There is logic in placing a national library at the seat of government, where its national status is better recognized by both the Congress and the citizenry.

In favor of area outside of Washington:

- B 1. National treasures and national monuments should be more accessible to all the people; when an opportunity presents, the near monopoly of the Eastern Seaboard should be broken.
- B 2. If the Library were located nearer to the geographic population center of the Nation, the time required to bring the Library's resources to users on both coasts would be equalized. This would be reinforced if the area chosen was a transportation center; this emphasis on availability of transportation is pertinent mainly in relation to carriers of mail.
- B 3. The Library should be located in a city in which other great medical libraries already exist; if this were done, the libraries would supplement and reinforce one another.

- B 4. Part of the Library is already in Cleveland; transporting this part to Chicago, for example, would be no more expensive than transporting it back to Washington. (But note that the Cleveland collection contains only 35,000 volumes out of the total of 500,000.)
- B 5. The Library might receive the stimulus of national organizations having headquarters in the new area.
- B 6. The danger of possible loss of the collections through bombing is less outside the Washington area than in it.

Leaving out of consideration, for the moment, the arguments stemming from the fact that the Library is already in being in Washington, we could set forth the requirements on area as follows:

- C 1. The area selected should be in or near a fairly large city. This would assure an adequate transportation network, a fair sized group of medical people with whom ideas could be interchanged, and from whom consultation and stimulation could be obtained, and not least, a population from which an adequate staff, with adequate language competencies, could be drawn.
- C 2. Other things being equal, the less industrialized a given city is, the less probable that it might become a bombing target, and the safer the Library might be. It is difficult if not impossible to reconcile this criterion with criterion C 1 above.

If not the Washington area, then what other area? The following cities have been suggested, and might serve as examples of types.

CHICAGO

- D 1. Chicago is the second largest city in the United States; it therefore has, save for one other city, the largest number of doctors, hospitals, medical schools, research facilities, and so forth.

- 75
- D 2. Chicago is a transportation center. It is also highly industrialized. For both reasons it is presumably a prime bombing target, and is perhaps more accessible than most, if the polar route is considered.
 - D 3. The headquarters of many national medical associations are in Chicago, and Chicago is host to many national medical conventions.
 - D 4. Chicago already is the home of the largest medical library west of the Alleghenies (The John Crerar Library), and altogether has 4 of the 15 largest medical libraries in the country.
 - D 5. The airline distance between Washington and Los Angeles is 2295 miles; between Washington and Chicago is 594 miles; and between Chicago and Los Angeles is 1741 miles. Chicago is therefore 554 miles, or 24%, closer to Los Angeles than is Washington.
 - D.6. A specific site within the Chicago area is available without charge to the government.

DENVER

- E 1. The population of greater Denver is over half a million. Air and rail facilities are available.
- E 2. The area is not highly industrial. Access for bombing might be most difficult.
- E 3. A good medical school is at hand; University of Denver located in city, but University of Colorado located elsewhere.
- E 4. A few other government agencies have found special merit in locating here, or close by (Air Academy, NACA Lab.).

CHARLOTTESVILLE

- F 1. Located 100 airline miles from the nation's capital.
- F 2. Has a great university, and a medical school.
- F 3. Not industrial; population small; transportation facilities not too good.

Part II - SITE

Now moving to the second major part, the problem of site within an area.

The ideal requirements are as follows:

- G 1. Location adjacent to a medical center. (Up until now it has always been assumed that this was a major requirement. It will be recalled that the 1951 NRC Committee said that "relation to a medical center...[is] essential to provide the National Medical Library with direct advice and endorsement from the medical and scientific professions". And the Armed Forces Medical Library Advisory Group, in a letter to General Hays on 13 April 56, stated that the Library should be "provided with that most essential ingredient for its healthy growth - the constant, day-by-day stimulation of medical people which will promote improvements in the Library's services by contact and familiarity of the Library's staff with the whole medical scene, in all its operational aspects." A primary consideration in site selection would seem to rest on the validity or non-validity of this argument).
- G 2. Government land already available, or available without great expense or dislocation of present tenants.
- G 3. Transportation accessible for staff.
- G 4. Transportation available for visitors.
- G 5. Adequate parking space available and adequate space available for subsequent additions to stacks.
- G 6. Freedom to build functional building, without undue restriction from zoning laws.
- G 7. The further the site is from the center of the city, the less likely is the possibility of total loss from bombing.
- G 8. Availability of site at early date, as speed of building is of the essence.

Measured against these criteria, the various sites which have been mentioned within metropolitan Washington might be rated as outlined in Appendix B (Chicago Medical Center, only specific site mentioned outside Washington, shown for comparison). Ten possible sites are rated on a simple three-level scale; it would be possible to rate any two sites, comparing one to the other, on a more detailed scale which would reveal minor advantages and disadvantages of each.

Part III - LOCATION

While it is probably logical to assume that ultimate selection of a specific location on a given site should be the prerogative of the Library administration and its parent agency, the general availability of suitable locations on a given site will also tend to influence selection of the site. Factors bearing on choice of location are as follows:

- H 1. Suitability of terrain (slope, level of water-table, character of sub-soil, etc.).
- H 2. Relationship with surrounding buildings.
- H 3. Availability of sewage lines, power lines, heating lines, etc. (e.g., whether or not the Library will have to provide its own heating plant is a large factor in construction costs.)
- H 4. Availability of housekeeping services from adjacent area (food, landscaping, trucking, and similar items).
- H 5. Availability of administrative services from adjacent area (supply, fiscal accounting, and personnel processing support).
- H 6. Style of architecture.
- H 7. Suitability of road net.
- H 8. Future plans for site development.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

PREDICTED CIRCULATION LEVELS FOR FY 1957

(based on FY 56 figures, and first
quarter FY 57 experience)

Total circulation		128,400
Within library	28,200	
Photoduplication	78,000	
Interlibrary loans	22,200	
<hr/>		
Interlibrary loans		22,200
Metropolitan Washington area		18,200 (82%)
Government agencies	15,000 (67.5%)	
Civilian institutions	3,200 (14.5%)	
Outside of Washington		4,000 (18%)
Government agencies	1,200 (5.5%)	
Civilian institutions	2,800 (12.5%)	
TOTAL loans to government agencies		16,200 (73%)
TOTAL loans to civilian institutions		6,000 (27%)

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

RATING OF SELECTED BUILDING SITE POSSIBILITIES

	Adjacent to Medical center	Land available	Transportation for Staff	Transportation for visitors	Adequate surrounding space	Freedom to build functionally	Located toward periphery	Early availability
Walter Reed	Good	Poor	Good	Good	Poor	Good	Fair	Poor
Forest Glen	Poor	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Good	Good	Good
Capitol Hill	Poor	Poor	Good	Good	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor
Mall	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Poor	Fair
SW development	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Poor	Fair
23rd & Constitution	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor
Naval Observatory	Poor	a.	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Soldiers Home	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	b.
Naval Medical Center	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Good	Good	Good
NIH Campus	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Good	Good	Good
Chicago Medical Center	Good	Good	Good	Good	Poor	Good	Poor	Good

a. Now dedicated to headquarters Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff

b. Conflict of jurisdiction

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

BOARD OF REGENTS

SCHEDULE

April 29, 1957

1. Assemble at Library at 9:30 a.m. Allow time for filling out travel vouchers and similar details.
2. Bus leaves Library promptly at 9:45 a.m. for inspection tour of several possible building sites.
3. LUNCH - served at the Library at 12 noon.
4. Afternoon session begins at Library at 12:30 p.m.
 - a. Further consideration of site.
 - b. Discussion of recommendation on loan policy.
 - c. Presentation of scope and coverage policy (if time permits).
 - d. Setting of date for next meeting.
5. Adjournment at about 4 p.m.

(Please return the section below, with appropriate checkmarks)

Director
 National Library of Medicine
 7th Street and Independence Avenue, S. W.
 Washington 25, D. C.

- I will be present for the bus tour on April 29th.
- I will be present for lunch.
- I will be present for the afternoon session.

 Signature

7-1

BOARD OF REGENTS
of the
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING, FY 1957
Washington, April 29, 1957

Member absent: WILSON. In the absence of Dr. BURNEY, Dr. W. Palmer DEARING, Deputy Surgeon General, Public Health Service, attended.

Morning session: During the morning the Board proceeded by chartered bus to the area on Capitol Hill east of the Folger Library; thence to the southern portion of the Soldiers' Home tract; thence to the Naval Medical Center grounds at Bethesda; thence to the campus of the National Institutes of Health, returning to the Library at noon. Following lunch, the afternoon session was called to order at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes of last meeting: Approved as circulated.

Communications received: The CHAIRMAN read communications received from the Association of American Medical Colleges and from the American Association of Dental Schools, endorsing the Washington area as the site for the new Library building. Copies of these letters are attached as part of TAB E.

DISCUSSION OF CHICAGO OFFER

Letter from Dr. Theobald: The CHAIRMAN reviewed briefly the letters received by members of the Board from Dr. Walter J. Theobald, Chairman of the Chicago Medical Center Commission. A copy of the letter received by the CHAIRMAN is attached as TAB A.

Letter from Mayor Richard J. Daley: The CHAIRMAN read a letter received from the Honorable Richard J. Daley, Mayor of Chicago (copy attached as TAB B). In replying to Mayor Daley, the CHAIRMAN appointed Dr. VOLWILER to inspect the proffered site and report to the Board. (See TAB C.)

Report on Chicago site: Dr. VOLWILER reported that on Saturday afternoon, April 27, in company with Mr. McLester and Mr. Downs, members of the Medical Center Commission, he had visited the Chicago Medical Center District. This is an area encompassing about 305 acres, located about two miles west of the Loop, set aside by act of the Illinois legislature for use as a medical center. The University of Illinois Medical School, the Cook County Hospital, and several other large medical institutions are located there.

Dr. VOLWILER produced a map of the area, oriented the members of the Board as to major highways and access roads, and pointed out the triangular area offered as a site for the National Library of Medicine. He reported on a conversation by phone with Dr. Theobald on the afternoon of Sunday, April 28. He summarized his impressions by saying that he believed this was a very good site, in a major medical center, and easily accessible.

General OGLE asked if there had been any mention of housing for personnel. Dr. VOLWILER said that this had been discussed, and that housing was adequate.

The CHAIRMAN extended his thanks to Dr. VOLWILER.

Motion: Dr. RAVDIN moved that the National Library of Medicine be located in Washington, D. C., or its environs. Dr. DeBAKEY seconded the motion. The motion was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

LOCATION IN WASHINGTON AREA

Discussion: The CHAIRMAN reviewed the areas seen on the morning trip. General OGLE mentioned the possibility of a Foggy Bottom site. At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Admiral HOGAN spoke in favor of the Bethesda area, and again offered the site on the Naval Medical Center grounds. General HAYS established that adequate parking areas would be available on either of the Bethesda sites. The CHAIRMAN reported on what was known of sub-soil conditions at Soldiers' Home, Naval Medical Center, and National Institutes of Health (see TAB D). In response to a question from Dr. VOLWILER, Colonel ROGERS reviewed the three sites, with special attention to accessibility. Dr. LYONS remarked that he believed that existing plans for a building on the Naval Medical Center site were not precisely detailed plans, and that they would require very extensive modification. On questions from Dr. VOLWILER and Dr. RAVDIN, Admiral HOGAN mentioned supporting services that would be available from the Naval Medical Center. On a question from Dr. CURRAN,

Dr. DEARING discussed supporting services in connection with the National Institutes of Health site. Dr. FRANCIS and General OGLE questioned Colonel ROGERS in relation to availability of downtown sites on Constitution Avenue, the Mall, and Capitol Hill. Dr. SPECTOR, Dr. DEARING, Dr. MUMFORD, Dr. MIDDLETON, and the CHAIRMAN discussed problems of transportation to the Bethesda area.

Motion: Dr. RAVDIN moved that the site located in the southeast sector of the grounds of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, and offered by the Public Health Service, be approved as the site for the new building of the National Library of Medicine. Dr. DeBAKEY seconded the motion.

There was considerable discussion from all sides on two main points: 1) the amount of ground over which the Library would have jurisdiction, and 2) possible limitations on style of architecture allowable. General HAYS felt that a resolution on style of architecture might serve only to hamstring the project.

Dr. LYONS moved to amend Dr. RAVDIN'S motion to add the proviso that at least ten acres of land should be available for the Library's use. Dr. VOLWILER seconded. Admiral HOGAN expressed concern over possible increased construction costs on the NIH site over the Naval Medical Center site, due to less favorable terrain configuration.

The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the amendment offered by Dr. LYONS. It was passed without dissent. He then called for a vote on Dr. RAVDIN'S motion; it was unanimously carried.

The CHAIRMAN distributed copies of a draft of a letter to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service stating the position of the Board. There was a lengthy discussion, with many changes of language proposed and accepted. Dr. LYONS moved, and Dr. DeBAKEY seconded, that at the conclusion of the letter the Board should recommend that the highest priority should be given to the obtaining of funds for construction of the new National Library of Medicine; this resolution was carried unanimously. A copy of the final version of the letter as transmitted to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is attached as TAB E.

CHANGING NLM LOAN POLICY

Orientation: Board members had previously received a discussion outline entitled "Considerations for Formulation of Loan Policy." Colonel ROGERS briefly reviewed this paper.

Discussion: Dr. MUMFORD raised the question of copyright restrictions. It was stated that while the recommended new policy would not obviate the copyright problem, it would not raise more, and probably raise fewer difficulties in this area than does the current policy.

Miss MARSHALL was strongly in favor of the new policy, and reviewed experiences at her own medical library, indicating the favorable effects of the new program.

Several members, and most particularly the CHAIRMAN, expressed some concern about the public relations problem which the new policy would entail. It was indicated that if the new policy is adopted, every opportunity should be taken to "accentuate the positive" in explaining it to the Library's clientele.

Admiral HOGAN asked how the new policy would affect military personnel outside the country, who do not have libraries available through which they might ask for loans. Colonel ROGERS stated that in these cases exceptions to the general rule would be made. Dr. FRANCIS questioned the wording of the opening general statement of the proposed draft of the rules proper; various suggestions for improvement were offered. Admiral HOGAN recommended that the action should not become effective until September 1.

Motion: Dr. LYONS moved that the recommendations of the Library administration for revising the mechanisms for offering loan services be approved by the Board. Dr. RAVDIN seconded the motion. The motion was put to a vote and carried.

NEXT MEETING

Agenda: Presentation by Library's architects; discussion of policy of scope and coverage (background papers on this question were distributed).

Time of meeting: After discussion it was agreed that the next meeting of the Board of Regents would be held in Washington on Friday, June 7, at 2 p.m. Lunch will be available at the Library before the meeting.

Future meetings. The Board will meet in the fall on September 23. Another meeting will probably be scheduled for sometime early in February.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.)



FRANK B. ROGERS
Secretary to the Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine

Attachments:

- TAB A - Letter, Dr. Theobald to Chairman
- TAB B - Letter, Mayor Daley to Chairman
- TAB C - Letter Chairman to Mayor Daley
- TAB D - Sub-soil conditions
- TAB E - Letter, Chairman to Surgeon General, PHS

C
O
P
Y

TAB A

MEDICAL CENTER COMMISSION
Chicago 7, Illinois

Dr. Worth B. Daniels
Clinical Professor of Medicine
Georgetown University School of Medicine
Washington 7, D. C.

Dear Dr. Daniels:

On behalf of the members of the Medical Center Commission, I extend congratulations on your appointment as regent of the National Library of Medicine. Your appointment is of special significance because it brings this important project definitely nearer reality.

Chicago is conceded to be the medical capital of the country. This is due to the unique concentration of hospitals, professional schools and related institutions in this city. Here also are located the national headquarters of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Dental Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and 35 other important medical organizations.

In the heart of Chicago is the 305-acre Medical Center District. Some of its prominent features are revealed in the enclosed brochure. The great hospitals, medical colleges and associated facilities established here make it unquestionably the foremost of all medical centers. More than 3,300 students are enrolled in its professional schools, and from 2,000 to 2,500 physicians come here each year for refresher courses or post-graduate studies. This unparalleled concentration of facilities for medical service, research and teaching, its accessibility to scientific personnel, and its unsurpassed location for transportation, distribution and communication, make the Medical Center District the ideal site for the new National Library of Medicine.

The Library's widespread service will be of immeasurable use not only to medical institutions and personnel in the rapidly growing Medical Center District, but throughout the great mid-west. For this reason, I am pleased to tell you that the Commission is ready to donate an 8-acre area to your Board for this most worthy project.

Cordially yours,

/s/ Walter H. Theobald, M.D.
Walter H. Theobald, M. D.
President

M.

C
O
P
Y

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
City of Chicago

TAB B

RICHARD J. DALEY
Mayor

April 17, 1957

Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman
Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

Dear Doctor Daniels:

It is my privilege to inform the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine that a committee of Chicagoans, on which was represented all of the professional and scientific groups interested in the selection of a site for a new National Library of Medicine building, appeared before a congressional commission to present reasons why the library should be erected in Chicago. At that meeting it was officially announced that the Medical Center Commission of Chicago and the University of Chicago each offered to the United States Government, free from cost, the necessary land on which could be built the National Library of Medicine.

Prior to the meeting of your Board of Regents on March 20, 1957, I addressed a letter to President Eisenhower suggesting that when the Board was named they visit Chicago to inspect the sites which we had offered for the location of the Library.

A letter from Mr. Sherman Adams, dated April 8, 1957, informed us of the meeting of your Board on March 20, and expressed his opinion that you would be glad to receive any additional information or data concerning the Chicago site which we might care to offer.

I do not desire to burden the Board of Regents with material which "I am sure would not add to the knowledge which is already theirs -- that Chicago in the heart of the United States is the medical center of the world. I am also sure that all of the members of the Board of Regents are members of some one or more of the dozens of national medical, dental and other scientific societies which are located in Chicago. It is reasonable to expect no additional evidence is needed to gain acceptance of the fact that the library located in Chicago would make its facilities and services available to the greatest possible number of those whom it is intended to serve.

We respectfully refer your Board to the records of the congressional hearings which clearly show that the interests of our country will best be served by the location of the library in Chicago.

May I extend to the Board the same invitation conveyed in my letter to President Eisenhower -- Come to Chicago and survey the sites we offer.

We will gladly furnish your Board with any information or data you may desire.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard J. Daley
Mayor

C
O
P
Y

1150 Connecticut Avenue
Washington 6, D. C.

TAB C

The Honorable Richard J. Daley
Mayor of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

My dear Mayor Daley:

Your letter of April 17, in regard to The National Library of Medicine, directed to me at the Georgetown University was delayed in arriving at my office.

Each member of The Board of Regents of The National Library of Medicine has been supplied with a transcript of the testimony given by prominent Chicago citizens and physicians before the Congressional Committees. The Regents have been informed that The Medical Center Commission of Chicago and The University of Chicago have offered, free from cost, the necessary land as a site for The National Library of Medicine. Members of the Board of Regents have received a letter from Dr. Theobald with a brochure "Report of the Medical Center Commission to the 70th General Assembly of Illinois".

As Chairman of The Board of Regents I have requested Dr. Ernest Volwiler, one of The Regents resident in Chicago, to report to The Board of Regents of The National Library of Medicine at its next meeting on April 29th on the land offered as a site for The Library. I have just talked by telephone with Dr. Volwiler who is out of Chicago today. He hopes on his return mid-day Saturday April 27th to communicate with Dr. Walter H. Theobald, President of The Medical Center Commission, and view the specific sites suggested by The Medical Center Commission. He tells me that he is already familiar with the general area of the site or sites so generously offered by Chicago. I will request Dr. Volwiler to report to the full membership of The Board of Regents at its meeting on April 29th, next.

I can assure you that The Regents are giving most serious thought to sites for The Library and careful consideration to the suggestion that The Library be located in Chicago.

Thank you very much for your interest and for Chicago's generosity.

Sincerely yours,

Worth B. Daniels, M. D.
Chairman, Board of Regents
The National Library of Medicine

WBD:mjm
cc: Dr. Walter H. Theobald
Dr. Ernest Volwiler

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
Washington, D. C.

TAB D

April 25, 1957

SUBSOIL CHARACTERISTICS FOR THREE WASHINGTON SITES

Site	Source of Information	Facts	Comments
NMHC, Bethesda Jones Bridge Road	Navy Department	Borings made	Site recommended by Navy. See Note A
NIH, Bethesda	GSA-FBS	Two borings made 30 ft. apart	Site recommended by GSA See Note B
Soldiers' Home S. E. Corner (Franklin Road and Michigan Avenue)	1. GSA-FBS 2. D.C. Highway Engineer	New hospital constructed 2,000 ft. W. Highway overpass constructed 700 ft. N.W.	See Note C Piles necessary

NOTES

- A. Due to the necessity of providing blast-resistant features for the basement and three sub-grade book stack floors, a site was chosen encompassing a large ravine. This factor greatly influenced the exact location of the building relative to the site. Underground rock contours were obtained by core borings and applied against the topography of the area. The building was then located so that a solid rock foundation would be provided with the most economical excavation. Under these conditions a balance of excavation and embankment quantities could not be attained and an excess of excavation remains. (Advanced Planning Report, Part II)
- B. At the site on S.E. section of NIH reservation two borings 30 ft. apart have been made. Hard rock was struck at 19 ft. in the first hole and at 25 ft. in the second. The rock is suitable for foundations and upon exposure to air will disintegrate to the extent that pneumatic drills and scoops can remove it. Thus the soil conditions are excellent for strong foundations and will not be excessively costly to dig for two floors below ground. There is no unusual water problem.
- C. The quality of the subsoil at this site varied greatly. The foundations were designed partly for piles and partly for spread footings. The contractor requested and was permitted to substitute caissons for both piles and spread footings. Piles or caissons are more expensive to design and construct than concrete on rock.

May 1, 1957

Dr. Leroy E. Burney
The Surgeon General, Public Health Service
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Dr. Burney:

In accordance with Section 376 of Part H, Title III, of the Public Health Service Act, which pertains to the National Library of Medicine, specifying that "The Administrator of General Services is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable site or sites, selected by the Surgeon General in accordance with the direction of the Board, for such buildings and facilities and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities," the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine herewith transmits to you its decision.

The Board of Regents, by unanimous vote, has decided that the site of the new building for the National Library of Medicine will be the southeast sector of the National Institutes of Health reservation in Bethesda, Maryland, provided that an area of not less than ten acres will be designated for the Library's use.

In reaching this decision the Board met in executive session twice, on March 20, 1957, and on April 29, 1957. The Board had available and has studied carefully complete transcripts of hearings held before the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, April 10 and 11, 1956; hearings of the Subcommittee on Health and Science of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, June 11, 1956; the hearings of the Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, June 19 and June 26, 1956. The Board has also studied the debate in the Senate as reported on pp. 8988-8996 of the Congressional Record for June 11, 1956, and the debate in the House as reported on pp. 12803-12805 of the Congressional Record for July 23, 1956.

Communications received by the Board of Regents from the two leading American organizations engaged in medical and dental education especially impressed the Board; ; the Association of American Medical Colleges and the Association of American Dental Schools have expressed themselves as favoring retention of the National Library of Medicine in the Washington area. Copies of these communications are enclosed.

Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General, PHS

May 1, 1957

The Board of Regents considered that the problem of site selection for the new building of the National Library of Medicine was approached most logically by successive attention to three major aspects. The first aspect was area selection, by which the Board means the selection of the city or metropolitan area near or within which the Library will be located. The second aspect was site selection proper, which means the choosing of a particular region within the chosen metropolitan area. The third aspect was that of location selection, which means the choosing of specific acreage on the selected site.

In considering the first aspect, area selection, the Board believed that the area chosen must be within or near a fairly large city. This would assure an adequate transportation network, a large group of medical people with whom ideas could be interchanged, and from whom consultation and stimulation could be obtained, and a population from which an adequate staff, with adequate language competencies, could be drawn.

The Board decided that the Library should be located in or near the city of Washington, D. C. The facts that major users of the Library are government agencies in the Washington area, that any move outside the area would disrupt patterns of service established for over a hundred years, and that some replacement for this Library would need to be made should it be moved out of the area were major considerations. The Board also believed that the expense of moving the enormous collections of the Library any appreciable distance from its present location would not be justifiable; the money required would be better spent on facilities, materials, and services. Among many other factors considered, one which seemed quite prominent to the Board was the inevitable breaking up of the present staff of the Library, assembled and trained over the years, if the Library should be moved from Washington.

In the course of its deliberations the Board gave thoughtful consideration to other sites in various parts of the United States. In the opinion of the Board, the facts outlined in the paragraph above heavily outweighed any advantages which might otherwise pertain to these areas.

On the matter of site proper, the Board considered that location of the Library adjacent to a medical center was a criterion of vast importance. The Board recalled that both the National Research Council Committee on the Army Medical Library, in 1951, and the Armed Forces Medical Library Advisory Group, in 1956, had attached the same high degree of importance to this point. The Board considered also the availability of land, transportation networks, space or parking and subsequent additions to stacks, and other matters. As to

Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General, PHS

May 1, 1947

the general availability of suitable locations on given sites, the Board considered such matters as configuration of terrain, relationship with surrounding buildings, availability of central heating connections, and similar elements.

The Board considered many possible sites in or near Washington. It was the unanimous decision of the Board that the site chosen, on the grounds of the National Institutes of Health, is the most eminently suitable.

By resolution, the Board of Regents recommends that the highest priority be given to the obtaining of funds for construction of the new National Library of Medicine building at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely yours,

WORTH B. DANIELS, M. D.
Chairman, Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine

Enclosures:

Letter, Association of American Medical Colleges, April 1, 1957
Letter, American Association of Dental Schools, April 4, 1957

C
O
P
Y

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES
2530 Ridge Avenue
Evanston, Illinois

April 1, 1957

Dr. Worth B. Daniels
1150 Connecticut Avenue
Washington 6, D. C.

My dear Dr. Daniels:

I have polled the members of the Executive Committee of the Association of American Medical Colleges and as a result I am authorized to tell you that, in the opinion of the Council, the National Library of Medicine should be located in Washington, D. C. It is our strong hope that the Board of Regents will take action consistent with this recommendation.

Yours very truly

/s/ Ward Darley
Ward Darley, M. D.

WD:R

C
O
P
Y

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF DENTAL SCHOOLS

April 4, 1957

Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman
Board of Regents
National Library for Medicine
1150 Connecticut Avenue
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Doctor Daniels:

The American Association of Dental Schools, in formal Session at Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 24-27, 1957, considered two proposals about the National Library of Medicine.

One proposal concerns the possible change in the location of the Library. It is the considered opinion of the Association that since the need for the library, because of the many governmental facilities engaged in various medical and allied researches is more urgent in Washington, D. C. than in another city, the location of the Library should continue to be in Washington, D. C.

The other proposal concerns the name of the Library as established in Public Law 941, 84th Congress. Since the Library will service all health areas, rather than medicine alone, the Association, although recognizing that Section 375 covers the disciplines included in "medicine" feels that the name "National Library for Health Sciences" is more appropriate.

The Association hopes that Public Law 941 can be amended to provide for the change in name as suggested.

Yours very truly,

/s/ Marion McCrea
Marion W. McCrea, Sec.-Treas.
Am. Assoc. of Dental Schools

cc: Dr. Basil G. Bibby
Dr. Harold Hillenbrand
Dr. Roy G. Ellis

7

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
CONSIDERATIONS FOR FORMULATION OF LOAN POLICY

Historical Background

From earliest times great libraries have pursued a tradition of not allowing the contents of their collections to circulate. The Royal Library in Ninevah under King Esarhaddon (III Dynasty of Ur, ca. 2000 BC) did not loan to anyone but the King, although the librarian was instructed to seek out and transmit answers to questions asked of him. Cicero from his country villa in Tusculum mentions in one of his letters to Atticus what a solace it is to retire from the bustling city, except that in so doing he is denied the contents of the Roman libraries. An Italian Renaissance princeling once pledged his entire estate to a German Duke in exchange for the loan of a manuscript. The curses which "mutilators of collections, spoilers of the symmetry of shelves, and creators of odd volumes" have had showered on them from the beginning of time to the present show the continuing feeling of generations to loaning books. And the chains by which medieval books were bound to reading desks may be considered a practical acceptance of the fact that more than the curse of the gods is necessary to keep books inviolate.

Reasons for such practice are not hard to find. There is the magical quality of writing itself. There is also scarcity; manuscripts frequently existed in a single copy only, and whenever books are scarce, difficult to reproduce, and expensive, their loss takes on great significance. Under these circumstances prudent husbandry of books as artifacts is required.

This heritage is still with us, but by no means can it by itself account for the fact that despite the great growth of popular lending libraries in the 19th and 20th centuries, most great research libraries of our day adhere to a noncirculating policy. The Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, the John Crerar Library, the British Museum, the Bibliotheque Nationale, the Vatican Library, and the various Staatsbibliothek throughout Western Europe, for example, all restrict their loaning policies, even for the common, run-of-the-mill, in-trade publications.

There are various reasons for this. A research library is, by definition, a place where an attempt has been made to bring together the literature of a subject or a field so that a person wishing to use that literature, whether a reader or a member of the staff doing bibliographic and reference work, can find in one place what might otherwise be widely scattered. As Oliver Wendell Holmes put it, "Every library should try to be complete on something, if it were only the history of pinheads." The preeminence of a collection

consists more in the fact that the works have been brought together than in the fact that any of them are rare or unusual in their own right; the whole of a library is much greater than the sum of its parts. It follows that when volumes are loaned from the collection they are effectively lost to the reader who comes to the collection with the understanding that a majority of his needs will be met in that one place.

A second reason for the fact that research libraries follow a policy of noncirculation stems from the archival nature of such collections. There is an internal paradox of library economy here, in the broadest sense, libraries exist to be used, while archives exist to preserve the literature. In trying to reach a decision on circulation or noncirculation of books from a particular library, we are in a way required to decide to what extent the library should be considered the preserver of books as objects and as transmitters of intellectual history, and to what extent a force for the dissemination and use of expendable items, and, finally, which facet has priority.

All of the foregoing discussion on use implies, to a great extent, a tradition of readers coming to the library to consult the literature. This tradition is not quite so completely valid today as it was in former times when transportation systems were more primitive. In addition, the development of copying devices has enormously changed the methods of scholars, and more and more library service is being rendered at a distance. But the preservation vs. use dichotomy is accentuated, rather than diminished, by this development.

History of loan policy at NLM

Over the years the loan policy of the National Library of Medicine has exhibited swings of the pendulum, but generally shows a tendency to have the best of both worlds, the library and the archival. As one of the earliest American libraries to allow items in its collection to go beyond its own walls, and as a library which has raised its photocopying service to a high level, the NLM has demonstrated time and again its concern with getting its holdings to the people who need them, wherever they may be. The early letter books of the Library show that individual physicians could borrow in two ways: first, by interlibrary loan through any "public" library near them. In the very earliest days this meant that the governing boards of the libraries were required to agree to take responsibility for books sent to them for the use of individuals. Second, they could borrow by depositing with the Library a sum of money sufficient to cover the cost of replacing the book if it were damaged or lost. Many physicians, such as Dr. Rudolph Matas of New Orleans, left sizeable deposits for years, against which they borrowed books; likewise, there are records of the refunding of sums to individuals after the safe return of single loans.

Widespread use of the Library's material was formalized in 1892 by passage of Joint Congressional Resolution No. 8 (52d Congress, 1st Session), (20 U.S.C.91) as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the facilities for study research and illustration in the following and any other governmental collections now existing or hereafter to be established in the city of Washington for the promotion of knowledge shall be accessible, under such rules and restrictions as the officers in charge of each department or collection may prescribe, subject to such authority as is now or may hereafter be permitted by law, to the scientific investigators and to duly qualified individuals, students, and graduates of any institution of learning in the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, to wit:

One. Of the Library of Congress

Six. of the Army Medical Museum..."

By the phrase "under such rules and restrictions as the Officers in charge of each department or collection may prescribe, subject to such authority as is now or may hereafter be permitted by law," the resolution made loans permissive but not mandatory.

In later times, it was realized that some research workers needed better access to the collection than by conventional interlibrary loan methods, which were not always able to serve them adequately. When it became possible to provide photocopies of the Library's holdings, therefore, the Library conceived of this service primarily as an extension of its traditional service, and made photocopies available to individuals as well as to groups. The reception of the photocopying service was enthusiastic.

Present Considerations

Now that the Library has become the National Library of Medicine, it is appropriate to reconsider the traditional policies in regard to loans. Loans are made so that books may be used outside the Library's confines, frequently in conjunction with other equipment, and so that works may be examined in greater detail or for longer periods than is feasible within the Library. These are all worthy objects, and the only question is whether the loaning of the books themselves is the best way in which the objects can be attained. The development of photocopying devices over the past 25 years has led to an alternate possibility, and this must be examined from various angles to see if the newer way might be the better way.

To start with, it must be pointed out that there are legal restrictions to the unlimited copying of published works; restrictions which are vague in some respects but which have been interpreted fairly definitely in most. The two most important interpretations for this problem are that whole works may not be copied and that multiple copies may not be made. In the field of science, the short journal article is by far the most important material to be requested. For the comparatively infrequent request for the loan of an entire monograph of recent vintage, photocopying has no answer.

Other considerations must be weighed to determine the method of choice in getting medical literature to the scholar. First is the purely economic one of the cost of a photocopy, next the secondarily economic question of the progressive destruction of the book in the photocopying process, and third the ease with which photocopies can be read. These must be compared to equivalent considerations for loans of the piece itself.

It is pertinent to indicate that the cost of making a photocopy is ordinarily not greater than the cost of maintaining records on ordinary interlibrary loans, that circulation of material outside the library building subjects it to some but possibly not as much wear and tear on the physical book as photocopying, and that some types of photocopies can be read with the same ease as the books themselves. Photocopies, moreover, have the advantages of making the material available outside the building and still provide for keeping the collection together as a unit.

It is recognized that photocopying is a slower process for the local reader than borrowing the book itself, but if the National Library of Medicine remains open in the evening and on weekends, as is now envisioned, local readers with an emergency deadline will have direct access to the book itself within the library building at all reasonable times. Moreover, they would be likely to find the book on the shelf when they need it.

The National Library of Medicine is set up to serve the entire nation. At the hearings on the establishment of such a library, great stress was laid on the possibility of making the Library an independent agency so that it would be free to develop as a national group and not find itself degenerating into a Departmental library merely. This appears to be a valid point; the resources which the government has placed at the disposal of the Library for over a century have been greater than what would have been necessary to develop a Departmental collection. They have made it a national asset, one for the whole country, and therefore it should be available to all citizens on an equal basis. It would be as illogical to say it should be first and foremost a Public Health Service Library because it is administratively centered there, or a Washington library because it is housed there, as to say the text of the Declaration of Independence should be available

only to the General Services Administration because it is housed in the National Archives. The National Library of Medicine is the heritage of all the country, not of any one group.

Still another consideration weighs against the National Library of Medicine's present practice of loaning books to and making photocopies for individuals, and this rests on the concept of a national library as a capstone of an arch of libraries throughout the country, complementing those libraries, doing what they cannot do as effectively, if at all, but not supplanting them. To attempt to be at the same time the local library for each research worker everywhere and the national supplementary collection for all, is to invite the disaster of falling between two stools. The problems of each kind of library are different and it is unlikely they can be merged successfully.

But even granting that it were possible to carry out such a program successfully, it is doubtful whether it would be to the national interest to do so. To make the National Library of Medicine the medical collection to which all research workers would turn immediately for help would be to weaken other medical libraries all across the country. A physician or research worker who does not get help from his local library is not likely to support it in money, time, or energy. Without such support, the library is likely to grow weaker and become less able to aid the local physician when called upon for such aid, and this in turn would cause a still further drop in support. The final result would be the withering away of the outlying libraries and the centralization of all medical library service in Washington. This is an untenable position to advocate because of the likelihood that so vast an operation would be an uneconomic and inefficient one, as well as because in a time of national emergency in an atomic age, the tendency should be rather to strengthen local situations than to weaken them. The necessity for strong medical libraries in all geographical regions of the country has been accepted, it should be pointed out, by the Medical Library Association, and plans for bringing it into being have been worked out, though not effectively put in operation.

Description of loan policy now in operation NLM

Loans are now made in three ways:

- 1) Directly ("over the counter") to physicians practicing in the Washington Metropolitan Area. This is the smallest group of loans, amounting only to about 1000 volumes a year.
- 2) To other libraries on interlibrary loan. Over 22,000 such loans are made yearly, of which 18,000 (or 82%) are to libraries in the Metropolitan Washington area and 4,000 (18%) are sent outside Washington. The loans in and around Washington are dispatched through the government mail-messenger service or are picked up and returned by messengers provided by the borrowing.

library. Works loaned to libraries outside Washington are sent express collect and returned prepaid by the borrowing library, This is expensive to the borrowing library, but is infinitely simpler for NLM than setting up postage accounts for each borrower.

3) As photoduplicates, to both individuals and other libraries, three main types of photoduplicate service can be distinguished:

- a. To government libraries and officials. These requests are filled free of charge; about 40,000 such orders are completed yearly, mostly as photoprints.
- b. To those outside the government who wish to retain their copies. Such requests are filled on a charge basis; they amount to about 18,000 requests per year, which yield approximately \$17,000. This money is turned over to Miscellaneous Receipts, U.S. Treasury.
- c. To those outside the government who wish to borrow microfilm copies. Annually about 10,000 orders of microfilm copies of journal articles are loaned free of charge for a period of 90 days.

The cost of these services is shown in Appendix B,

Discussion of present policy

Free photocopying for government agencies and officials has developed beyond reasonable bounds. For example, in a recent study conducted over a two month period, it was found that over 50% of all requests received could be filled by photocopying journal articles from 125 common journal titles of the last five years.

(On the face of it, this is a need which the printing press, not the camera, is designed to fill. When a request from New York City is received for a photocopy of an article which appeared in last month's JAMA, it is apparent that the Library is being treated as a cheap and convenient reprint service, and not as a library. It is felt NLM should not run a copying service per se; NLM must operate as a library, and all photocopying done should be in extension of normal library operations.)

Free microfilm loans have developed beyond reasonable bounds. This service was developed four or five years ago with the primary aim of providing a mechanism whereby foreign libraries in soft currency areas, with little or no dollar exchange available, might yet be able to obtain urgently needed material from NLM. While this service has

fulfilled its primary purpose, it has perhaps inevitably widened to the point where at present many requests for free microfilm loans are originating within the United States. While the service was created for a different purpose, the NLM is in the position of not being able to deny to a tax-paying citizen what it is providing free to those abroad.

The percentage of requests received at NLM which cannot be filled is very high; over 12,000 requests each year fall into this category. The outstanding reason for non-fulfillment is the fact that works requested are already on loan elsewhere. Any proposed new policy should provide for decreasing this figure significantly, to enable NLM to provide better and more consistent service.

The keeping of fiscal accounts for the photoduplication service is burdensome in the extreme. Even though the coupon system, with its block prices, is used in order to make the system as simple as possible, and even though an extraordinary effort has been made, over the years, to simplify the bookkeeping system, the task is still a formidable one. It is conservatively estimated that it costs the Library \$4,000 per year to account for \$17,000 in receipts; such a ratio is shocking, and impossible to justify rationally.

Because the keeping of postage accounts, and particularly the procedures involved for insuring packages, would lead to bookkeeping hazards similar to those encountered in the photoduplication area, the Library's practice has been to loan books to other libraries on an express-collect basis. The charge for express is usually more than several times the charge for postage, and thus imposes an undue burden on the borrowing library, and further unduly restricts the number of requests which the borrowing library might otherwise legitimately make.

Proposed new system

The NLM believes that one of its main reasons for being is the provision of medical literature and the keys to it to all who are engaged in medical research or medical care. Any change in its traditional policies must be examined in the light of whether the new scheme will perform this function more effectively than, and as cheaply as, the older scheme. We believe the proposed new system will do this.

The new loan policy consists, essentially, of two portions:

1. Hereafter no materials would be loaned to individuals "over the counter" for use outside the building. As shown by the statistics above, this is a minor change.

2. The interlibrary loan service and the photoduplication service would be considered as two phases of the same plan: to get medical literature to all who need it anywhere. In this scheme requests by individuals would be channeled through other libraries; no requests for loans of original works or orders for photocopies from individual borrowers would be honored, with the occasional exception of requests for certain Art Section and rare book material. The National Library of Medicine would decide how to fill interlibrary loans - by sending the original or by furnishing microfilms or photoprints; this decision would be based on copyright restrictions, length of the item requested, rarity of the work, distance of the borrowing library from the NLM, and other pertinent considerations. Photocopies would be retained by the borrower.

All loans under this system, whether of the original or photocopies, would be entirely free to the borrowing library, except that postage charges for the return of original works would be borne by the borrowing library. An estimate of the cost of such a service is shown in Appendix B; from this, it can be seen that costs of the new system are comparable with those of the present service. In addition, it would aid the borrowing library by doing away with expensive express charges now incurred by them when they borrow from this library, and, by providing them with permanent copies, it would make elaborate record-keeping unnecessary for them.

Implications of new policy

For National Library of Medicine. Besides the factors implicit in the discussion already presented, the following effects would be noticed at NLM:

1) Pressure on "core" journals would be relieved; requests would be spread more widely over a much larger number of physical volumes. This would be of great help in preservation of the Library's collection.

2) Would make more rational the Library's position vis a vis copyright.

On the other hand, there would certainly be large problems in public relations, and a difficult adjustment period during the first year of operation.

For other medical libraries. Such a system can be expected to take the interlibrary loan pressure off regional medical libraries in their areas; it can be assumed that many such requests will be channeled to the NLM, where the chances of obtaining the material would be great, instead of being directed to another local library, with a smaller chance of obtaining the work.

The new system, moreover, as noted above, will be cheaper for the borrowing library than the present one, with its costly express charges; and, by that fact, will make the service broader and more useful to all who have need of it. On the other hand, since this Library will not furnish copies of material to individuals, and will send interlibrary loans only when the original cannot be obtained locally, and will occasionally furnish microfilms, the pressure on outlying libraries to develop photocopying service and provide extra equipment (such as microfilm readers) will increase.

Policy statement

A draft statement of the proposed NLM policy for loaning library materials is attached as Appendix C.

Summary

It is recommended that the National Library of Medicine adopt the new policy for loaning library materials herein proposed. In carrying out the program in this manner, the National Library of Medicine would be fulfilling its obligations to serve all people impartially, to make its collections available to all who need them, to keep its collections together for most efficient reference use, to preserve the collection for the benefit of future generations, and to strengthen other medical libraries of the nation for routine and emergency use.

April 2, 1957

Appendix A

Effects of Proposed Loan Policy
 (all rates shown are annual rates)

	PRESENT	ESTIMATED EFFECT OF NEW PLAN		
		3 months after adoption	6 months after adoption	1 year after adoption
Paid orders	18,000	(2,000)	(14,000)	(14,000)
Government orders	40,000	(10,000)	(15,000)	(16,000)
Free loans	10,000	(1,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)
Inter-library loans				
Washington	18,000	(18,000)	(18,000)	(20,000)
Elsewhere	4,000	(4,000)	(8,000)	(15,000)
Unretrievables	12,000	3,000	6,000	6,500
TOTAL	90,000	35,000	60,000	70,000

Appendix B

The costs of operating Photographic Services under present program compared with costs anticipated under proposed Loan policy, utilizing (a) current photographic processes, and (b) Xerography.

	PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESS (a)		XEROGRAPHY (b)
	Present Program	Proposed Program	Proposed Program
Personal Services	58,000	54,000	41,900
Equipment Costs	5,200	5,200	15,000
Equipment Maintenance	2,500	2,500	2,000
Supplies	27,000	27,000	13,800
Total Cost to MM	92,700	88,700	72,700
Numbers of Orders	68,000	65,000	65,000
Cost to MM per order	1.36	1.36	1.12
Deduct reimbursement to U. S. Treasury	17,000	---	---
Total cost to U. S.	75,700	88,700	72,700
Total cost to U. S. per order	1.11	1.36	1.12
Plus cost of making originals (5000 @ .45)	---	2,250	2,250
Total cost of 70,000 orders	---	90,950	74,950
Cost per order	---	1.30	1.07

Notes:

- Costs of photographic services devoted to internal library purposes, as the poor paper project, are excluded.
- Costs of shelving and reshelving books excluded.
- Costs of wrapping and record-keeping on loans of original works excluded; this would be approximately the same under either plan, probably less under the proposed plan.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

POLICIES IN LOANING LIBRARY MATERIALS

I. PURPOSE

The aim of the National Library of Medicine is to make its resources available to all workers in the health professions who may have a need for them. In fulfilling this aim the National Library of Medicine considers that its role should be to supplement the resources of local and regional libraries.

II. WHAT MAY BE BORROWED

All printed literature in the Library's collection is available for loan, with the exception of ordinary, current, in-trade publications where the presumption of wide-spread accessibility elsewhere is reasonable. In the case of material in the History of Medicine Division, requests will be examined individually.

III. WHO MAY BORROW

The National Library of Medicine will loan material only to other libraries. Individuals coming to the Library must use the material on the premises. For qualified researchers undertaking long-term bibliographical projects at the Library, study tables in the stacks will be made available, insofar as facilities permit, on application to the Head of the Circulation Section.

IV. FORM OF LOANS

Material in the Library will be loaned in the original form or as photoduplicates (microfilm or photoprints). The National Library of Medicine reserves the right to determine in which form the loan will be made, taking into consideration costs of photocopying, copyright restrictions, rarity of the item requested, its physical condition, the frequency of use of the item, shipping costs, and any other points which seem pertinent. While loan service is international, normally loans to libraries outside the Continental United States will be made in the form of photocopies only.

V. PROCEDURES FOR BORROWING

1. Requests for interlibrary loans are to be made in writing, using either the ALA Interlibrary Loan form or the NLM Interlibrary Loan Form (No. _____), available without charge from the Circulation Section, National Library of Medicine. All requests must be signed, and the signature shall be understood to be certification that the material requested is not available in the requesting library.

2. Requests for loans should contain full bibliographical information. For books, this consists of full name of author, title of work, place, publisher, and date of publication. When feasible, the NLM call number should be given. A request for an article should show the name of the journal, date of issue, volume number, author, and title of the article, and the pages (inclusive numbering) on which the article appears.

3. Loans of original works are made on condition that the greatest care be taken in packing and transmitting material for return to the National Library of Medicine. Among other precautions, the corners and edges of books must be well protected; unbound material should not be rolled but should be sent flat, preferably by mail. All returns must be adequately insured. Original material from the History of Medicine Division is to be used within the borrowing library exclusively.

4. All material in original form must be returned within two weeks of receipt. Any item may be recalled by the National Library of Medicine at any time. Interlibrary loans in the form of photocopies may be retained by the borrowing library.

VI. PHOTOGRAPHIC SERVICES

1. Exclusions. Requests by individuals for photocopies of books, journals, journal articles, or other printed materials will not be honored as such. The extent of photocopying at the National Library of Medicine is limited to a selected portion of interlibrary loan requests, as explained above.

2. Pictorial Works. Works such as portraits, photographs, etchings and caricatures which are a part of the Library's collection will not usually be loaned outside the Library. Photographic copies of these works can be made; cost estimates for such work will be provided on request.

3. Facsimile and other copying. Whenever facsimile photocopies are required, in positive copy and exact size of the original, or whenever enlarged copies of certain pages may be required, as for exhibit or other purposes, the Library will make such copies available; cost estimates will be provided on request.

BOARD OF REGENTS
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Meeting June 7, 1957 2 PM

Washington, D.C.

1. Report on the new building
2. Discussion with architects
3. Consideration of interim publication distribution policy
4. Next meeting
 - a) Confirmation of date - September 23, 1957
 - b) Items for agenda
 - (1) Review of FY'57; forecast for FY'58;
status of FY'59 budget
 - (2) Consideration of NLM policy on scope
and coverage
 - (3) New building

3 /

BOARD OF REGENTS
of the
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING, FY 1957
Washington, June 7, 1957

Members absent: FRANCIS, HOGAN, OGLE, RAVDIN, VOLWILER.

Guests present: Mr. R. J. O'CONNOR and Mr. W. H. KILHAM, Jr., architects; Mr. Keyes METCALF, building consultant, Mr. C. J. BIEGALSKI, Public Buildings Service; Dr. W. P. DEARING, Deputy Surgeon General, PHS; Mr. R. MILES, Director of Administration, DEW; Mr. R. W. SEVERANCE, Special Assistant for Building Plans, NLM.

The Board met for lunch at 1 p.m., and the meeting was called to order by the CHAIRMAN at 1:45 p.m.

POLICY ON DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLICATIONS

The DIRECTOR briefly summarized the paper "Interim Policy on Distribution of Publications" which had been distributed to Board members a week before the meeting. The recommended policy would adjust distribution patterns to federal government agencies in such a manner that all agencies would receive NLM publications on an equitable basis, within existing financial and regulatory limitations. There was some discussion of the nature and extent of these limitations, and of Government Printing Office practice in offering publications for sale. Dr. MIDDLETON and General HAYS commented favorably on the proposed policy. The policy was approved, without dissent.

LETTER FROM THE SURGEON GENERAL, PHS

The CHAIRMAN read a letter from Dr. BURNEY, acknowledging receipt of the Board's letter of May 1 communicating the Board's decision on site. A copy of Dr. BURNEY'S letter is attached as TAB A.

REPORT ON NEW BUILDING DEVELOPMENT

The DIRECTOR described three lines of development which had culminated in a meeting with the Bureau of the Budget on the morning of June 7, 1957.

Line 1 - BOB Stipulations on initial apportionment: When the first \$100,000 of the planning funds were apportioned earlier this year, the BOB required that before planning of the new building could go forward, a study of NLM requirements should be made, and the feasibility of using existing BUDOCKS plans should be examined against these requirements. A contract was let with O'CONNOR and KILHAM of New York City to make the required study; the architects' report on this matter was delivered to GSA and DHEW in Washington on May 13. The conclusions of the report were as follows:

- a. A better plan, adjusted to present requirements, and with improved functional relationships, can be prepared.
- b. Space allowances are adequate and the over-all number of square feet reasonable for the purposes intended.
- c. The BUDOCKS plans have not reached a state of development where their economic value is very great compared to the total cost of preparing plans for competitive bids; due to various changed circumstances, none of the plans are useable as they are, and all would need substantial revision; the cost of revision might well exceed the cost of starting afresh; the tables of space requirements, and room and equipment layouts have considerable reference value in checking and developing new plans; the engineering phases are not sufficiently developed to be of any assistance and certain modifications would be anticipated; the new specifications would have to be written under GSA criteria; the quantities used in the estimates would no longer apply with the revised program and new site, and the unit costs are substantially below present market values in library construction.
- d. While the cost estimate of the BUDOCKS plan was carefully prepared, in proper detail, it is not believed that unit costs utilized envisaged the type of construction, materials, and workmanship expected in a present day library building which may anticipate a long life of public use; the BUDOCKS total sum is far below the cost, on a square foot basis, of typical air-conditioned libraries built in the last few years.
- e. Recommendation: It is believed that it is to the best interest of the government and the future of the National Library of Medicine that the BUDOCKS plan be recognized only for the experience gained in its preparation, and its value as a reference in determining the new requirements, and it is, therefore, recommended that new plans be prepared.

In addition, the architects furnished a cost estimate of \$8,774,000, which is to be compared with the estimate of \$5,150,000 in the BUDOCKS plan, as modified by BOB in 1955.

Line 2 - Threatened expiration of obligational authority: In March it was discovered that four appropriation items (one of which was planning funds for the National Library of Medicine) which the Public Health Service considered to be "no year" accounts had been assigned symbols indicating annual (1957) availability only. A request to the Treasury on March 29 for redesignation of these appropriations as "no year" accounts was denied by the Treasury in a letter of April 23. Subsequently request was made to The Comptroller General (GAO) for a legal ruling; on May 29 PHS was informed that the Comptroller General's ruling would be unfavorable to the PHS position. At this point Mr. Kelly, Director, Office of Financial Management, DHEW, wrote a letter to Mr. Carey of BOB, inclosing a copy of the architects' report, stating the urgency of action if funds were to be obligated before June 30, asking for apportionment of the remainder of the planning funds, and requesting an early meeting between DHEW and BOB on the matter.

Line 3 --Disagreements over site: On June 4 a meeting was held in Mr. Kelly's office, at the request of Mr. Green, BOB. Representatives of DHEW, PHS, NIH, NLM, and BOB were present. Mr. Green stated that BOB had serious doubts as to the adequacy of the NIH master plan (NIH reservation development) which had been submitted by NIH to BOB in November, 1956. Mr. Green stated that he had "informally" presented a memo criticizing the plan to DHEW in March, 1957. Mr. Green said that the BOB was concerned that certain major parcel of presently unused land should be planned for use in their entirety; he did not see, for example, why the 45 acre parcel of land in the northeast corner of the NIH reservation should be "pre-empted" for further use by the "encroachment" of two planned buildings (Biological Standards and Dental Research) on a 15 acre corner of the parcel. He asked for consideration of changing the sites of these buildings, even though final working drawings for one of them are due on June 13. He mentioned similar reservations concerning the proposed site of the National Library of Medicine. Mr. Kelly then referred to a letter (dated May 29) from Secretary Folsom to Mr. Brundage (BOB) stating a principle which DHEW expected to follow in the planning and construction of any new buildings on the NIH campus. This principle is that as new buildings are planned, they should be so located that the land will be economically used; that unused segments of the lands which might be suitable for inter-related groups of buildings will not have their utility destroyed by locating single buildings in such a way as to block off the possibility of future economical use of the remaining property. On the basis of this principle, the question arises as to whether the National Library of Medicine ought not to be located somewhat closer to the present NIH building, for instance, just north of the corner site selected. This would leave vacant the entire south side of the NIH property, and the Library would still face Wisconsin Avenue.

Meeting with Bureau of the Budget June 7: These three lines of development came together at the meeting with the BOB on the morning of June 7. Present at this meeting were McNamara, Berry, Green, Arnot, Childs, and Fee of BOB, Kelly, Thompson, Huddleston and Leahy of DHEW; Gaulk and Fowlkes of PHS; Palmer and Biegalski of PBS, Rogers and Severance of NLM, along with Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Kilham, and Mr. Metcalf. Mr. McNamara opened the meeting by stating that the BOB intended to approve the apportionment of the remaining planning funds, that the purpose of the present meeting was to go into cost estimates, and that in any event design of the Library cannot be carried beyond the "schematic" stage without further review and approval by the BOB. Mr. McNamara wanted to know what kind of construction and materials are envisaged which would result in costs indicated in the O'Connor and Kilham report; what was wrong in terms of cost factors with the BUDOCKS estimates; what are other libraries being constructed on today's market costing; what is the effect of the new site on need for reviewing the original plans; and what considerations are involved in determining the new design. Mr. Kilham stated that the average cost of five libraries designed by O'Connor and Kilham (Princeton, Trinity, Louisville, Spær, and Colgate), brought up to date and projected for about one year in the future, formed the basis for his estimate; that his experience leads him to believe that the BUDOCKS estimate is insufficient to have built a research library comparable with these libraries or consistent with the program; and explained the necessity of changes in the BUDOCKS plan. Mr. Metcalf supported and confirmed these views. Mr. McNamara said that in spite of everything that had been said he still did not feel that he had received an adequate answer on why costs should be so much higher on the new estimate. Finally, Mr. McNamara and Mr. Green raised a point regarding the specific siting of NLM. They stated that policy considerations might require the building to be placed north of the cross-drive which now represents the northern boundary of the library site. Mr. Kelly recommended that this matter be settled after the apportionment had been made, and the meeting was then adjourned. At this point, it would seem certain that BOB in making the apportionment will tack on stipulations which will restrict the NLM building program rather seriously.

* * * * *

There followed a discussion from the floor. At 2:30 Mr. Rufus MILES, Director of Administration, HEW, appeared, and the CHAIRMAN invited him to express his views.

STATEMENT BY MR. MILES

The BOB for quite sometime has been bringing increasing pressure to bear on various departments and agencies, including HEW, as a general matter of policy to improve the management and utilization of real property holdings. This is a part of the overall program of BOB to see to it that land which is not sufficiently utilized either for planning or for use immediately or on a long-range basis is disposed of. As part of the whole picture, BOB asked DHEW to develop a master plan involving a ten-year prediction into the future as to how all the land at NIH would be utilized.

In relation to the proposed site of the National Library of Medicine, from informal discussions DHEW knows that BOB feels that the matter of locating NLM as far from the other buildings as was proposed, in the corner, would tend to make the use of the land less economical, and that it would increase utility and other costs, such as the job of bringing steam lines in from NIH. It is certainly desirable to consider all of the pros and cons of moving the building somewhat closer, north from the site previously discussed, so that utility lines would be shorter, and there would be less of a problem of blocking off further use in the future; if a complex of federal buildings were later to be located on that land, then the land ought to be available for such a purpose.

The Office of the Secretary wishes to do everything possible to expedite the apportionment of funds to complete the planning on the Library, and to get the building built as rapidly as possible. In order to expedite that, it behooves us to consider the pros and cons of movement of the Library somewhat north of the originally selected site and to see what the factors in the picture are. If the weight is strongly on one side or the other, DHEW wants to prepare its position accordingly. The BOB will withhold their full approval until there is concurrence by them on the site location.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE SITE PROBLEM

Dr. LYONS said that he considered that the basic philosophy of the Board in choosing the site was the desire to preserve the separate identity and integrity of the National Library of Medicine, and that to move the site any closer to the National Institutes of Health would defeat that purpose. Dr. DeBAKEY reinforced this point; he said that the Congressional hearings on the Library would reveal that there was considerable controversy as to whether NLM should be placed under any single agency; that the Library's activities in a sense cut across all other health activities of the federal government, and that the Regents

regard these activities as of extreme importance in terms of their influence on the advancement of medical science; that the Library's separate identity must therefore be preserved; and that he could not for a moment think of placing the Library on a site which would tend to restrict its future development.

Mr. KILHAM said that the corner site is a desirable one, from the point of view of its individuality and from the point of view of the slope of the land. From a theoretical view, he said, in regard to the existing NIH plant, the basic objective should be to allow its expansion from whatever part in the future, and that in allowing for expansion, proximity of related functions is one of the very important factors. On that premise, NIH should be able to expand to the south or the east; expansion into the corner plot would be least likely. In the long run, that is a very practical consideration. Mr. MILES felt that there is no special need for NIH to expand either toward Wisconsin Avenue or southward. To this Mr. KILHAM's rejoinder was that for any great institution, it is impossible to predict now what aspect of the institution is going to grow ten years from now. A few years ago one may have thought of NIH that it could never expand further, but in the last few years it has tripled in size.

Mr. METCALF mentioned some points for consideration in choosing the site for a library. 1) There is a problem of putting on the main floor all of the functions which should be located there and it is helpful if you can provide entrances on two levels; 2) For protection a good part of the building should be underground, but extreme care must be used in regard to adequate drainage. We ought to be much more worried about getting books wet than having them burned. 3) We are interested in having a good exposure; since the north exposure is best, it is better to have a building with north-south sides longer than the east-west sides. 4) The most important point in placing the Library is to preserve the opportunity for it to be enlarged; the Library needs to be a single unit indefinitely, and the Library is one thing you can be absolutely sure is going to grow. We have been in trouble in our university libraries all over the country because we admitted they were the heart of the university, and then we set them down in the heart of the campus, and so we couldn't add to them. We have had to go to tremendous expense on that account.

Mr. BIEGALSKI said that preliminary discussions had indicated that the only utility which might be drawn directly from NIH was steam, and that the difference in distance between the present site and the proposed site would amount to very little in terms of cost. Other utilities (water, sewer lines, electricity) might go directly into public facilities, and there would therefore be no difference in costs between the two sites. He also said that he understood that another federal agency has been authorized to plan for a new building if they can find the land, and that NIH was to be approached for thirty acres; this would seem to indicate that there are other pressures bearing on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN said he felt that the site which the Regents had chosen would set off the Library properly, whereas if it were moved to another location it might be hemmed in by other parts of the NIH. He said that the wedge of land across the new roadway, which would never be built up but would remain as a park, was also a factor in the Board's thinking.

There was considerable further discussion revolving around these points. It was felt that the legislation which brought NLM into being and which made provisions for the new building clearly demanded a site of independent distinction, and that the Board would be derelict in its responsibilities if this independence were not zealously preserved. The chosen site is a good site; its relation to utility costs is not likely to be an important factor; and from the point of view of future expansion of NIH facilities it seems as free from interference as is likely to be found. The NLM is a national library, and by virtue of that fact should be in a position somewhat separate from its parent agencies.

Motion. Dr. DeBAKEY moved that the Board of Regents reaffirm its position as to the site of the National Library of Medicine. Dr. CURRAN seconded the motion.

The DIRECTOR said that he just wanted to make sure that the Board was fully aware of the stake. Argument about the site with BOB would involve a delay, perhaps a considerable delay, in proceeding. Several members of the Board, and particularly Dr. MIDDLETON and General HAYS, felt that nevertheless the Board could not act otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN then put Dr. DeBAKEY's motion to a vote, and it was unanimously carried.

Mr. MILES stated that HEW would do everything it could to get the BOB to move with the greatest amount of speed in dealing with this matter; and that it would be helpful if a determination could be made as rapidly as possible as to the approximate amount saved one way or the other that would be involved between the two sites; if the difference were very small, it would strengthen the case a great deal.

In the temporary absence of Dr. BURNEY (who had been called to testify at a Congressional hearing), the CHAIRMAN announced that HEW had placed a request for \$8.5 million in the 1959 budget for the NLM building. He said that Dr. BURNEY had also intimated that if the plans were far enough along there was some possibility of speeding up obtaining the money by asking for it in a supplementary budget appropriation. Mr. MILES doubted that this action would gain time, and said that it might in fact jeopardize the funding.

DISCUSSION WITH ARCHITECTS

Mr. KILHAM made a presentation on the new building, mentioning the fact that he had not yet been authorized to go ahead and design it. He exhibited pictures of recent buildings designed by his firm to illustrate some general features of library construction. He referred to diagrams of NLM functional areas, in which his central concept was that of the public catalog being the heart of the activity. He displayed a model of the site, showing contours, and placed rectangles of different shapes, all representing 55,000 square feet to scale, in various positions on the site. He indicated the effect of placement on future additions to the Library, and stressed the necessity of having an adequate amount of land available, and of the architect's having some freedom in exact positioning of the building.

APPOINTMENT OF A DIRECTOR

The CHAIRMAN said that Dr. BURNEY had mentioned to him that he had given further consideration to the position he had taken at the first meeting regarding the role of the Board of Regents on the appointment of a Director. Dr. BURNEY said he could only agree with the position of the Board that appointment of the Director with the recommendation and approval of the Board of Regents was in fact a desirable precedent to establish, and should be so noted in the minutes. Dr. BURNEY anticipated that in any future appointment the Surgeon General of the PHS would surely wish to have the Board, or a committee of the Board, canvass the field and recommend to him a suitable candidate, who would of course have to meet all regulatory qualifications, for appointment. The Board voted its commendation of the Surgeon General for his forthrightness on this issue.

NEXT MEETING

The date of September 23 was confirmed for the next meeting (9:30 AM). The agenda will include a review of the past year, a forecast for the new year, and FY'59 budget. Other items will be 1) discussion of policy on scope and coverage; 2) new building progress; 3) report on how the new loan policy is taking hold.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted;

FRANK B. ROGERS
Secretary to the Board
National Library of Medicine

Attachment:

TAB A - Letter Dr. Burney to Dr. Daniels

C
O
P
Y

TAB - A

THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES
WASHINGTON

June 6, 1957

Dear Doctor Daniels:

As you know, I have just returned to my desk after an absence of over a month in connection with the WHO meeting in Geneva.

I am extremely pleased to have your letter of May 1, communicating the decision of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine fixing the site of the new building for the Library in the Southeast Sector of the National Institutes of Health reservation in Bethesda. It seems to me that this is an eminently suitable location; all of us in the Public Health Service are, of course, especially pleased that the Library will be adjacent to two great medical centers, the U. S. Public Health Service's National Institutes of Health and the National Naval Medical Center.

I have passed your letter on for the consideration and approval of Secretary Folsom with my full concurrence. I assure you that I will do everything in my power to see to it that work on the new building proceeds as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ L. E. Burney
Surgeon General

Dr. Worth Daniels
Chairman, Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine
Washington, D.C.

June 3, 1957

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
INTERIM POLICY ON DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLICATIONS

The Problem

The transfer of the Library from the Department of Defense to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its new legislative status as the National Library of Medicine require a re-evaluation of major Library practices, among them the policy on distribution of publications. This problem is difficult because the audiences for the various publications differ, because the costs of the publications vary widely, and because of other differences such as periodicity, general versus special medical subject interest, governmental requirements, and so on. At this time the Library administration wishes to recommend changes only in the area of distribution of publications to agencies of the Federal Government, for it is here that inequities of current practice are most evident. Prompt action in this area is desirable so that notices can go out to the agencies affected before new fund commitments are made by them, and this ordinarily occurs early in the fall.

Present situation

The Library's distribution patterns have never been codified into a formal policy; distribution of each publication has been developed separately after having been considered from the viewpoints of financial necessity and the Library's former special obligations as an Armed Forces activity. That certain inconsistencies are discernible is due to the fact that these considerations have been given different weights at different times, that no statutory base for the Library's operations existed, and consequently that factors of expediency sometimes prevailed.

For example, on the one hand the Library has always made the Current List of Medical Literature available without charge to organizations within the Department of Defense, but has insisted that other agencies purchase the publication through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office; on the other hand, copies of occasional bibliographies have from time to time been distributed free to all agencies.

Recommendation

The Library's present position is obviously untenable. To rationalize the pattern of distribution of publications to offices of the Federal Government requires only modest adjustments; the solution of the problem within the framework of the present financial and statutory pattern is relatively simple. In brief, the Library proposes to provide all of its publications free to all government organizations which have need of them, on as equitable a proportional base as can be devised, and within the financial and regulatory limitations on each publication.

Statutory Requirements

1. The National Library of Medicine Act states the purpose of the Library as being "to aid in the dissemination and exchange of scientific and other information"; one of the functions of the Library is to "publish and make available its catalogs, indexes, and bibliographies"; and "The Surgeon General is authorized, after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the Board, to prescribe rules under which the Library will provide copies of its publications or materials...to public and private agencies and organizations, institutions, and individuals. Such rules may provide for making available such publications...(1) without charge as a public service, or (2) upon a loan, exchange, or charge basis, or (3) in appropriate circumstances, under contract arrangements..."

2. Section 1 of the Act of May 11, 1922, as amended (44 USC 220), provides as follows: "The head of any executive department, independent office, or establishment of the Government is authorized, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to use from the appropriations available for printing and binding such sums as may be necessary for the printing of journals, magazines, periodicals, and similar publications as he shall certify in writing to be necessary in the transaction of the public business required by law of such department, office, or establishment. There may be printed, in addition to those necessary for such public business, not to exceed two thousand copies for free distribution by the department, office, or establishment issuing the same. The Public Printer shall print such additional copies thereof as may be required for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents; but the printing of such additional copies required for sale by the Superintendent of Documents shall be subject to regulation by the Joint Committee on Printing and shall not interfere with the prompt execution of printing for the Government."

Effect of the Proposal

The following list of publications provides the basic data for each publication, and gives present and proposed governmental distribution. Present figures are accurate, but rounded off; proposed figures are indicative of general magnitude, but may and will be adjusted up or down to meet changing requirements.

1. CURRENT LIST OF MEDICAL LITERATURE

Monthly; indexes selected current journals; sold at \$13.50 per year domestic, \$17.00 foreign. Three year approval granted by Bureau of the Budget expires 30 June 59, and must then be renewed; it limits the

Current List to a maximum of 5000 pages a year, a maximum of 1800 copies per issue for official use and free distribution, for which the printing funds (Library) may not exceed \$33,000 per year.

Distribution

	PRESENT	PROPOSED
LIBRARY'S Printing Order	1500	1800
Dept. of Defense	(350)	(325)
Other free distr	(50)	0
Libr, reserve, & stock	(125)	(75)
Exchange	(975)	(925)
Veterans Administration		(250)
Public Health Service		(100)
Other gov't agencies		(125)
GOVERNMENT SUBSCRIPTIONS	200	0
Public Health Service	(75)	
Other government agencies	(125)	
RIDER TO REQUISITION		
Veterans Administration	250	0

2. NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE CATALOG

Annual; quinquennial cumulation; contains the record by author and subject of books cataloged in the Library since 1950. Published as a supplement to the catalogs of the Library of Congress, which absorbs a considerable portion of the costs. The National Library of Medicine subsidizes this publication by purchasing 125 copies of each issue, at a cost of \$2000 for the annual volume and \$10,000 for the five year cumulation. The annual volume sells for \$17.50 and the quinquennial cumulation for \$64.00 (six volumes).

Distribution

		PRESENT		PROPOSED
LIBRARY'S Order		125		125
Dept of Defense	(70)		(50)	
Other gov't	(5)		(15)	
Private inst.	(10)		0	
Libr, reserve, & exohg.	(40)		(30)	
Veterans Admin.			(20)	
Public Health Service			(10)	

3. INDEX CATALOGUE OF THE LIBRARY OF THE SURGEON GENERAL'S OFFICE

Occasional; decision taken in 1950 to discontinue this publication, which is now superseded by the Current List and the NLM Catalog. Last volume of the regular series (Series IV, vol. 11) was published in 1955 (on sale at \$9.00). In addition to 58 volumes already published, a supplementary series of 3 volumes will be published during the next five years to bring this publication to date 1950. The cost of printing, \$60,000 per volume, can be justified only on the basis of fulfilling a commitment begun in 1880, and finally closing it out. Distribution: The Library buys 1000 copies, which are distributed free to medical libraries, government and private, throughout the world. It is proposed to continue this same distribution for the last three volumes.

4. BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MEDICAL REVIEWS

Annual; first issue (experimental) in 1956. Lists review articles, by subject; will be continued; current issue in press; probable price \$1.50.

Distribution

		PRESENT		PROPOSED
LIBRARY Order		1500		1000
Dept of Defense	(350)		(325)	
Veterans Admin	(250)		(250)	
Other gov't agencies	(225)		(125)	
Public Health Service			(100)	
Libr, reserve, & stock	(125)		(75)	
Other & exchange	(550)		(125)	

5. OCCASIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES * PRINTED

Examples: Plasma Substitutes (1951), Pathology and Physiology of Burns (1952), Gas Gangrene (1954), Structure, Growth, and Composition of Bone (1955). This last is the only one sold by the Superintendent of Documents (\$1.00); the others have been distributed free on request. In 1956 the bibliography on Cancer Chemotherapy was published as a supplement to the journal CANCER RESEARCH. In preparation now is a bibliography on psychopharmacological agents.

Recommendations: Same distribution as Bibliography of Medical Reviews (1000 copies).

6. OCCASIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES - PROCESSED

Examples: Effects of Jet Aircraft Noise on Hearing; Lower Nephron Nephrosis; Narcotic Addiction. These near-print bibliographies are published with the Library's own reproduction facilities and are distributed free upon request.

Recommendation: Continue free distribution.

7. NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE CLASSIFICATION

The Library's scheme for shelf arrangement of its books. 2d ed., 1956. Available from Superintendent of Documents at \$2.00 per copy. Distribution free to selected federal agencies and to selected library schools.

Recommendation: Free distribution to all recipients of the NLM Catalog (2 above).

8. NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE NEWS

Monthly; a medium for the dissemination of information concerning the Library's activities, services, and holdings to physicians, educators, and librarians in this country and abroad. Three year approval granted by Bureau of the Budget expires 30 April 1960, and must then be renewed; it limits the News to a maximum of 48 pages per year, 12 issues per year, 1000 copies per issue, and an annual expenditure from printing funds of \$160.00.

Recommendation: Continue free distribution to individuals and institutions requesting.

9. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Near-print; prepared primarily for submission to the Surgeon General, PHS. Distributed as a professional courtesy to a maximum of 350 medical and other research libraries at home and abroad.

Recommendation: Distribution to all recipients of the NLM Catalog (2 above).

10. OCCASIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE PAMPHLETS

Examples: Services, Card Catalogs, Scientific Translation.

Published to provide the Library's clientele with information about its services. Distributed free to all who request them; also used as substitutes for or as supplements to correspondence.

Recommendation: Continue present free distribution.

BOARD OF REGENTS
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

A G E N D A
for
Meeting of September 23, 1957
Washington, 9:30 a.m.

1. Report of the Director
 - a. The year just past (see Annual Report, FY 1957).
 - b. The year ahead (see Program Document, FY 1958).
 - c. Budget for Fiscal Year 1959.
2. Report on the new loan policy.
3. Discussion of policy on scope and coverage (see paper attached).
4. Building program.
5. Date for next meeting (early February?).

BOARD OF REGENTS
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Agenda Item 3, Meeting of September 23, 1957

POLICY ON SCOPE AND COVERAGE

At the meeting of April 29, 1957, background papers on this topic were distributed to each member:

1. Acquisition Policy of the National Medical Library; Proceedings of a Symposium held 12 April 1956;
2. Library Manual B-5, dated 20 December 1955, subject: "Scope and Coverage of Collections";
3. Library Manual B-5a, dated 27 December 1955, subject: "Resume of Scope and Coverage."

Extra copies of these papers can be supplied on request.

The following is recommended as minimal background reading:

1. All of Library Manual B-5.
2. From the Symposium--
 - a. Paper by Colonel Rogers;
 - b. Paper by Mr. Clapp;
 - c. Paper by Dr. Smith;
 - d. Paper by Dr. Bestor, especially pp. 49-52, p. 63.
 - e. Discussion, especially pp. 67-69.
3. See also National Library of Medicine Act, Section 375.

The Library administration makes the following recommendations to the Board of Regents:

1. That the Board of Regents approve the general policy of scope and coverage of collections now being pursued at the National Library of Medicine (as exemplified in Library Manual B-5).
2. That the Board of Regents require that additional studies in this field be made. (At the moment, particular attention is being given to theses, morbidity and mortality reports, and hospital reports.)
3. That the Board of Regents take a continuing interest in this area, and that the Board members, individually and collectively, offer opinions and recommendations thereon to the Library administration from time to time.

BOARD OF REGENTS
of the
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING, FY 1958
Washington, September 23, 1957

Members absent: FRANCIS, HAYS, HOGAN, MIDDLETON, MUMFORD, OGLE.
Dr. W. Palmer DEARING, Deputy Surgeon General, PHS, sat in for Dr.
BURNEY.

The meeting was called to order by the CHAIRMAN at 9:30 a.m.

REPORT ON WATER DAMAGE TO COLLECTION

The DIRECTOR reported that on September 17 about 400 books of the Library's collection had been damaged when water backed up in a storm drain which was mis-connected to waste lines, and overflowed into the west basement stacks. All of the damaged books were imprints of the first half of the nineteenth century. Yeoman work on the part of the staff will result in allowing most of the books to be rebound, with only water stains to mark the incident, but a few of the books must be written off as total losses. Members of the Board felt that this incident heavily underlines the urgency of the need for new construction.

BUILDING PROGRESS

On June 19 the Bureau of the Budget apportioned the \$350,000 which had been appropriated for planning. In making the apportionment the Bureau entered four stipulations: 1) the building to be designed not to exceed 230,000 square feet; 2) for planning purposes, not to cost more than \$7,300,000 on the basis of current construction costs; 3) no provision made for cafeteria for employees; 4) "it is expected that the building will be located closer to existing central services of the National Institutes of Health than was indicated on the master plan."

During the last week of June a contract for architectural services was negotiated with O'Connor and Kilham of New York, and the planning funds were obligated.

On the 17th of June Dr. DANIELS wrote a letter to Dr. BURNEY transmitting the Board's reaffirmation of its decision on site,

made at the meeting of the Board on June 7 (copy attached). On July 25th Mr. FOLSOM wrote to Mr. BRUNDAGE, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as follows (in part): "After reviewing the recommendation of the BOARD OF REGENTS and the advice of the staff of this Department, I have come to the conclusion that the site previously selected is a wise and prudent choice. We therefore propose to request the General Services Administration to advise the contract architect to proceed with the development of plans for construction of the building. Since the architect cannot proceed without a firm decision on the site, and since he has notified us that his staff will have to be assigned to another project if there is further delay, it seems to me we should give him our decision by July 31. Sincerely yours."

No reply was received from the Bureau of the Budget, and on August 5 the architect was instructed to proceed with the plans on the site selected by the Board of Regents.

The matter of a lunchroom for the Library is currently being negotiated, with the Department taking the position that this is a necessity.

The space and dollar limitations are not being argued at this point. These issues cannot be dealt with intelligently until the plans have reached a more advanced stage.

Dr. DEARING commented on the budget situation in general. He indicated that even obtaining apportionment of FY 1958 operating funds was extremely difficult. After reminding the Board that all information concerning development of the President's budget is confidential and privileged within the Executive Branch, Dr. DEARING said that the Bureau of the Budget had given DHEW a ceiling figure for the Fiscal Year 1959 budget which is a substantial cut below that which Mr. FOLSOM believes to be the needs of the Department. On instructions from Mr. FOLSOM, the Department is now developing two budgets for Fiscal Year 1959 - the so-called "A" and "B" budgets. The A budget is the budget which comes under the ceiling figure supplied by the Bureau of the Budget; this budget contains no funds for construction of the National Library of Medicine nor for any other PHS-sponsored construction. The B budget is the budget which the Secretary believes is necessary; funds for construction of the Library are included in the B budget. The Secretary will fight for acceptance of the B budget; it remains to be seen how successful this action will be.

DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD

The CHAIRMAN put before the Board the question of what action could be taken to support the Library's request for construction funds. Dr. DeBAKEY and Dr. RAVDIN felt that the Board should offer a resolution of support to the Secretary, with copies to Senator HILL and Mr. FOGARTY. Dr. LYONS and Dr. VOLWILER thought that the resolution should go to the President. Dr. BIBBY suggested the need of two communications, one to the President and another to the interested parties in Congress. After extended discussion, the following motion

was made and carried:

Motion: That the CHAIRMAN draft a letter to the President, submit the draft to Board members for comment, then send the letter to the President with a copy to Mr. FOLSOM; that the CHAIRMAN prepare letters to Senator HILL and Mr. FOGARTY commending them for support of the Library's appropriation requests.

REVIEW OF BUILDING PLANS

The Board discussed plans drawn up by O'Connor and Kilham and designated "H-3." The Board expressed some concern at putting the loading dock area on the side of the building toward the National Institutes of Health (north side), and suggested that, all other things being equal, the architects should consider a reversal of the floor plans so as to bring the loading dock on the south (Glenbrook Parkway) side. The Board asked the DIRECTOR to convey this view to the architects for their consideration.

WORK OF THE LIBRARY DURING FY 1957

The Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1957 had been distributed earlier to all members of the Board. Board members were profuse in their praise of the record, and of the quality of the report itself. Miss MARSHALL offered a motion commending the Library administration, in which the Board concurred. Dr. DeBAKEY suggested that it would be a good idea to submit a synopsis of the report, highlighting certain features, for publication in the Journal of the American Medical Association. The DIRECTOR mentioned an article on the Library by Dr. SCHULLIAN (Cleveland) and himself, which will probably appear in the January 1958 issue of Library Quarterly.

PROGRAM OF THE LIBRARY FOR FY 1958 AND FY 1959

The Program Document for Fiscal Year 1958 had been distributed earlier to all members of the Board. The DIRECTOR cautioned that the Program Document is not to be considered a publication of the Library; it is a document developed exclusively for internal management purposes.

The Program Document, FY 1958, indicates how the \$1,450,000 appropriated for FY 1958 would be used to support the Library's programs. It was also indicated that for FY 1959 the Library had requested \$1,553,000 and was being allowed \$1,452,000; the difference of \$101,000 was to have been used to introduce new methods of production, involving new machinery (largely automatic camera equipment), into the Current List operation, and to regularize the Library's intern program, now being financed "out of the hide" of regular operations. It was also indicated that the Library staff, which had fallen to a low of 205 members in January, now stood at 223 (to be compared with 225 positions authorized and funds to support 217 man-years).

Considerable interest was expressed in the intern program. Dr. RAVDIN, Miss MARSHALL, and the CHAIRMAN felt that the Library administration should go all out in support and further development of the program. Dr. BIBBY, Dr. VOLWILER, and Dr. CURRAN commented on various aspects, and Dr. WILSON inquired as to the range of interest (in the various library schools) which the program had elicited.

The DIRECTOR was asked to explain further the desired changes in Current List production, which had been mentioned in the Annual Report for FY 1957. The changes were described. Again the Board expressed a deep interest in the possibilities as outlined.

The discussion of these two points was enlarged. The Board felt that the Library should continue to pursue the tack it was taking in training for, and research in, medical librarianship. The Board believes that the seeking of funds to support internship and fellowship programs, and to support research in mechanizing some elements of the indexing operation, should not only be approved but also encouraged. The Board suggested that the Council on Library Resources, Inc., (Ford Foundation funds) might be approached. The idea of a Library Coordinator for education and research was mooted. Dr. BIBBY felt that one or the other program should be tackled first, not both at the same time. The DIRECTOR indicated that he felt there was something anomalous in having an agency of the Public Health Service seeking training grants; Dr. DeBAKEY and Dr. BIBBY disagreed. As to research, the DIRECTOR felt that brains and ideas were more scarce than money.

A motion, offered by Dr. DeBAKEY and seconded by Dr. LYONS, to the effect that the Board encourage the further development of research and training programs of the Library was eventually brought to a vote and passed. It seemed clear that the Board expected that the DIRECTOR, despite his expressed hesitancy and doubts, would explore further the possibilities of obtaining funds to support the research and/or training programs.

PROGRESS REPORT ON LOAN POLICY

The Board, at its last meeting, had asked that the new loan policy be appraised and reported on. The new system has been in effect only since September 1, and it is difficult at this early date to get a sound view of what is happening.

In the first half of September 3,959 requests were received. Of these, 3,161 were filled, 279 of them by sending the original piece and 2,882 by sending a xerographic copy. (Of these last, 247 went to APO addresses.)

There were 798 requests which were not filled. Of these, 479 came direct from individuals, who had to be notified of the change in the system. Another 156 requests were sent in as paid orders, and these were returned. The remainder were denied for one reason or another - they were requests for entire copyright issues, for example, or they were references which were undecipherable.

On the whole, the DIRECTOR's impression was that the new program is going well, that requests were comparable in volume to those received under the old system, and that the initial falling-off in number of requests which had been predicted for the early change-over period had not developed.

The DIRECTOR expressed his concern with the continuing vexing problem of copyright restrictions. He indicated that the Library is proceeding as circumspectly as possible, but that it is possible, if not indeed probable, that the years would bring, sooner or later, a test of the issue in the courts. Dr. VOLWILER, in particular, expressed similar misgivings. The DIRECTOR took pains to indicate that despite the difficulties of the situation it seemed clear to him that the Library could do no other than pursue its present course, since a very large part; if not the major part, of the Library's services is dependent upon it.

POLICY ON SCOPE AND COVERAGE

Complete statements of the Library's policy on scope and coverage of the collections, along with a copy of the Acquisitions Symposium Proceedings (1956), had previously been placed in the hands of all members of the Board. An interesting and extended discussion of the problem, with Miss MARSHALL leading, ensued; the various baffling aspects of the problem were reviewed. The consensus of the Board seems to indicate that, in collecting, the rule of thumb for most medical libraries should be "When in doubt, don't," but that for the National Library of Medicine the rule would have to be reversed.

Motion. Dr. DeBAKEY moved, with second by Miss MARSHALL, that the Board approve the general policy of scope and coverage of the collections now being pursued, and that the Board recommend that continuing studies be carried out in this field. The motion was passed unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

Harvey Celebration. The Harvey Tercentenary Celebration, held at the Clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health on September 17, and jointly sponsored by the National Heart Institute and the National Library of Medicine, was a qualified success. The magnificent exhibit of Harveiana will be on display at the Library during October and November, and thereafter at the Smithsonian Institution, the Medical Museum of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, and Georgetown University.

Publications. Copies of the recently published National Library of Medicine Catalog (1956), and the second volume of Bibliography of Medical Reviews were displayed.

NEXT MEETING

The Board determined that the next meeting of the Board of Regents will be held on Monday, December 9, 1957, at 9:30 a.m. Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. KILHAM will be invited to attend, and the plans for the new building will be reviewed and criticized.

The Board set February 17, 1958, as a tentative date for a following meeting.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Board that his term of office will expire at the end of February; he felt that no period should intervene in which the chairmanship would be vacant. He therefore put the Board on notice that he expected to call for election of a new Chairman of the Board at the last meeting which will occur before the end of his term.

- - - - -

The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

FBR

FRANK B. ROGERS, Secretary
Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine

Attachment:

Copy of letter of Chairman to
Dr. BURNEY, June 17, 1957

C O P Y

June 17, 1957

Dr. Leroy E. Burney
The Surgeon General, Public Health Service
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Dr. Burney:

On May 1, 1957, I transmitted to you the decision of the Board of Regents regarding the site for the National Library of Medicine; this letter bears on the subject further.

Meeting on June 7th, the Board of Regents was informed that some question had arisen as to whether a more northerly location than that selected by the Board might be preferable. The Board, which had previously made an inspection visit to the National Institutes of Health area, considered this matter carefully, and voted unanimously to reaffirm its previous decision; namely, that the site for the National Library of Medicine shall be in the southeast sector of the NIH reservation, marked by the proposed Glenbrook Parkway on the south, the proposed north-south perimeter road nearest Wisconsin Avenue on the east, and with the north and west limits defined by a slight relocation of the proposed roads marking those boundaries so that the area within these confines shall consist of a minimum of ten acres for the Library's use. The Board felt strongly that the legislation which brought the National Library of Medicine into being and which made provisions for a new building clearly demanded a site which preserves and attests the separate integrity and the national character of the Library.

The Board was pleased to have your assurance that you will do everything possible to forward construction of the new building, and you may be certain that you have the all-out support of the Board as you proceed with this task which is of such vast import for the advancement of medicine.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Worth B. Daniels
WORTH B. DANIELS, M. D.
Chairman, Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine

76

(No Agenda issued for
meeting of December 9, 1957)

BOARD OF REGENTS
of the
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING, FY 1958
Washington, December 9, 1957

Members absent: FRANCIS, HOGAN, WILSON.

Guests present: Mr. Keyes D. Metcalf, Building Consultant to the National Library of Medicine

Dr. Aims C. McGuinness, Special Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Mr. E. G. Huddleston, Jr., Chief of the Property Management Branch, Division of General Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Mr. DeWitt L. Cocke, Chief of the Property Management Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Public Health Service

Mr. Harry L. Doran, Deputy Chief Finance Officer, Division of Finance, Public Health Service

Mr. Charles L. Carroll, Acting Liaison Architect, Public Buildings Service

Mr. Ray W. Grim, Executive Officer, National Library of Medicine

Mr. Robert B. O'Connor, Mr. W. H. Kilham, Jr., Mr. Robert M. Beder, Architects for the National Library of Medicine

- - - - -

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by the CHAIRMAN, who announced that the morning session would be devoted to a review of plans for the new building.

MORNING SESSION

Mr. O'CONNOR: "The following brief review of the progress of work on the new National Library of Medicine may serve to bring the Members of the Board of Regents up to date.

"On April 5th 1957 the General Services Administration called O'Connor and Kilham to Washington to negotiate the first contract for architectural services to include a survey and report on the needs of the National Library of Medicine and the extent to which plans previously prepared by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, U. S. Navy, could be utilized in the preparation of documents for construction.

"On May 11th 1957 the report just mentioned was submitted to GSA. This recommended:

"1. That the Budocks plans could not be usefully employed except for data on existing conditions and functional procedures, and accordingly a new approach should be made to the planning problem giving consideration to:

- a) the new policy situation resulting from legislation establishing the new National Library of Medicine;
- b) the new site selected by the Board of Regents;
- c) the revised program for the building.

"2. That an overall budget of \$8,774,000 be authorized based on 240,000 square feet of space and a staff of 250 persons. This was figured at \$22.50 per square foot plus the various reservations and contingencies provided in GSA and BOB procedures.

"On June 7th 1957 the Architects and the library consultant, Mr. Keyes Metcalf, appeared with representatives of the National Library of Medicine, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and the Public Buildings Service before the Bureau of the Budget. At the close of that hearing the Bureau of the Budget announced that they would recommend procedure with planning though at a reduced budget (subsequently set at \$7,300,000) and reducing the authorized area to 230,000 square feet. They also stated that their report would question the site selected for the new building.

"That same day the Board of Regents met at lunch in the National Library of Medicine. After discussion the site selection was reaffirmed, and the Architects and PBS liaison officer were asked to prepare data on utility costs for this site relative to one further north along Wisconsin Avenue which appeared to be the preference of the Bureau of the Budget.

"No further conclusion having been reached as to the site, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare directed a letter on July 25th 1957 to the Bureau of the Budget urging settlement of the site question on the basis of the original selection. By August 5th, no reply having been received to that letter, it was assumed that the original site was definite.

"Meanwhile, on June 24th 1957, GSA negotiated with the Architects a second contract providing for completion of professional services on the proposed new library. While progress with the drawings during June and July was somewhat retarded by uncertainty as to the site, development of the diagrammatic plans has been actively pushed since early August. A total of twenty schemes has been prepared, discussed by the Architects, the library authorities and the library consultant, and modified in accordance with these discussions. The drawings before you today are the latest revision of the twenty-first scheme lettered H-13. Having reached the point where they are acceptable to Colonel Rogers they will be submitted officially to GSA to constitute the diagrammatic stage of the design contract, subject to any improvements which may come out of today's discussion."

Presentation of plans. Mr. KILHAM and Mr. BEDER presented a series of drawings in slide form, and the DIRECTOR commented on each. Of many points questioned and discussed, the following are perhaps particularly worthy of note:

LOBBY - Size probably adequate; consider incorporating built-in upright exhibit cabinets.

STUDIES - Bulk of these are in stack areas; those few in main reading room may be used alternatively as typing rooms (readers') and microfilm-viewing rooms.

FILM COLLECTION - Adequate storage space available.

LOCKER ROOMS - Only for guard and char force; staff will disperse to work areas.

AUDITORIUM - Omitted in accordance with ruling of Bureau of the Budget; now only Board Room included.

BOOK CAPACITY - 1,293,000 volumes, a little more than double the present holdings.

MAIN STACK AISLES - Six feet wide, uniform pattern.

RANGE AISLES - With usual shelves, 30 inches.

SERVICE ENTRANCE - The Board had recommended consideration of placing the service entrance on the opposite side of the building. After considerable study it was decided to place it on the north side of the building, as originally planned. Reasons: 1) the most important aspect of the building is that from the southeast; 2) not desirable to bring traffic up steep slope, and no indication as to when access to Glenbrook Parkway will be available; 3) future expansion of the building is planned toward the rear (west) and present location facilitates this; 4) loading dock will be 14 feet below level of main floor, and can be adequately screened by this difference in surrounding ground level as well as by landscaping.

DOME STRUCTURE - Center well would equalize bomb-blast pressures on inside of walls. Provides some admixture of natural light in interior of very large building; this is a psychological advantage. Form of dome not yet decided upon.

OUTSIDE HEIGHT OF BUILDING - Long low building, necessitated by requirements of underground stacks and all major functions on ground floor, makes exterior treatment difficult; on the other hand, this may be thought of as offering an unusual opportunity for capitalizing on a very fine setting.

Mr. Metcalf summarized by stating that he felt that "the architects have come a long way, and those are good basic plans. It pleases me particularly that the communication system has been worked out very simply. So many of our large buildings become terribly complicated; here the architects have been very successful in simplifying the arrangements."

AFTERNOON SESSION

[Only Members of the Board were present]

Budget status of construction funds. The CHAIRMAN reported on his talks with General Snyder, following receipt by the President of the letter authorized by the Board at the last meeting [see TAB A].

The upshot of the whole affair seems to establish that considerations of fiscal policy are still primary, and that the chances of construction funds being included in the FY 1959 budget are very remote. Dr. BURNEY confirmed this.

The discussion turned to possible courses of action to be followed from this point. Dr. RAVDIN said that the American College of Surgeons had informed Mr. Folsom of their interest in a new building for the Library. Dr. LYONS put forth the idea of trying to make more prominent the role of the Library in relation to space medicine. General OGLE commented on the relatively small amount of unclassified literature on the subject; he drew attention to the increasingly acute relationship of medicine with physics, chemistry, astronomy, and the basic sciences. The discussion broadened into a review of the Library's activities in handling Russian literature, into the need to spread information about the Library more widely among the general public, and into the possibility of expanding the Library's functions and collecting scope into adjacent fields of science. The DIRECTOR spoke a cautionary word on this last proposal; while science is indeed indivisible, it does not necessarily follow that what is needed is one great unified library for all the sciences.

Dr. DEBAKEY felt that the Board should again stress the urgency and importance of the need for the new building, pointing out the relationship of the Library to intelligence programs and the national security generally. Dr. RAVDIN alluded to the President's statement in signing the bill to aid in the construction of medical research facilities; he felt that recent discussion in the Association of American Medical Colleges dealing with the future expansion of medical educational facilities which will be required by continuing population growth was also highly pertinent to the argument for support of the Library. After further discussion -

Motion: Dr. DEBAKEY moved, with second by Dr. LYONS, that the CHAIRMAN prepare a letter to Secretary Folsom embodying the various ideas outlined in the paragraph immediately above.

Report from the Director. The DIRECTOR reported on the status of the new loan policy (summarized in the December NEWS), and said that he thought it was going along very well. In response to a question he said that 65% of the orders are processed by the end of the fifth day following receipt, and 96% are processed within ten days. The DIRECTOR also reported on preliminary exploratory talks with Mr. Verner W. Clapp, President of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. (Ford Foundation) concerning the possibility of obtaining funds to support radical changes involving mechanization of the Current List operation. Mr. Clapp offered encouragement, and the Library will proceed to submit a formal application for funds. The DIRECTOR did not discuss with Mr. Clapp any matters in the area of intern training or educational fellowships.

Date of next meeting. After discussion it was voted to cancel the meeting of the Board which had been scheduled for February 17. It was decided that the date for the next meeting should be tentatively set for Friday, May 9, 1958.

Election of Chairman. Dr. DANIELS reminded the Board that his term as Chairman expires on February 22, 1958, and that a new Chairman should be elected to take office on February 23; he then called for nominations. Dr. LYONS nominated Dr. RAVDIN, and Dr. DEBAKEY seconded. Dr. RAVDIN was unanimously elected, after he had put in a modest demurrer. Dr. LYONS was elected to continue in office as Vice-Chairman. /Announcement of election of new Chairman will be made in mid-February.

- - - - -

The meeting was adjourned at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



FRANK B. ROGERS, Secretary
Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine

Attachment:

TAB A - Letter from President of U. S. to Chairman, Board of Regents, October 19, 1957

TAB A

THE WHITE HOUSE

Washington

October 19, 1957.

Dear Dr. Daniels:

Thank you very much for sending me a report on the first year of operation of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine.

I understand that General Snyder is going to discuss with the Bureau of the Budget your request for inclusion in the 1959 budget of money necessary for the construction of a new building for the Library.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

/s/ Dwight D. Eisenhower

Dr. Worth B. Daniels,
Chairman, Board of Regents,
National Library of Medicine,
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare,
Washington 25, D. C.

BOARD OF REGENTS
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

A G E N D A
for
Meeting of May 9, 1958
Washington, 9:30 a.m.

1. NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE BUDGET FOR FY 1960

- a. Comparison with FY 1958 and FY 1959
- b. Detail of increases
 - (1) Machine bibliographic techniques for the Currant List (grant from Council on Library Resources, Inc.)
 - (2) Library internships and training
 - (3) Other - photographic services, cumulative catalog, personnel.

2. WHERE WE STAND

- Russian medical literature
- Russian medical bibliography
- Western bibliographical control of Russian medical literature
- NLM-NIH handbook of Russian medical literature

3. PROGRESS IN CURRENT PROGRAMS

- a. Publications - Catalog; BMR 3; Psychopharmacology; Space medicine; Russian dictionary; Russian handbook; Library Quarterly article; article in What's New; Macy-Princeton Conference
- b. Interlibrary loans and photoduplication
- c. Medical motion pictures

LUNCH, 11:30-12:30

4. THE NEW BUILDING

- a. The story since December 9th
- b. Current problem areas
- c. Developing plans (architects' representative will be present)

5. NEXT MEETING - June 30th?

BOARD OF REGENTS
of the
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING, FY 1958
Washington, May 9, 1958

Members absent: FRANCIS, HAYS, HOGAN, MARSHALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by the CHAIRMAN, Dr. I. S. RAVDIN, who announced that appointments have not yet been made to fill the positions on the Board vacated by Dr. DANIELS and Dr. SPECTOR.

BUDGET, FY 1960

Current budget (FY 1958)	\$ 1,450,000
FY 1959 budget (now awaiting Congressional action)	1,415,000
FY 1960 budget (here under discussion)	1,520,000

The difference between the 1959 and the 1960 budgets is \$105,000, although the difference between the current budget (FY 1958) and the 1960 budget is only \$70,000. The \$105,000 is itemized as follows:

<u>Personnel</u>	\$ 38,400
1958 staff authorization	225
1959 staff authorization	224
1960 staff authorization requested	227

The three additional positions are intern positions. Up to this time the Library has not managed to regularize the intern positions, but has had to support the intern program by attrition in regular staff positions.

The money requested also includes pay for one extra day above 52-week base pay period. Money for advances in grade is included in this request. The Library has reviewed the grade situation position by position; right now over 20% of the staff is serving at the top of the grade, and by 1960 over 30% of the staff will be serving at the top of the grade.

Also involved is an increase of \$2,300 in contributions to the retirement fund, required by law.

<u>Printing and Binding</u>	\$ 13,400
---------------------------------------	-----------

This increase is due to the fact that during FY 1960 the cost of the second quinquennial cumulation of the National Library of Medicine Catalog must be paid. (First cumulation, 1950-54; second cumulation, 1955-59.) The Library paid \$10,000 for the first cumulation, and estimates the cost at \$13,400 for the second cumulation. This money is, in effect, a subsidy that the Government contributes to keep the price of the Catalog down within reach of the other medical libraries of this country. This money pays for the copies which are distributed free to Federal Government medical installations. (Cost of 6-volume 1950-54 cumulation: \$64 per set.)

Support of "poor paper" program \$ 5,100

The Library is getting into high gear on the program for saving the disintegrating material in the collection by microfilming it. This amount of money will furnish enough film and other supplies to keep one and one-half men busy for one year; the actual manpower is expected to be available through increased efficiency in other photoduplication services.

Acquisition of medical motion pictures \$ 2,000

Up to now the Library has relied almost entirely on gifts to bring in contributions to its motion picture collection (only two films have been purchased so far - the Harvey film, and the Lillehei film on cardiac surgery involving extracorporeal circulation). The Library expects to use the money to make copies of prints offered, rather than buying them outright. The amount requested will buy less than ten prints.

Changes in CURRENT LIST production \$ 43,800

This is summarized under the next heading.

The above six items represent the total of \$105,000.

CHANGES IN CURRENT LIST

On April 16 the National Library of Medicine received a grant of \$73,800 from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., to finance a program for the study of means of mechanizing index publication. This award is spread over two years; \$46,300 will become available as soon as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare formally accepts the grant. [Note: DHEW forwarded its letter of acceptance to the Council on Library Resources on June 5.] This money will be used largely for rental of the necessary equipment - IBM collators and sorters, flexowriters, reproducers - consultant service, etc. If the program is successful, Current List format will be changed beginning with the issue for January 1960.

[At this point charts and diagrams were displayed detailing the present and proposed systems of making up the Current List.]

Using the present manual system the Library is indexing 110,000 articles per year. Recent studies at the Library seem to indicate that the totality of articles that might be indexed comes to about 200,000 per year, rather than the 300,000 which others have previously estimated. Using the new system the indexing of 200,000 articles will be within reach; the Current List can cover the total, if this proves desirable. The heart of the system is the Listomatic camera, built by Eastman, which photographs one-, two-, or three-line entries, imprinted along the top of an IBM card, at a very rapid rate.

Projection of CURRENT LIST expenditures. The following chart shows the total budget for the Current List for six years, beginning with the current year:

	<u>1958</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>
Indexing Load	106,500	110,000	120,000	150,000	160,000	180,000
Unit Cost \$	2.17	2.09	2.00	1.80	1.74	1.63
Division Budget	275,640	263,000	310,000	318,500	317,500	300,000
CLML Budget	230,640	230,000	277,000	272,000	280,000	295,000
CLML Budget (Equipment amortized over 10 years)	230,640	230,000	240,000	270,000	278,000	294,000
Man years	42	42	42	44	44	45

It is expected that by 1963 the budget will have settled down to about \$300,000 per year, that by then the number of articles indexed will have increased from the present 110,000 to about 180,000, and that unit price per article indexed will have come down from the present \$2.17 to about \$1.63. The Library will be getting a lot more index for its money; in addition, it will have available the means for rapidly producing auxiliary categorized lists.

DISCUSSION

General OGLE commented that the average staff salary came to \$4,682, which was modest. There were widespread comments to the effect that continuation of the intern program was extremely desirable and should have high priority. Dr. DE BAKEY noted that the Bureau of the Budget had cut the Library's 1959 budget by \$37,000; this was largely adjusted by abolishing the position of Special Assistant for Building Program (vacant after Mr. Severance went to another job), and by deferring completion date of final volumes of the supplementary series of the Index-Catalogue. Dr. DE BAKEY said that he was sure the grant from the Council on Library Resources would be accepted, after review in the DHEW General Counsel's office. The CHAIRMAN and Dr. CURRAN expressed appreciation for the detailed budget presentation. Dr. DE BAKEY proposed, with second by Dr. LYONS, that the Board express by a formal resolution its acceptance of the FY 1960 budget proposal. After amendments, the final resolution, as unanimously adopted by the Board, is as follows:

"RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine takes cognizance of the thoughtful and well-developed budget for FY 1960, and expresses its strong approval and high commendation; the Board believes that the budget of \$1,520,000 is a minimal figure for support of the Library's program. It is particularly gratifying to observe the careful attention being given to the development of those expanded activities essential to the strengthening of medical science in general and the health program of the nation in particular. These include such developments as the mechanical processing of the Current List of Medical Literature, the

broadening coverage of Russian and other foreign medical literature, and the institution of a program for intensive training of medical librarians. It must be recognized that the major deterrent to more complete development of necessary library functions and the wise expenditure of more ample funds for this purpose is the limitation imposed by the present physical plant. Accordingly, with the establishment of the new library building, it will become necessary to increase the budget if the purposes of the Act creating the National Library of Medicine are to be fulfilled."

At this point there was an off-the-record discussion of the Senate Appropriation Committee hearings on the National Library of Medicine, and on the possibility of obtaining construction funds for the new building.

RUSSIAN MEDICAL LITERATURE

The Director presented a resume of the production of Russian medical literature and medical bibliography, and of the National Library of Medicine's efforts in this area. He displayed a book-truck full of samples of the monographs and serial literature to which he referred.

Russian production. It is estimated that the Library is, and has been, receiving about 75% of current Russian medical publications of a substantial nature. The Meditzinsk'i Referativnyi Zhurnal, its predecessors, and its analogs in other subject fields were shown and explained.

Western bibliographical tools. The following Western publications were displayed and briefly characterized:

- Excerpta Medica
- Abstracts of Soviet Medicine (Part A and Part B)
- Monthly Index of Russian Accessions (Library of Congress)
- East European Accessions Index (Library of Congress)
- Express Contents of Soviet Journals
- Current List of Medical Literature
- Sample issues of Russian journals being translated in their entirety by Consultants Bureau and Pergamon Institute, under subsidy by the National Institutes of Health Russian Translation Program

Guide to Russian Medical Literature. The Director announced that the Library would soon publish a Guide to Russian Medical Literature, edited by Mr. Scott Adams of the National Institutes of Health, and by himself.

At this point there was a luncheon recess which extended from 11:35 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

BUILDING PROGRAM

Present at the afternoon session were Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Kilham, and Mr. Beder, representing O'Connor and Kilham, Architects, and their consulting engineer, Mr. Mongitore. Mr. Keyes attended as a representative of the Public Buildings Service. Mr. Grim of the Library staff was present also.

The DIRECTOR reviewed events of the building program since the last meeting of the Board on December 9, 1957.

Diagrammatic plans, reviewed by the Board on December 9, 1957 were submitted to Public Buildings Service on December 30, 1957.

Public Buildings Service approved the plans on January 30, 1958. The Bureau of the Budget objected to the diagrammatic plans on the basis that whereas the Bureau had approved a building of 230,000 square feet, the plans as submitted called for 235,031 square feet. The Bureau finally agreed to a compromise allocation of 232,200 square feet.

The Bureau of the Budget's decision was communicated to the architects on March 17. The decrease in the number of square feet was eventually met by transferring mechanical equipment space on the mezzanine to Floor C, and squaring up the remaining reduced mezzanine area; and by reducing the long dimension of the module from 21'4" to 21'1" (made possible in part by reduction of the long dimension of the supporting columns from 36" to 34").

Current drawings (May 9) of the building, posted on the wall of the meeting room, reflected the changes to date. Chiefly to be noted, in addition to the above, are the improved arrangements for the administrative area, including the Board Room, on the mezzanine, and the improved front lobby and History of Medicine entrance arrangement.

A drawing displaying slight changes in the exact siting arrangement was also shown. Provisions are made against the possible eventuality of a major superhighway being routed down the Wisconsin Avenue corridor.

CHAIRMAN: What is involved in moving the machinery to the basement?

MR. O'CONNOR: I don't believe it will make a great deal of difference. We lose some space in bringing large ducts up through the building, but there is no question but that the system will work entirely properly where it is now located.

At this point the Board moved across the hall where various models of the building were on display, including the building's location on the site, models of Floor B, the main floor, and the mezzanine, with major partitions, furniture, and equipment in place. Models of the proposed window treatment and a model of the hyperbolic paraboloid roof form were on display. Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. KILHAM explained the main features.

Discussion between the CHAIRMAN, Mr. O'CONNOR, and Mr. KEYES established that if the present schedule is adhered to, ground could be broken on April 1, 1959. The CHAIRMAN emphasized that if the architects could move ahead of the schedule they "would have the gratitude of a bunch of anxious Regents."

Roof design.

Dr. DE BAKEY: That is very effective. It has grown on me since seeing the first drawings. It has to be seen. It is quite good. Certainly it has symmetry and harmony.

CHAIRMAN: I rather like it. That tremendous expanse of building needs something like that.

At this point the group reassembled in the Conference Room and discussion was resumed.

Dr. BURNBY: Do you have any major alternates if the bids come in high?

Mr. O'CONNOR: There is a cushion of some proportions in the number of stacks. Alternates may be given for the exterior facing material. Estimates will be submitted along with the tentatives on June 27.

Mr. KEYES: I want to get the feeling of the group on that roof. Our stand at Public Buildings Service is to take a dim view on that roof right now.

DIRECTOR: Earlier this week I had a phone call from Mr. Wetherill of PBS on the roof question. He said that Mr. Hunter of PBS did not like the roof, from the standpoint of its aesthetic appearance; they believed that the type of construction necessitated by the large span was unwarranted, and they were afraid that the Bureau of the Budget might raise objections on the cost of the roof. I told him that the Bureau of the Budget had already received the consultant's memorandum on the cost of the roof, as submitted by the architects, and that the Bureau was satisfied on this score.

CHAIRMAN: Let's get an expression on two items -- on exterior facing, and on the roof.

Dr. VOLWILER: I like the appearance of limestone. It would be my first choice.

Dr. BIBBY: Alabama or Indiana limestone, if we can afford it.

CHAIRMAN: (following discussion): It has been moved and seconded that we recommend that bids be received with treatment of the exterior walls in two materials; limestone, which is our preference, and brick. (The motion was passed unanimously.) Would you wish to express opinions about the roof?

Dr. CURRAN: Does the model represent your final judgment on exterior angles and slant?

Mr. O'CONNOR: We will study it further. Originally the hyperbolic paraboloid roof came about partly from structural and partly from protective angles, but the protective factor was discarded by the Bureau of the Budget. In the various studies we have made we still feel, in our office, that this character of roof does something for the building, quite aside from the protective advantages.

DIRECTOR: Would you like to comment on the 63-foot span?

Mr. O'CONNOR: It is not an excessive span.

CHAIRMAN (after discussion and show of hands): The opinion regarding this roof is all but unanimous; the great majority favor this treatment. Mr. O'Connor and Mr. Kilham, we are grateful for the progress you have made. Any other questions?

DIRECTOR: Where should the name of the Library go? Should it be considered as part of the design? (Discussion was inconclusive.)

CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, gentlemen, for coming.

At this point Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Kilham, Mr. Beder, Mr. Mongitore, Mr. Keyes, and Mr. Grim departed.

Dr. MUMFORD: I am not opposed to that roof treatment; I abstained from voting because I don't ...

CHAIRMAN: Thanks for making it unanimous. We will move on now.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Items discussed:

Publication of 1957 annual Catalog
Volume 3 of Bibliography of Medical Reviews, in press
Bibliography on Psychopharmacology, in galley proof
Bibliography on Space Medicine, to be completed in June

Russian-English medical dictionary, compiled by Mr. Jablonski of the NLM staff, to be published by Academic Press this summer.
Guide to Russian Medical Literature
Appearance of Library Quarterly article
Appearance of article on NLM in Abbott's What's New, with sketches by Frederick Franck
Interlibrary loans

Interlibrary loan program. A tabulation of 15,545 consecutive requests, broken down by time of publication of article requested, language, whether or not indexed in Current List, and number of requests per journal title, was displayed and discussed. There were only 26 journal titles for which more than 50 requests were received during the survey period; 13 of these were domestic, 5 were British, and 8 were in languages other than English. This argues a broadening of the base of the requests, which is one result that was hoped for in going over to the new program. A total of 2,589 journal titles were requested during the survey period; of these there were 899 titles from which only a single article was requested during the period. About 30% of requests are for material printed before 1940. The ratio of foreign articles to domestic articles is 3 to 1. The number of requests filled by sending the original item is now one-third of the former figure, and the percentage of requests unfilled because the work is already on loan has dropped to one-quarter of the former figure. The annual rate of filling requests seems to be leveling off at about 75,000. On the whole, this survey is encouraging; with only a few qualifications, it is fair to state that the new interlibrary loan program is a success.

The cost of interlibrary loans, for the photographic process only, is \$1.01 per order. Of this, 43% represents personnel costs, 24% represents equipment, 24% represents supplies, and 9% represents postage. Several surveys of the other costs involved -- identifying and searching requests, shelving and reshelving, transportation to and from photographic laboratory, etc.-- vary from an average of 85 cents to \$1.35 per order. If it is assumed to be one dollar, then the total cost of the average interlibrary loan order is \$2.00. At a rate of 75,000 requests per year, this is a direct expenditure for interlibrary loans of \$150,000, or 10% of the Library's budget.

DEATH OF COLONEL JONES

The DIRECTOR reported the death of Colonel Harold Wellington Jones, Director of the Army Medical Library from 1936 to 1945, on April 5. An obituary appears in the May issue of the National Library of Medicine NEWS. The Board noted with sadness the passing of Colonel Jones, remembering his great service to the Library. The Board asked the Secretary to write to Senator Hill, suggesting that he might wish to insert an appropriate notice in the Congressional Record. /This has been done; see issue of May 19./

NEXT MEETING

There was a discussion on whether to hold the next meeting of the Board of Regents on June 30, or wait until fall. After some debate it was decided that a meeting in June was not necessary; in the absence of the Chairman, and following the expiration of his term in August, the Vice Chairman would carry on the business of the Board. New appointments to the Board are imminent, and membership should be back to full strength by fall.

It was felt that the best time for a Board meeting would probably be during the early part of November /tentative date: Friday, November 7/. If circumstances require, the Chairman may call an extra meeting earlier.

Before adjourning (at 2:30 p.m.), the Board expressed its warm appreciation to the Chairman, Dr. RAVDIN, for his leadership and for his many efforts on behalf of the Library during the past several years.

Respectfully submitted,



FRANK B. ROGERS, Secretary
Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine