

AD 644337

U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory  
Dahlgren, Virginia

NWL MAL-1

Microfiche Usage in the  
Technical Library at Naval Weapons Laboratory

By  
CATHRYN C. LYON  
Head, Technical Library  
Division

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION		
Hardcopy	Microfiche	
\$3.00	\$.65	10 pp. ad
1 ARCHIVE COPY		

D D C  
RECEIVED  
JAN 4 1967  
RESOURCES

DOCUMENT RELEASE STATUS  
BUREAU FORM 3000/3 (REV 11-65)

CLASSIFICATION

**CLASSIFIED**

UNCLASSIFIED WHEN ENCLOSURE IS REMOVED

SERIAL NUMBER (When required)/DATE

AD NUMBER (To be inserted by DDC)

ORIGINATING AGENCY

Naval Weapons Laboratory

ENCLOSURE (Report title)

MICROFICHE USAGE IN THE TECHNICAL LIBRARY AT THE NAVAL WEAPONS LABORATORY

REPORT SERIES AND NUMBER

MAL-1

REPORT DATE

1 December 1965

COG. BUREAU CODE (For use in BUREPS only)

CONTRACT/PROJECT/WEPTASK NUMBER

TO Administrator  
Defense Documentation Center for Scientific and Technical Information (DDC)  
Bldg #5, Cameron Station  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

	UNCLAS	CONFI	SECR
REPORT	X		
TITLE OR SUBJECT	X		
ABSTRACT OR SUMMARY	X		

Enclosure is forwarded for distribution subject to limitations checked below. Request AD number be inserted in space above; two copies of this letter be returned to originating activity if shown below; two copies be sent to Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons, and one copy be retained by DDC.

- 1. Distribution of this document is unlimited.
- 2. For official use only. (DOD Directive 5200.6)
- 3. This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with the prior approval of
- 4. Each transmittal of this document outside the agency of the U. S. Government must have prior approval of
- 5. Each transmittal of this document outside the Department of Defense must have prior approval of
- 6. This document may be further distributed by the holder only with specific prior approval of

IN ADDITION TO SECURITY REQUIREMENTS WHICH APPLY TO THIS DOCUMENT AND MUST BE MET -

Technical Library  
U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory  
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448

SIGNATURE

*Cathryn C. Lyon*  
CATHRYN C. LYON

TITLE

Librarian

CODE

DATE

CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons (DLI-302)  
Navy Department  
Washington, D. C. 20380

UNCLASSIFIED WHEN ENCLOSURE IS REMOVED

U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory  
Dahlgren, Virginia

NWL MAL-1

Microfiche Usage in the  
Technical Library at Naval Weapons Laboratory

By  
CATHRYN C. LYON  
Head, Technical Library  
Division

1 December 1966

This report is not to be construed as expressing the opinion of the U  
Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren.

In 1964, the Technical Library made plans for moving into newer, more spacious quarters. While making these plans, it was obvious to the Librarian that in two years the accumulation of documents, books, and periodicals would again be a storage problem.

The Librarian and the Library Advisory Committee asked the Management Engineering Staff to assist them in a study of the use of microfiche for the library. I'm assuming the reader is familiar with the size and format of microfiche sheets and will not elaborate on them. The study that we requested was conducted and included visits to the only users of microfiche in the Washington area at the time. They were NASA, AEC at Germantown, and a future user, DDC. The Library Advisory Committee in preliminary discussions had stressed the need for making the use of microfiche completely convenient and comfortable for the user. The study was intended to help us learn how microfiche was produced, reproduced, and used. An interesting thing became glaringly obvious--none of these agencies were equipped with enough readers to make the use of microfiche convenient. In fact, at the time one agency had only a large reader-printer in the library which appeared to be used solely for reproducing hard copies--not for reading purposes. We were convinced that the Advisory Committee was correct and recom-

mended in our report to Laboratory Management that we would need ten (10) portable readers for the laboratory as a start. We have since purchased the following and recommend this equipment as satisfactory: (or equivalent equipment)

1.	10 Dukane Portable Readers	@152.20	\$1522.00
2.	14 Doc. Inc. Portable Readers	@159.50	2228.00
3.	1 Filmac 400 Microfilm and Microfiche Reader-Printer in Main Library.		1073.10
	Microfiche Attachment		215.00
4.	Microfiche Copying Equipment (Kalvar) Printer Developer		596.00 300.00
5.	Filing Cabinet for 4x6 Microfiche (GSA)		91.50
6.	Filing Envelopes (for holding Micro- fiche in cabinet) (Microcard Editions, Inc.)	@6.00 per M	60.00
	TOTAL		<u>\$6323.50</u>

Because of the resistance of research people to using microfilm, we felt that we should conduct several sessions in which we explained the need for using microfiche, and the advantages. As we placed each of the first portable readers, we itemized the following and answered questions:

NEEDS

1. To increase storage capacity in the library without adding space.
2. To eliminate myriad filing cabinets of hard copies in

storage in various individuals offices.

3. NWL is geographically remote from information centers and it is necessary to maintain an extensive working collection for prompt availability. This can only be done if storage capacity is sufficient.

USES AND ADVANTAGES

1. Duplicates are made of master microfiche and are circulated without being charged to the individual. They are expendable. This is true for the unclassified. The Confidential and Secret have to be accounted for.

2. When several requests come to the library for the same document, copies can be sent immediately of microfiche to all requestors, thereby allowing him to receive the document immediately and not have to wait his turn to see a hard copy.

3. One thousand (1000) microfiche will fit in a filing drawer on a man's desk as compared with a 2½' by 1½' filing cabinet.

4. Can reduce bound journal back files when these are finally available on microfiche thereby allowing storage for a greater collection of journal literature.

5. Ratio of shelving in library to microfiche drawer space is 140:1.

The education process to promote usage of microfiche is a continuing one. Acceptance has been very good by the NWL staff. However, when there are problems, it is because the microfiche copy is poor. Agencies who produce these need to staff their operations for accuracy in copying that will reproduce good tables, graphs, and diagrams, as well as text. If some mathematical notations are obscured, it can change the whole problem. These poor microfiche create our only user problem.

Originally, we had planned to purchase portable reader-printers when they were available. However, it seems to satisfy the users needs to have a handy reader and the knowledge that a reader printer is available when needed. It seems that discretion is the better part in this case and encouraging copying will create again the hard copy storage problem in individual offices.

Certain costs savings can be documented while an estimation of the value to the borrower of prompt access to reports can only be assumed. We have thirteen thousand (13,000) microfiche documents in one filing cabinet. All of the document distribution from NASA comes on microfiche and all of DDC and AEC reports are requested to be on microfiche. Roughly about \*50 filing cabinets in offices can be discarded making the following savings:

I. 13,000 documents would require 18 sections of shelving		\$ 3034.00
Floor cost if 18 new sections of shelving had to be placed @25 per ft.		3375.00
Floor space saved by eliminat- ing *50 filing cabinets 2½'x1½' @25 sq. ft.		4487.50
TOTAL SAVINGS TO DATE WITH MICROFICHE		<u>\$10856.00</u>
II. Cost of filing cabinet		91.50
Cost of floor space for cabinet @25.00		89.75
Other equipment (minus cabinet)		6232.00
TOTAL COST OF MICROFICHE		<u>\$ 6413.25</u>
Savings		\$10856.50
Costs for equipment, etc		6413.25
TOTAL		<u>\$ 4443.25</u>

These figures indicate that we are about four thousand dollars (\$4000.00) ahead by having installed the use of microfiche. They are the obvious. The value of having enough information available and room for it when it is needed for a research problem is hard to estimate. But in emergencies like the present conflict a delay in obtaining reports or manuals can mean the delay of effective support to the war effort. Who can evaluate the cost?



UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R &amp; D

*(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is class)*

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
Naval Weapons Laboratory		UNCLASSIFIED	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE			
MICROFICHE USAGE IN THE TECHNICAL LIBRARY AT THE NAVAL WEAPONS LABORATORY			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and, inclusive dates)			
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)			
Lyon, Cathryn C.			
6. REPORT DATE		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
1 December 1966		5	
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
b. PROJECT NO.		NAL-1	
c.		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be this report)	
d.			
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT			
Distribution of this document is unlimited.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY	
13. ABSTRACT			
This is a report of two years experience of using microfiche and microfilm equipment in the Naval Weapons Laboratory Technical Library.			