

**FDLP Regional Librarians Meeting**  
**Arlington VA**  
**October 19, 2010**  
**2:00-3:30 PM; 4:00-5:30 PM**

I. Approval of minutes of April 27 regional librarians meeting

Approved

II. Selection of new REGIL members

Dan Barkley and Stephanie Braunstein going off of REGIL. The new members of REGIL are Arlene Weibel and Hallie Pritchett

III. Round-robin—brief communication of news and conditions in attendees' regional depositories (30 min.)

- Oklahoma--two regionals. Steve has been very active with outreach, teaching 18 seminars. Had statewide annual meeting selective in December . Steve is busy planning a 120th anniversary celebration.
- Michigan—Sadly, Michigan just had its 150th anniversary celebration. GODORT of Michigan sponsored and produced a book in the format of a timeline. Contact Anne Marie for details.
- Montana—busy with retro cataloging and digitizing Native American materials.
- Virginia—100th Anniversary. Digitizing WWI materials. Chesapeake PL dropped status. Only one PL remains.
- Kansas—will be working on state plan, urging use of congressional hearings. Proud of Johnson County Public Library
- Georgia—head of processing retired, inherited unit. Working on inventory project. 1st draft of state plan. New space for maps and government information. New service models
- Oregon—retirements of library directors, new evaluations of stuff, what's this regional agreement about? A little nervous. Notes that Washington state in bad shape. What to do when regional does not have support
- Iowa—retro conversion, cataloging State department, EPA, Agriculture. Iowa State going electronic. Absorbed half of materials, justice and judiciary, 13 libraries going mainly electronic, all have agreed to remain in program.
- Florida—cataloging 300,000 docs in storage, working on procedures that will be posted online. 18% required original cataloging. Strange collection in storage. Center of Excellence for Panama. Working on state “action” plan.

- Missouri—selectives getting rid of long runs of serials, discarding 5 sets of Congressional Record. Resigned to doing my best. Things on one record such as USGS. 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary
- Hawaii—six years since flood. Moved back into old basement, new drainage measures. Haven't inventoried, property stamped
- Texas—holding breath, legislature meets in January, anticipate budget cuts . The depository has the support of library director. Update state plan. Renovating building
- Arizona—Arizona—6 state conference. Talked every other week. Reached all types of libraries, including one rural library that expressed interest in getting depository status. Updating GI 21 site. Working on state plan.
- Tennessee—has met with and trained 5 new documents librarians. Revising state plan, planning annual meeting. Storage a problem. Promised the old navy hospital as a storage facility.
- Ohio—New state librarian, supportive. New directors in selectives, lots of training, heavily weeding and going electronic. New state plan.
- Delaware, DC—Cataloging expert retired. Staffing problems at university, strategic plan will involve looking at FDLP status.
- West Virginia—Inventory, recataloging hearings from LC into Y4. C
- New Mexico—database, staff cuts, head of cataloging supportive of government documents. Sandia and Los Alamos electronic depository, nuclear waste material repository, WIPP Carlsbad, right-to-know site.
- Kentucky—ASERL Center of Excellence for WPA
- South Carolina—ASERL Center of Excellence for education. Cataloging ed stuff. Busy with ASERL. In a holding pattern while that settles out.. Renovation of exterior. Huge personnel changes. Head of systems, music, business, 4 reference....and more. Huge personnel changes.
- New Jersey—NJPL budget of cut 20,000,000 Furlowed 2 out 5 days per week from now to the end of the year.
- Wisconsin—superseded items removed. Working with cataloging. “
- Mississippi—PAA process winding down. Public services reorganization. Changing role of government info. Already combined service. Close documents service point and move to reference. Will be reporting to the head of TS. No desk duty. Reducing staff on desk. Tiered reference desk. Evening, weekend. Devising a training agenda. Planning how this is going to work. Move microforms and equipment.
- Arkansas—Moved into new building. Lost 2500 sq ft. Budget okay. PAA by GPO. Working on state plan.
- Louisiana—major budget issues. 2 selective librarians, not being replaced, training staff. LSU—Center of Excellence for corps of engineers. Major cuts next year.

- Minnesota, South Dakota—consolidating collections. Cataloging collections being dispersed.
- Alabama—expert on planning and executing moves in very little time. No state plan, not working on one. Part of ASERL. Auburn University Montgomery is the other regional - Lucy Farrow is Dean and is continuing to act as Documents Coordinator.
- California—new state librarian, Stacy Aldritch, changing culture. Exciting plan. Moved collection for renovations. In warehouse 7 miles away. 18 months later, renovations have not begun. Good shuttle service. Lost 2 selectives.

IV. Brief introduction to the sustainable models project (Ithaka S+R) as it relates to regional depositories (Roger Schonfeld and Ross Housewright, 10 min.)

Roger and Ross presented an overview of work that ITHAKA S+R will be doing under contract with GPO.

Conducting survey and report for GPO, component of FDLP strategic plan to develop sustainable models for FDLP in digital age. One of the chief questions is “How can libraries work together as a network to work in the digital environment?” Four major steps in the project: 1) environmental scan, what’s going on, what are the important issues. Catalog of how libraries work with each other. 2) Describe existing networks, models we can learn from. 3) Development of set of new models for FDLP how this system might be configured to function efficiently while maintaining its core mission and values. That’s off the table. 4) Final report with recommendation for model or models.

They are doing the project in transparent manner. They plan to set up a website to inform broader audience and to gather feedback to make sure that all issues are covered. They will be posting descriptions of questions, sets of things they are looking for. So far they have received good suggestions. They would like more feedback, especially during the environmental scan. Need to draw on this community of experts, especially for missing or misinterpreted information. When ITHAKA posts the environmental scan, really need feedback. Also need feedback from external stakeholders. Attendees were asked to look at the website and communicate with selectives. It was noted that there are a whole set of voices that don’t come out very often in this community. It can be challenging to gather feedback from public libraries and small community colleges. Timeline: report by spring DLC.

Questions from the audience: will they be talking about non-depositories; where do people turn for government information; how can we make the program more effective; and how can we bring in issues that the program does not address?

- V. Regional depository strategic plan (Jennie Burroughs and committee members, 30 min.)

## DRAFT

### Regional Depositories Strategic Plan

#### Regional Depositories in 2025

What might a regional depository look like in 2025? Technological, societal, and library-specific trends point to some significant changes in information access and much work is underway to take advantage of those changes. Some access will be very different. Some principles—public access to information, content preservation, expertise with government structures, publication patterns, and products—will remain the same. No two Regionals will be the same, but here is an optimistic scenario.

#### Core assumptions

- Access to government information will be primarily digital—both new content and digitized, retrospective content. With regard to information responsibility, the line between government information that is “published” and not will fully blur.
- Tangible collections will be smaller at regionals due to coordinated collection retention. This ensures long-term access (assuming a long period is required for testing digital preservation models) and creates a more manageable preservation load. Full cataloging and a national inventory will make this possible.
- Regionals, and other depositories, will take part in a national strategy for collecting and organizing new content, and a distributed digital preservation model (using local hardware or trusted cloud computing options) will help to ensure long-term access.
- Regionals will offer content and technological expertise through such activities as personalized training, virtual reference (short and lengthy), research consultations, data manipulation training, tutorials, customizable guides and alerts.
- Due to a reduced number of long-term copies of print government publications (through weeding and loss), these primary source materials will increasingly resemble traditional special collections.

#### The User Experience in 2025

- Users will expect to easily access all government information online for free—this includes access to new content, (digitized) retrospective content, finished reports, customizable data products, any government record that is not classified (whether “published” or not). The information overload we already see will be ongoing.
- Users will find government information primarily through mainstream internet searching—retrieving items from agency sites, non-profit project servers, corporate servers, and library servers, but where material is not branded, they will not be aware of the creator of that digital access. In cases of load sharing, server crashes, and natural disasters, regional digital deposit servers (or cloud contracts) will provide seamless, long-term access to users.

- Patrons will primarily access government information through download to personal computers/mobile devices (including phones and tablet PCs) with mark-up capability. However, within 15 years this transition will not be complete, and there will still be patrons who use print for a number of reasons (readability, financial issues, broadband access issues, desire for a personal copy). Print on demand stations may fill some of the point-of-need requests for print, regional collections and interlibrary loan will fill other requests.
- Users will primarily want to find materials independently but want personal help when stuck. There will also be an ongoing desire for contextual information about subjects and information sources. Extensive marketing will indicate they can get expert help from depositories/regionals, and centers of excellence will play a unique role in user training and assistance in their respective areas of expertise.
- Unless they are in data management fields, users will not think about preservation issues—they will assume that's taken care of by libraries or by the government.

### **The Selective Depository Experience in 2025**

- Given the preference for personalized assistance at point of need, selective depositories will continue to provide assistance and training to local end-users of government information.
- Selective depositories will primarily rely on digital access to government information, retaining minimal print collections of strong local interest. Selectives will rely on regionals to carry the preservation flag and retain long-term tangible copies of materials. They may elect to participate in digital preservation activities as resources allow.
- Further disposition of tangible materials will not be mediated by regionals but may involve checking against a national needs list.
- Selective depositories can expect to call on regional depositories for content expertise, training and ongoing education, and coordination of regional activities.
- Selectives will likely work with a “local” consortium of regionals for assistance and materials.

### **Path to the Model**

Elements of the model may seem out of reach and some of the existing challenges to the model may feel insurmountable, but there are concrete steps that regional depositories can take to change and better serve users of government information. Many of the steps on the path will require coordination and collaboration between multiple libraries to make the change feasible. In some cases, it may be best for a library or consortium to take the lead on an objective for purposes of coordination.

The path to the model has a range of timelines. The best practices describe actions regional libraries will need to undertake in the very near term to improve current service and better position ourselves to meet the future. The current and projected actions describe work that will take longer to complete but describe activities that regionals must pursue to address larger-scale issues. Work on some of these objectives is underway, and other objectives describe work that will likely begin at a future date.

## **Best Practices for Regional Depository Services to Selective Depositories**

There has been and will continue to be variation in the ways regional depositories serve selective depository libraries, but there are minimum standards for regional service that can and should be followed at the present time in order to improve communication, build knowledge of collections in service areas, and increase content expertise in the region. These service standards, as described in Appendix A, lay the groundwork for future collaboration and evolution of service.

## **Current and Projected Actions**

Objective 1: Complete inventory of regional tangible collections with a central point for identification of available copies.

Strategies:

- Individual libraries are cataloging and copy cataloging materials, reflecting holdings via OCLC.
- Leverage GPO shelf list conversion to help identify extent of depository-distributed materials.
- Employ cooperative copy cataloging using methods akin to those suggested in the ASERL draft (center of excellence takes lead for identifying items and records for an agency) or Pre-76 Batch Project (libraries share batches of OCLC numbers for materials they have cataloged to speed identification).

Projected timeline: Complete by 2015

Objective 2: Develop complete digital access to retrospective collection and new materials.

Strategies:

- Identify scope of retrospective government information (what must be digitized)—possibly accomplished through conversion of data from regional inventories or Catalog of Government Publications.
- Identify at a granular level digitization that has been done (and is ongoing) by libraries, agencies, non-profit, and cooperate entities.
- Determine digitization gaps and identify responsibility for filling gaps (through recognizing ongoing agency efforts, using centers of excellence model, coordinated library efforts, and/or contract work).

Projected timeline: Complete by 2020

Objective 3: Develop an updated model for service to selective depositories given larger geographic areas, virtual tools, and varied resources.

Strategies:

- Expand use of FDLP Community website for improved collaboration and communication.
- Develop a regular schedule for virtual training (for end users and selective depositories) conducted by regionals with a distributed workload.
- Create an assessment for regional depository quality based on minimum standards.

Projected timeline: Complete by 2012

Objective 4: Improve awareness and use of regional depository services.

Strategies:

- Develop a unified assessment of the impact of regional services.
- Expand marketing and promotion efforts, in many cases making local use of GPO marketing materials.

Projected timeline: Complete by 2013

Objective 5: Initiate a movement to revise Title 44 of the U.S. Code to ease tangible retention rules and service boundaries.

Strategies:

- Draft recommended statute changes (a regional working group is pursuing this activity).

Projected timeline: Complete by 2014

Objective 6: Develop a robust digital infrastructure for long-term preservation of born-digital and converted content.

Strategies:

- Build on LOCKSS pilot for best practices.
- Determine partners, technology requirements, and workflows for digital deposit.
- Identify trusted cloud-computing options or hardware and software needs for locally hosted solutions.

Projected timeline: Complete by 2015

Objective 7: Develop a plan for coordinated (but distributed) collection retention and preservation.

Strategies:

- Build on models suggested by ASERL or the Kansas-Nebraska partnership.
- Identify regional groupings or other logical regional consortia.
- Determine centers of expertise and excellence (with regard to preservation commitments and service expertise).

Projected timeline: Complete by 2020

Objective 8: Implement a tested plan for long-term digital preservation.

Strategies:

- Stay apprised of the work of the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program and other pioneers in the area of digital preservation.
- Employ best practices as they are determined.

Projected timeline: Complete by 2025



## Appendix A

### Best Practices for Regional Depository Services to Selective Depositories

The following points are derived from Chapter 12 of the *FDL Handbook*  
<http://www.fdlp.gov/administration/handbook/127-chapter12>.

#### Communication between Regional and Selective

- Develop a regional or state plan, if one does not already exist. If a plan exists, review or revise it every five years, or more frequently if circumstances change.
- Maintain an email discussion list or other group communication forum for all depositories in the region and encourage active participation.
- Maintain a paper and/or electronic file of documents related to each selective depository, including documentation of each depository designation.
- Regularly review public access assessments, biennial surveys, selective housing agreements, and other documentation to maintain familiarity with conditions and operations at selective depositories.
- Become familiar with the collection strengths of each selective depository. This could be accomplished through a simple poll.
- Contact all selective depositories at least annually. If in-person visits are not possible, communicate via telephone, email, or another method at least once a year.
- Notify selectives of events or situations that might affect service to them.

#### Interlibrary Loan and Reference Services

- Provide interlibrary loans to selective depositories as expeditiously as possible. Loan volumes or provide reproductions, such as microform duplication or scan on demand.
- Coordinate with the depository to deliver documents directly to users if necessary.
- Promptly respond to reference questions from selective depositories, and provide prompt reference assistance to users referred from selective depositories.

## Collection Development and Disposal Procedures

- Provide written disposal procedures. Review discard lists and respond to selective within 60 days.
- Make cataloging records available to other depositories. Catalog selected material when requested.
- Maintain current knowledge of FDLP requirements, policies, and guidelines and be able to interpret them. Provide guidance regarding collection development policies, item selection, retention, and substitution of other formats.

## Training

- Provide guidance to new depository coordinators. Refer them to materials on the FDLP web site, such as the *FDL Handbook* and Public Access Assessments materials, as well as region-specific information.
- Instruct selective depository coordinators to subscribe to FDLP-I.
- Provide online information about regional services, including reference assistance, interlibrary loan/document delivery, and disposal procedures.
- Provide technical consultation and training regarding collection development, item selection and deselection, technical processing, cataloging, and other matters.
- Organize regular statewide or regional meetings for depository coordinators. Meetings can take place in person or through virtual conferencing.

## Depository Relinquishment

- Advise the depository to notify GPO. Communicate with GPO staff regarding relinquishment of the selective depository's status.
- Coordinate the disposition of the FDLP collection and provide instructions to the selective on how the disposition is to be implemented.

## Comments about the draft plan:

- Directors have concerns about speed of change.
- Break down issues into smaller pieces that are more manageable.
- No one regional can tackle all of this on their own.

- Goals complement ASERL and other strategic directions.
- How are we moving this forward? What are the next steps? Is this group monitoring progress?
- Can this group endorse and then people would be able to talk with deans and directors?
- Develop best practices for key tasks, especially withdrawal processes. Standardize as much as possible.
- One regional would take on one of the goals.
- Is achieving all of this possible? It was noted that there is a great deal of diversity in how we do business.
- It was also noted that many of the objectives already being accomplished.
- One of the problems—not all regionals equal. Not always their fault. Underperforming regionals. Dumb down the requirements enough so that everyone can meet them. We have to be prepared for the fact that there are libraries that can't meet these expectations. Not realistic. Define what is good service in this environment. Weak regionals. Maybe they should not be regionals.

At the conclusion of this segment of the agenda, there was no agreement on next steps.

VI. Off-agenda topics (10 min.)--None

### **3:30-4:00 Break**

### **4:00-5:30**

VII. Draft language for possible revision of Title 44, Chapter 19, Sections 1911 and 1912 (Barbie Selby and committee members, 90 min.) Complete document online at <http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/govtinfo/depos/title44-regionals-initial-working-draft.pdf>

At the Buffalo regional meeting there was discussion of possible revisions to title 44. This is nothing new. GPO cannot propose revisions. Council is an advisory body to GPO and is also constrained. Maybe regionals should take this on? Barbie Selby, Dan O'Mahoney, Danny Barkley, Kristen Clark presented 3 possible revisions. The basic question: if we were writing the 1962 depository act today given the realities, fiscal, electronic transition, and other issues, what we would we want this to look like?

There was discussion of several attempts to revise 44 over the last 25 years or so. Based on that experience, the committee determined that it is better to frame the issue narrowly. It was noted that there are many obstacles to potential revisions, including key

differences in the positions of various stakeholders. With minimum changes, how we could provide for preservation of our materials while allowing more flexibility and diversity in what we do with respect to collecting, weeding, etc?

The committee described their work to date:

- Formed of a working group
- Gathered regional input
- Contacted key stakeholders
- Used listservs such govdoc-l and lawlib-l to conduct outreach
- Discussion at DLC
- Focused on limited, targeted, focused changes to Title 44.

It was noted that “ it will unravel if we try to rewrite all of title 44.” It’s essential to have a conversation with the entire community stakeholders and come back to Congress with limited, targeted, focused changes for 44.

Draft 1—format neutral

Provide for flexibility by allowing GPO to provide some guidance that allows for flexibility (section 19.12) Copied 19.12 into 19.11 Major difference is the extent to which 19.12 speaks to digital format. Concern that regionals might be required to retain digital copies. Rest of chapter 19 is steeped in the print era. Nothing that could require regionals to permanently retain digital copies.

Challenge of coordinating regional collections beyond state borders. Bottom paragraph is an attempt to encapsulate goal of cross-state cooperation and collections. May not be broad enough, but it is a placeholder for the broader concepts. Gives them an option to work beyond state borders.

Draft 2—Regional not required

Explicit parenthetical statement in 19.12

Draft 3—retains either print or microfacsimile. Keep except as authorized by GPO. Laying responsibility for the flexibility on GPO.....not standardizing to gpo standards. Digital surrogates must be to standards.

Expect that GPO will put safeguards and standards into process. Best to leave out of the law. Expect it to take time.

Look at the 19.11 in version 3.

**Comments on the 3 drafts:**

- Your regionals are there, they are the backstop. Some get nervous when we start hearing flexibility.
- Why not force them to find a regional in another state.

- If one library digitizes, the rest of us can pitch our copy.
- Not trying to get rid of regionals. Wish I could guarantee that I could keep all of these things. Many regionals under enormous pressures. Unique revolution that none of us have ever been through....we need to continue to evolve. Need to understand our reality. It is likely regionals will continue to drop regional status or out of the program.
- Allow for regional in another state. Don't say contiguous state. For example Alaska is served by Washington, a neighboring state. Geography does not matter as much as it used to. Would it be impossible for Michigan to be served by a state that doesn't touch its borders?
- Use language in one of the "early" versions of GPOs regional report.
- In the District, we do not have the resources to appoint one as regional, have to look outside of our area. Electronic communications allow some information to be shared.
- Refer to all formats as tangible.
- Support for #2. Selectives would be happy to be served by one of 15 collections.
- Support for #1 (format neutral) because it would be the most flexible.
- Directors worried about and want explicit acknowledgement that there is no requirement to retain digital copies.
- Dan—general question: did we get the goals right? If one were to get the limited, targeted, focused goal, did we focus in on the right outcomes? Multistate and ability to withdraw? Nothing to the contrary.
- Kansas—likes format neutral as long as there is a capability for GPO to write reasonable regulations that can be changed over time. Leave geography out of the mix since it's likely that more regionals will drop out.
- Kristen—works with S. Dakota but what does that really mean? Geography can be meaningless.
- Concern was expressed about the number of regionals (15). Maximum number of selectives that a regional can give good service to is 30. Gets unrealistic if the numbers are larger. Some highly-populated states have a large number of selectives.
- Not looking at regional du jour. Be as value-neutral as possible, be as accepting as possible. Try to compensate for the fact that there may be fewer regionals.
- How do we do shared agreements, shared compensation. Don't have geographical limits that occur when law originally written. Tried to look at ramifications of language changes.
- One of the original reasons for dispersing across 50 states was to provide easy, local access.
- 19.12—Senator's responsibility and senator's working together to make that designation.
- What's next: if something doesn't happen, there will be fewer regionals. Won't be orderly, controlled.
- One participant noted that she can't lobby Congress at her public institution. Should we start working with AALL, ARL, COSLA, Ithaca folks, and the next public printer? There has been interest and questions from ARL, AALL, etc.

## Summary sent to GOVDOC-L by Barbie Selby

Summary of DLC discussion of proposed revisions to Title 44 October 19, 2010 Dan Barkley, Dan O'Mahony, and Barbie Selby introduced the topic by giving

- \* some background information - why do regional librarians believe this is important to address at this time;

- \* a brief overview of the process followed - discussion within the Title 44 group, then among regionals; three variant proposals discussed with "key stakeholders," and then distributed on govdoc-l, etc.; and the DLC discussion;

- \* and an introduction to the reasons for the three variations in wording of the proposed Title 44 revisions.

As in earlier communications about our proposals we emphasized that we are attempting only to target a very specific, limited portion of Title 44 - sections 1911 and 1912 - which deal specifically with the current regional mandate to retain all paper and microform documents.

There was surprisingly little adamant protest from the attendees about the intent to modify Title 44. Comments tended to be more focused on the differences in the versions, not on the overall intention.

One attendee said she "feel[s] your pain," but wanted assurance that any GPO standards would be adhered to in digitizing and other areas. A Michigan librarian wanted to be sure that depository libraries always have a regional library to call upon.

Discussion of Section 1912 focused on whether or not a regional serving another state's depositories needed to be from a "neighboring state." While only a few people addressed this issue the consensus seemed to be that cross-state regionals did not have to be from a "neighboring state." One person indicated that the law currently makes no mention of any sort of cross-state arrangements. However, a GPO staff person clarified that Section 1912 currently allows a Senator to designate his/her state's regional. GPO has worked with Senators to establish any current cross-state regionals (Minnesota serving South Dakota, for example).

Mention was made to the recently approved ARL "Statement of Principles on the Federal Depository Library Program" and its mention of "15 regionally distributed comprehensive print collections," and what this might mean for regional depositories. Another person said that it might be fine if there were only 15 "regionally distributed comprehensive print collections" if they were rationally organized and distributed.

Several people expressed a preference for Draft 1 - format neutral. When questioned about the possibility of Draft 2 - format neutral, but with the addition of a "regionals not required to store digital files," they seemed to still feel that the entirely format neutral Draft 1 was preferable, and that such "not required" language didn't belong in the statutes. Barbie added that if this proposal does move forward we would

need the assistance of a true legislative drafter to iron out such language issues.

## VIII. Adjournment