# The LLMC-Digital Newsletter

Issue 35 JULY 8, 2009

**Contents:**



**Annual LLMC Members Meeting**

As most readers know, LLMC is owned and run by a fixed group of Charter Members, comprised of the 246 intrepid and far-sighted libraries that launched the digital project over five years ago when they became the found-ing subscribers to *LLMC-Digital*.[1]

The Consortium functions as follows. Day-to-day operations of the project are conducted by paid full-time staff, who are supervised by a part-time volunteer Board of Directors elected by the Charter Members. The Directors in turn seek advice as needed, particularly when unexpected issues arise between the annual meetings, from an eighteen-member Advisory Council, also elected by the Charter Members. The Members meet once a year, always in conjunction with the annual convention of AALL. At these annual meetings the Members select colleagues to fill vacant seats on the two governing bodies, receive reports from the LLMC staff on the project's progress, provide their input on issues major and minor, and decide any policy questions submitted by the Board of Directors. All Charter Member libraries are invited to have a representative in attendance. Voting entitlement packets will be available for pickup at the door by representatives of the Charter Member libraries. Although voting privileges on balloted points are reserved to *LLMC-Digital* Charter Members, other subscribers and any interested law librarian colleagues are most welcome to attend the meeting and provide input into the discussions.

The 33rd annual LLMC Members Meeting will be held during the AALL convention being held this year in Washington, D.C., from **5:30-6:30PM, on Monday, July 27, 2009,** in Washington Convention Center **Room 143A**.

As always, the main official business of our annual meeting will be to elect Directors and Councilors to fill open slots on our governing bodies: our Board of Directors and Advisory Council. The list of current incumbents in both bodies appears below. The final year of each person's term is listed after the name.[2]

The terms of two current directors expire this year: Bruce Johnson and Betsy McKenzie. Our

[1] New readers can view the list of Charter Members by going to www.llmc.com and clicking successively on the tabs "About LLMC" & "Charter Community." They will see that our membership includes all kinds of libraries, although it is decidedly weighted toward the academic side, including 90% of all U.S. law school libraries and 80% of the Canadian. This list also provides the voting entitlements for each Charter Member.

[2] Current LLMC governing structure:

**Board of Directors:**
Richard Amelung *Asso.Dir., St. Louis U.L.L. (10)*
Jonathan Franklin *Asso. Libn. U.Wash. L.L. (12)*
Barbara Garavaglia *Hd. Ref., U.Mich L.L. (12)*
Stuart Ho *Honolulu Atty. (represents U. Hawaii)*
Bruce Johnson *Dir., Ohio St. U.L.L. (09)*
Elizabeth McKenzie *Dir., Suffolk U.L.L. (09)*
Marian Parker, *Dir., Wake Forest U.L.L. (11)*
Kathleen Richman, *LLMC Exec. Dir. (ex officio)*
Regina Smith, *Dir., Jenkins Memorial L.L. (11)*
Julia Wentz *Dir., Loyola Chicago L.L. (10)*

**Advisory Council:**
Glen-Peter Ahlers *Dir., Barry U.L.L. (09)*
John Barden, *Dir., Maine St. Law & L.R. L. (11)*
Herb Cihak, *Dir., U.Ark.-Fayetteville.L.L .(09)*
Joel Fishman, *Libn., Duquesne U.L.L. (10)*
Joe Hinger *Dir. TechServ., St. John's U.L.L. (09)*
Darin Fox *Dir., U.Oklahoma L.L. (11)*
Judith Gaskell *Dir., U.S.Sup.Ct.L. (11)*
Yolande Goldberg, *Sen,Cat.Policy Spec., LC (10)*
Marcia Koslov *Dir., Los Angeles Cnty. L.L. (10)*
Margaret Leary *Dir., U.Mich. L.L. (10)*
Ann Morrison *Dir., Dalhousie U.L.L. (09)*
Marie Newman *Dir., Pace U.L.L. (11)*
Lee Peoples *Asso. Dir., Oklahoma City U.L.L. (09)*
Jeanne Price, *Asso. Dir., U.Texas L.L. (10)*
Ann Rae *Dir. (Ret.), U.Toronto L.L. (10)*
Carol Roehrenbeck *Dir., Rutgers-N. U.L.L. (11)*
Jules Winterton *Dir., IALL Lib., UK (09)*
Judith Wright *Dir., U.Chicago L.L. (11)*

first order of business will be to elect replacements. Following tradition and to ensure the availability of candidates able and willing to serve, the incumbent Board has recruited and will nominate candidates for all open positions. Nominations from the floor for these positions are in order, but nominators should be prepared to assure the Chair that their nominees are both able and willing to serve. The Board nominees for the two four-year slots being vacated by Bruce Johnson and Betsy McKenzie are: **Joe Hinger,** Asso. Dir. for Tech Services at St. John's University Law Library and **Judith Wright,** Dir. of the Univ. of Chicago Law Library.[3]

This year, for the first time, the Board is also experimenting with nominating a slate for the Advisory Council. The goal is, both to recruit people willing and able to serve, and also to include colleagues who have strongly supported the work of LLMC, but can't always attend the annual AALL meetings. This year there will be six open slots due to the completion of their terms by our colleagues Glen-Peter Ahlers, Herb Cihak, Joe Hinger, Ann Morrison, Lee Peoples and Jules Winterton. There may also be a vacancy for a partial term if nominee Judith Wright is elected to the Board of Directors. Board nominees for the six open positions are: **Steve Anderson,** Dir., Maryland St. Lib.; **Dragomir Cosanici,** Vice-Chan. for Info. Serv. & Lib. Dir. at L.S.U.; **Janis Johnston,** Dir., U. Ill. Law Lib.; **Ralph Monaco,** Hd. Libn., New York Law Institute Lib.; **Scott Pagel,** Dir., George Wash. U. Law Lib.; and **Richard Tuske,** Hd. Libn., Asso. of the Bar of the City of N.Y. Library. In the event of Judith Wright's seat becoming vacant, the Board will nominate outgoing Councilor **Glen-Peter Ahlers** to serve out her term. As with the other elections, nominations from the floor are in order and nominators are requested to make sure that their nominees are willing and able to serve.

**By-Laws Revision**

As mentioned in the last newsletter, LLMC's corporate By-Laws are seriously out of date. They were drawn up in 1976 when the prognosis for how LLMC would grow and evolve was pretty vague and, even in the short run, well off the mark. While this was a minor concern as we pleasantly drifted through the fiche years, it has become more problematic as we have grown into, and taken on much larger contractual responsibilities, in our digital era. It soon became clear to the Board that a major revision of the By-Laws was timely and necessary. Therefore, three years ago two then-neophyte Directors, Bruce Johnson and Carol Roehrenbeck were dragooned into the tedious and thankless task of developing a total revision. The result of their work and many write-up sessions by the full Board is now ready for review by the Members. Attached to this newsletter as supplements are two documents: One, the final[4] draft as revised by the Committee in response to changes made to by the Board in its mid-Winter meeting. Two, a document prepared by Revision Committee Chair Bruce Johnson that seeks to explain where changes have been made in the current By-Laws or where new clauses were inserted to cover lacunae in the original document.[5]

---

[3] In a late-breaking development it transpires that a third current Director, Marian Parker, will be resigning this month due to having been appointed to an AALL position in which her new responsibilities might risk a conflict of interest were she to continue as a director of LLMC. The LLMC Board has not yet had time to process this development, but members can assume that by the time of our meeting on July 27th the Board will have recruited a nominee to fill out Marian's term. That person's name will be brought forward as the Board's nominee at the meeting and, as usual, nominations from the floor will also be in order.

[4] Is anything ever final? As a matter of fact, there are a few small housekeeping changes that probably will be made to this document by the Board of Directors at their pre-AALL meeting on July 24th. These small changes, if they occur, will be incorporated into the "really final" version that will be distributed to the Members before the projected August ballot.

[5] Some will notice that we are not attaching a copy of the current By-Laws. The LLMC Board thought that little purpose would be served, and much confusion would result, from publication of that document, since it differs so fundamentally from both our current and any proposed new practice. The Directors suggest that it would be more pro-ductive if everybody just approached this task as if we were developing the rules *de novo.*

The current plan is that a short amount of time will be set aside at our meeting on July 27th for any who wish to address the revision in general terms. There obviously won't be time to discuss and work on detailed amendments. Then, in August/September as convenient, the final-final version of the proposed By-Laws will be distributed to all members via this newsletter, while paper ballots will be mailed to the directors of record of all LLMC subscribers. Balloting will be conducted under the current system of weighted voting and limited to the representatives of the Charter Members of *LLMC-Digital*. [6]

**Cataloging Session Laws & A.G. Rpts.**

As most readers know, LLMC is devoting a major portion of its scanning capacity during the near future to scanning the full historical run of the U.S. state session laws and state attorney general reports. This is a complic-cated endeavor involving an intricate ballet of materials acquisition and production schedul-ing. It's obviously not all going to get done in one year. However, this results in unique cataloging problems requiring an interim strategy. Here is how our Lead Cataloger, Richard Amelung of St. Louis Univ., describes both the problem and a proposed solution:

*"There is a story to be told concerning the bibliographic records associated with the col-lection of session laws that appears in LLMC-Digital. As many of you know, the Library of Congress decided in 1988 that, due to the numerous changes and recurring fluctuations in U.S. state session law titles, these works would be cataloged on a single serial record, one for each state. On that record, the cata-loger would record all the changes that the title underwent over time.*

*Now comes the LLMC dilemma. In many cases we have received scattered runs of ses-sion law volumes from all fifty states. At-tempting to catalog spotty holdings has, as you can imagine, represented a rather formidable challenge. The older cataloging records in OCLC reflect uneven and, in some cases, contradictory information regarding whether or not a particular title changed and when. Going forward, certainly LLMC-Digital will eventually have complete runs for all state session law sets. However, the completion date for this project may still be some two years in the future. Unfortunately, based on the structure of the whole LLMC-Digital system, digital images for a particular title do not go up on the website without the availability of the cataloging record representing that title. Thus, if we followed normal procedures much of this material could stand unusable for years.*

*As a consequence, from the descriptive point of view, what we have decided to do is to "give it our best shot" for the time being. In other words, Saint Louis University Law Li-brary will attempt to assemble its best esti-mate of what the session law title run looks like based on three sources and in this order: 1) the images that LLMC currently has at its disposition, 2) the print collection held at Saint Louis University, and 3) information gleaned from the bibliographic records pre-sent in OCLC. The caveat that we would like to make at this point is that these particular bibliographic records, viewed today, should not be considered the final statement for this category of titles. As the session law scanning project reaches completion, we will go back,*

[6] Most of our members are busy people with lives of their own. So we can't expect every reader of this newsletter to pick over every paragraph of the attached draft of the By-Laws revision. As a likely time-saver let us point out that the bulk of the text in the proposed document can fairly be described as "probably non-controversial, housekeeping ma-terial". In fact, judging by the tenor of the various Board meetings at which this document was dis-cussed while it evolved, the only portion that quite possibly will attract controversy is the proposed change in membership covered in Section II, Art 1. Recognizing that fact, the Board intends to bundle the membership issue separately when the balloting is conducted. That way folks will be able to vote on the bundle of housekeeping clauses as one issue, while giving separate consideration to the more disputatious question. Of course, it is possible that the Board is overlooking some other potentially controversial issue. That is one reason for having a short discussion period at the Annual Meeting. If there are other issues that people think should be voted on separately, flagging them at the Annual Meeting will give the Board time to con-sider isolating them out also for separate consider-ation in the balloting.

*review the titles session by session and make such alteration to the bibliographic records as necessary. To many, having something in the catalog that will link back to these materials may suffice. To the purists, knowing that a more complete record will eventually be available may cause them to annotate their 2012 calendars to check back.*

*With minor differences, the same general problem outlined above for the state session laws also applies to the parallel project in which LLMC is engaged, scanning a full back-file of the attorney generals' reports. Patrons should know that we will make a similar pass through the cataloging for the AG opinions and reports as those sets are scanned, while doing a final cleanup of the records as needed upon completion of that project.*

**Institution-wide Coverage for Subscribers**

Within the past two weeks we have fielded questions from colleagues at two academic libraries questioning whether they could offer *LLMC-Digital* to other libraries on their campuses. This alerts us to the fact that library staffs are always changing; old friends move on and new colleagues come in. We can't expect that the institutional memory will glide through the transition with all synapses intact. So some things merit repetition, especially those features which rank among our signature offerings.

Therefore, just for the record and to ensure that nobody is overlooking this significant benefit, let us stress that all academic law libraries subscribing to *LLMC-Digital* thereby acquire the right to share the database with every current member of their parent college or university community - students, faculty and staff - both in the other campus libraries and also remotely in their offices and homes. In practical terms, the way in which this is accomplished is that the subscribing library provides LLMC with the campus-wide IPs that facilitate campus wide access. If you have any questions on how to implement this program, please contact our Business Manager, Debbie Bagwell, at llmc@llmc.com. She will walk you through the process with minimal effort on your part. Its really easy, and we urge all eligible subscribers to make sure that all members of their community are receiving this benefit.

**Progress in our Google Partnership**

As reported previously, during early 2009 roughly forty-nine thousand volumes of New York records and briefs were shipped from our two donor libraries in Manhattan to Mountain View, CA, for scanning. At this point some six thousand volumes have been scanned. The biggest problem that has been unearthed in Mountain View by the New York scanning to date has been the question of foldouts. Since this is a problem that will recur in the records and briefs of other states, Google has decided that it is well worth the engineering effort and delay to solve the problem once and for all. Therefore, the New York scanning has been limited to volumes not containing foldouts, while volumes with foldouts are temporarily set aside. In addition, Google would like to hold off the start of scanning for any other state until this foldout problem, one that is more or less common to all the other states, gets solved.

In the interim Google would like get some non-records-and-briefs legal literature under its belt and has targeted federal and state legislative journals. We expect to start this project with the *Congressional Record* and then move into the journals for the separate states. A source of good paper for the *Congressional Record,* and its three predecessor series has been identified and this project is likely to start by the end of summer. With luck the *Congressional Record* and its predecessor series could be available on *LLMC-Digital* early in 2010.

---

**Note:**
**This issue of the Newsletter has two attachments.**