Susanne Caro called the meeting to order.

Puerto Rico and Disaster Plans
In light of the recent hurricanes, the latest being Puerto Rico, focused the discussion on libraries dealing with disasters. Issues mentioned included:

- each library’s disaster plan would present solutions for dealing with the kind of disasters in their areas such as hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes and chemical disasters.
- folks from the University of Colorado, through involvement with the Culture on Historic Resources task force and the state emergency management office were involved with the state emergency plan, and are happy to share information and guidance on setting up something similar in your own state.
- it was useful to have the Regional liaise with GPO on the Selective’s behalf and network to gather resources for the Selective that has been affected.
- besides focusing on how to recover, it is important to have a plan for the continuity of operations in the immediate aftermath of the disaster.
- it is important to include documents in a disaster plan, and a strategy to replace lost materials because documents are federal property.
- decide ahead of time, the most important materials to be saved/moved to a safe location and have a plan for doing so. Regionals could offer advice to their Selective’s regarding this gray area.
- there are other types of disasters such as pandemics and financial cuts.
- extra help may be needed to move boxes and take care of the relocation of material as in the case of Montana when Susanne’s Regional had to accommodate 600 boxes of documents in a hurry.

Susanne asked if anything stood out regarding changes to Title 44. Some issues discussed were:

- The discussion around changes to Title 44 has been very civil, open, and collegial, which is commendable. All stakeholders have provided valuable input—documents librarians, GPO, and other agencies such as ALA GODORT, ALA Council, and the ALA Committee on Legislation’s Subcommittee on Government Information
- Gavin Baker, of the ALA Subcommittee on Government Information concurred that all groups concerned were playing well together. He was excited about the possibility of GPO being given grant-making authority and invited feedback on how grant making may be planned for. He was in favor of GPO giving grants to Regionals on a formula basis rather than on a competitive basis and was interested in doing it in such a way as to make it most impactful in the region. The process to change Title 44 was moving quickly and he urged everyone to send in comments soon.
- Robin Haun-Mohamed urged the group to send in comments to the DLC as well.
- Bill Sudduth called attention to writing gift authority into the law—the ability of libraries to make gifts to the FDLP/GPO of catalog records or digitized content created by individual libraries. This could be of immeasurable value to GPO and the FDLP community.
- Further discussion on bestowing grant-making authority on GPO ensued.
As GPO explores models and options, state libraries may be tapped for information because they have experience in administering small grants and measuring the impact/value to their services—writing proposals/plans, measuring outcomes, and reporting on progress.

Grant giving would add value to the reasons for a depository to remain within the FDLP and would give a boost to the status of the library.

Grants could be helpful in GPO maintaining their agreements to state libraries to help with operations.

There was a concern that grant-making would raise expectations among FDLP libraries.

There was a concern that grant-making authority without appropriate funding could be problematic. If unfunded, would GPO have to make grants with their own funds or could it choose not to make grants during a particular year? It was pointed out that there were lots of other unfunded mandates by Congress so it may not be a problem. Laurie Hall asked if it was not funded by federal money and GPO had to divert dollars to grants, what services would FDLP libraries opt to go without? Would grant-making be less favorable if folks had to give up a service that was currently offered? The mandatory or otherwise nature of grants would depend on the language of the bill—‘may’ versus ‘shall’. The language could change after the bill was introduced. Usually, the agency being given grant-making authority would be asked to run a pilot project and changes would be made on the basis of the outcome of the project. It would then likely be given to the appropriate committee to make a plan. There wasn’t enough information about how it may be done but most agreed that it was a good idea to support and figure out how it could be done later. There was general agreement that this was a golden moment in time for changes to be made to Title 44 and for all stakeholders to make their voices heard. There was consensus on so many fronts and the Joint Committee on Printing was primed to take some action evidenced by the three staffers who were at the joint session earlier in the day. Hearings have been held and congress had a high level of investment in the issue and it is up to us to make sure that all the best ideas are heard.

Since introductions had been overlooked at the beginning of the meeting, Susanne invited everyone to introduce themselves.

Sandee McAnninch announced that she would be retiring in two months.

Bill Sudduth, the moderator for Regional-L listserv requested folks to contact him when new Regional coordinators were appointed so he could add them to the listserv and remove the names of those who were leaving.

ALA GODORT –Title 44 and Other Updates from Shari Laster
Shari made an announcement about the GODORT Social Hour at 8pm and encouraged folks to attend regardless of ALA GODORT membership. She invited nominations for the various ALA awards for 2018. ALA GODORT represents government publications and government publications librarians and has issued several position statements in the past pertaining to particular policies. The ALA GODORT Steering Committee has prepared a position statement (now on the ALA website) on the relationship between the FDLP and changes to Title 44. The central idea was to identify key principles for the FDLP. These include permanent no-fee public access to vital information which can be accomplished through partnership with GPO. The FDLP is well-positioned to play a significant role in the long term preservation
of print and digital federal information. The goal was to outline a broader federal information policy that could facilitate better access and more reliable preservation for government information. ALA GODORT is working with Gavin Baker on the development of legislation and hoping to provide a forum for discussion and feedback. She thanked past DLC members and others who had shared their insights with the group. ALA GODORT hoped to continue to provide one of many voices in this effort to change Title 44.

FDLP eXchange

There was a great deal of enthusiasm about the FDLP eXchange. Folks could not wait to use it. Some libraries are preparing needs lists. Some Regionals are preparing to try it out with their Selectives. Other Regionals are rewriting discard procedures. There was a lot of positive sentiment for libraries being able to offer documents, and build comprehensive collections more easily. It would restrict the number of documents being discarded. Libraries may request GPO to provide a training session for the FDLP eXchange.

FDLP eXchange is currently in the testing mode. There is a process to transfer from the training site to the production site. Data, however, will not be transferred. Invitations are being sent out to libraries. If you do not receive an email, let Lisa Russell at GPO know.

Presentation Stewards

The University of South Carolina, is in the process of signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with GPO for being a preservation steward for documents from the department of Education.

Some members thought it would be a good idea to see a combined list of all libraries who have offered to serve as preservation stewards and the collections they have agreed to preserve. GPO said that there is a list on the FDLP website.

Some members felt that it would be a good idea to have MOUs freely available so they could use language to create their own MOUs. Suzanne Ebanues (GPO) pointed out that it was GPO’s responsibility to draw up an MOU and that the libraries should not be concerned on that score. She is happy to talk to any librarian interested in finding out more about being a preservation steward for any part of a collection. There is a capability in FDLP eXchange to provide condition information for a publication. If a library is requesting a copy that is in better condition to replace a copy that is in poor condition, GPO will pay for shipping. When asked, a handful of members raised their hands to show interest in being preservation stewards.

Currently, there aren’t four preservation stewards for four copies of any publication (although it is possible that we may soon have 4 preservation stewards for hearings). GPO is preparing a marketing campaign for Preservation Stewards and will make it public soon. GPO staff are glad to visit a library and walk through the stacks to identify collections likely for preservation. Preservation stewards may also offer to preserve digitized collections. Preservation Stewards can also be digital content contributors. It would be perfectly acceptable if some Regionals wanted to get together and digitize titles jointly and make them available to GPO.

Susanne thanked everyone for coming and closed the meeting.
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