FALL FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING AND CONFERENCE TRANSCRIPTS
ARLINGTON, VA | OCTOBER 19 - 21, 2009

4   2009 FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE AND
5   FALL DEPOSITORY COUNCIL MEETING
6
7   October 19, 2009
8
9   DOUBLETREE HOTEL
10   300 Army-Navy Drive
11   Arlington, VIRGINIA 22202
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
0002
1   P R O C E E D I N G S
2   MR. JOHN SHULER: If you can find a seat,
3 we'll be ready to get the proceedings going. It's
4 going to be very cozy because we've matched the number
5 of people to the number of seats to build solidarity in
6 our community.
7   (Pause)
8   MR. SHULER: Closing the doors. This is
9 getting serious.
10   (Pause)
11   MR. SHULER: All right. I wish to call the
12 2009 Fall Depository Meeting to order, and I welcome
13 all of you. I welcome the folks at the table who'll --
14 some of whom I'll introduce shortly, but let me
15 introduce myself. I am John Shuler from the University
16 of Illinois at Chicago, and I am the Chair for this
17 meeting and next spring for the council.
18   (Applause)
19   MR. SHULER: Thank you. And I hope that was
20 the most difficult part of my remarks.
21   (Applause)
22   MR. SHULER: However, there are a few things
0003
1 before I introduce the Public Printer, Bob Tapella, and
2 they come under our old traditions of what we do at the

3 beginning of the conference, which is what we call our
 4 Depository calisthenics. However, I would like to do
 5 it a bit differently this time, and it was pointed out
 6 earlier this year this is actually the 75 meeting of
 7 the Depository Library Council. Yes, we have been
 8 meeting in one form or another, formally or informally,
 9 since '72, '73; and we usually do calisthenics along
10 geography and along institutions. I think in honor of
11 this historic event of being the 75 meeting we're going
12 to do this temporally, so everybody, everybody who was
13 alive --
14   (Laughter)
15   MR. SHULER: -- but I mean that. That is the
16 only definition you have to worry about now. Everybody
17 who was alive in 1973, '74 please stand.
18   (Laughter)
19   MR. SHULER: All right. Okay. Continue
20 standing, continue standing because we're going to be
21 eliminating you on a different basis.
22   (Laughter)
0004
 1   MR. SHULER: Not those libraries that are
 2 east of Eden, mind you, but rather if you attended more
 3 than one to five Council meetings in the years 2000 to
 4 2009, continue standing.
 5   (Pause)
 6   MR. SHULER: If you attended Council meetings
 7 between 1990 and 2000 1 to 5 times, continue standing.
 8   (Pause)
 9   MR. SHULER: If you attended -- you get the
10 pattern -- between 1980 and 1990, continue standing.
11   (Pause)
12   MR. SHULER: If you attended the Council
13 sessions between 1974 and 1980, continue standing.
14   (Pause)
15   (Laughter)
16   (Applause)
17   MR. SHULER: Wait a minute. Still stand.
18 Still stand. Please those times not from 1973, please
19 continue to stand.
20   (Laughter)
21   MR. SHULER: For those of you who were at
22 Woodstock, please stand.
0005
 1   (Laughter)
 2   (Pause)

3   (Applause)

4   MR. SHULER: Well, I think that was a hell of

5 a lot more fun than talking about where we live in

6 relations to the Mississippi, but I think -- the point

7 being that we are not only a community of institutions

8 and libraries, but we are a community of service with

9 long traditions and expertise that there Council

10 meetings have allowed us to share with ourselves, our

11 experience with various Public Printers over the years,

12 and it is a tradition and a condition that I hope will

13 continue in the future.

14   In relations to that, I would like to

15 recognize, and again, I hope that this will be an

16 ongoing tradition for the Council meetings here forth,

17 that we have also lost some of the members of our

18 community, and I'd like to recognize at least four of

19 those people. And after I read off their names, I

20 would just like to have a moment of silence.

21   Amongst the librarians that we have lost this

22 year who have no small impact on what we do in these

0006

1 Council meetings as well as throughout our library

2 professional practice, Marva (ph) T. Lane passed away

3 earlier this year. Judith Krug, ALA intellectual, a

4 freedom leader passed away. From the GPO, we lost two

5 significant people: Virginia Sanders (ph), who worked

6 at the GPO for 65 years. Unbelievable. And Tom

7 McCormick, who was actually the first Public Printer to

8 formalize in '73–'74 the ongoing 40 what we are -- the

9 structure that we work with today. So if I could have

10 a moment of silence to recognize those folks.

11   (Pause)

12   MR. SHULER: Thank you. I would now like to

13 introduce Bob Tapella, Public Printer of the United

14 States, who will speak about not only the traditions of

15 the Public Printing Office, but also its future. Bob.

16   (Applause)

17   MR. BOB TAPELLA: Thank you, John. Let's see

18 if we can do this the right way. Well, first of all,

19 John, welcome to chairing the Depository Library

20 Council meeting. For those of you that don't know John

21 well, I thought I'd share just a couple of things about

22 our friend John. Normally, I give him a hard time, but

0007

1 I think since he's the incoming Chair or the current

2 Chair, I'm going to be nice to him today.

3   First, John was the first person to work with
4 GPO to create our formal partnership with the FDLP a
5 number of years ago. He has spearheaded our
6 involvement in virtual reference collaboration, and we
7 can thank John for the missing Council.
8   (Laughter)
9   MR. TAPELLA: Oh, come on. That was worth
10 something.
11   (Laughter)
12   MR. TAPELLA: We actually do have Council
13 here. However, as part of John's interest in better
14 collaboration, he's changed the setup of today's
15 meeting, and so what I'd like to do is I'd like to
16 introduce Council, and I'd like you to stand where you
17 are when I introduce you. And I'm going to begin with
18 the newbies, the newest members of Council, Jim Jacobs
19 from Stanford University.
20   (Applause)
21   MR. TAPELLA: Jill Moriearty, from the
22 University of Utah.
0008
1   (Applause)
2   MR. TAPELLA: Who, by the way, was standing
3 until that last group was called.
4   (Laughter)
5   MR. TAPELLA: Dan O'Mahony, from Brown
6 University.
7   (Applause)
8   MR. TAPELLA: Ann Marie Sanders, from
9 Michigan Department of Education.
10   (Applause)
11   MR. TAPELLA: And Camilla Tubbs, from Yale.
12   (Applause)
13   MR. TAPELLA: And as long as we're
14 introducing Council since they're not sitting up here
15 and you really can't see who they are, I'm going to
16 introduce the rest of Council, which is the last class.
17 David Cismowski, Head of --
18   (Applause)
19   MR. TAPELLA: -- Government Publication
20 Section with the California State Library.
21   (Applause)
22   MR. TAPELLA: Sally Holterhoff, next to him
0009
1 from Valparaiso University.
2   (Applause)

3　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Justin Otto, from Eastern
4　Washington University.
5　　　　(Applause)
6　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Suzanne Sears, from Willis
7　Library.
8　　　　(Applause)
9　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Now Suzanne wanted to be
10　Vanna White today. So come on, stand up again, we want
11　to see that beautiful pink and scarf.　There we go.
12　　　　(Laughter)
13　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　I told her at some point
14　we're going to let her point something out.
15　　　　(Laughter)
16　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Chris Greer, who is now with
17　the OSTP, Office of Science and Technology Policy at
18　the White House.
19　　　　(Applause)
20　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Congratulations on the new
21　job, Chris.
22　　　　MR. CHRISTOPHER GREER:　　Thank you.
0010
1　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Kathy Lawhun, from San
2　Francisco Public Library.
3　　　　(Applause)
4　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Gwen Sinclair, from the
5　University of Hawaii at Manoa Library.
6　　　　(Applause)
7　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　And last but not least, Tori
8　Trotta, from Arizona State University.
9　　　　(Applause)
10　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Now, since I always like to
11　start with good news, we're going to start with
12　something that's good for a change, and that's our
13　budget.
14　　　　Now I'm going to go back historically just a
15　little bit, and for those of you that were around in
16　fiscal year 2008, we thought we did pretty well with
17　$34,913,000 approved by Congress for the S&E
18　appropriations. In 2009, we did even better, with
19　$38,744,000 for the Program, but I got to tell you for
20　fiscal year '010 -- or I guess it's fiscal year '10, we
21　are approved at $40,911,000 for the salaries and
22　expenses for the Superintendent of Documents.
0011
1　　　　(Applause)
2　　　　MR. TAPELLA:　　Now I think a lot of that has

3   to do with the good work the Council did in terms of
4   making recommendations and also, more importantly, the
5   work that the staff under Ric's leadership have done
6   in making the budget justification to Congress. They
7   saw what we were doing, they like what we are doing,
8   and they are funding what we are doing.
9   Now Ric will be talking about more specifics
10 on these programs in his remarks, but the one thing I
11 did want to highlight is that we have received in
12 addition to what's in the S&E appropriation nearly $7.8
13 million for FDsys continued improvement.
14   (Pause)
15   MR. TAPELLA: Oh, come on. Give Mike Wash
16 a clap.
17   (Applause)
18   MR. TAPELLA: Actually, stand up, Mike.
19   (Applause)
20   MR. TAPELLA: Thanks to Mike --
21   (Applause)
22   MR. TAPELLA: -- and what's going on. And
0012
1   as you know, we rolled out FDsys this year, and it has
2   just been a smashing success.
3   Looking forward, I thought I might share a
4   little bit on some of my strategic thoughts if they're
5   strategic on the future of the Federal Depository
6   Library Program. Tomorrow we're going to have some
7   folks make a presentation, and these are folks from
8   Ithaca S&R, and they prepared a report that was
9   commissioned by the Association of Research Libraries
10 and the chief officers of the state library agencies.
11 I was interviewed as were a number of folks at GPO, and
12 I know a number of you in the library community, and I
13 got a sneak preview of the report a couple of weeks
14 ago, and we will be releasing it -- have we released it
15 yet or are we releasing it tomorrow?
16   MR. SHULER: ARL is going to release it off
17 their site.
18   MR. TAPELLA: ARL will release it off their
19 site I guess, what, Friday. And I like it, and that
20 got me thinking really about sort of the future of the
21 FDL and also the Council recommendations last spring.
22 Council recommended last spring that GPO seek funding
0013
1   from an outside consultant to deliver a range of models
2   for the future of the FDLP. We did seek that funding.

3 We got the funding, and it was approved by Congress.
 4 We're going to be moving forward on that, but I thought
 5 that this report titled "Documents for a Digital
 6 Democracy: A model for the Federal Depository Library
 7 Program in the 21st Century An Interim Summary" is a
 8 good starting point. And the question that I had is I
 9 was on a conference call on Friday reviewing the report
10 with the folks who put it together. The big question
11 is what's next? And I guess that's the same question
12 that I'm here asking Council: What's next? And I know
13 we're going to need to work closely together. It'll be
14 Council and GPO and, of course, our oversight
15 committee, the Joint Committee on Printing, to decide
16 exactly what are going to be the expected outcomes that
17 we want from this process of looking for the future of
18 the FDLP.
19   When we bring in the consultant, we have it
20 through a competitive bid process; and for those of you
21 unfamiliar with Federal procurements, it can be a
22 lengthy process. And so I hope that you'll think about
0014
 1 the Ithaca report as a building block and that we use
 2 it as we start preparing for what Council has asked us
 3 or recommended us to do.
 4   There's going to be a strategic planning
 5 session tomorrow to begin framing the goals and
 6 expected outcomes for this consultant, and in doing so,
 7 I ask that you consider the following 10 assumptions:
 8 First, developments in the larger library world are
 9 informing the future of the FDLP.
10   Second, fewer Federal Depository Library
11 professionals will be steeped in the FDLP or in Federal
12 resources.
13   Third, depository libraries must be allowed to
14 adapt to technological change and program changes to
15 perform their role.
16   Fourth, competencies to lead and manage the
17 Federal Depository of the future will be different than
18 those of the traditional depository library.
19   Fifth, collaboration and cooperation are
20 essential.
21   Sixth, Government agencies and the private
22 sector will continue to independently develop tools and
0015
 1 resources to locate Government information.
 2   Seventh, partnerships between the Government

3 and the private sector will continue to develop and
4 increase.
5   Eighth, GPO needs to continue to promote
6 depositories, its resources, and tools outside of the
7 FDLP.
8   Ninth, an enhanced system is needed to ensure
9 persistent identification and description of Government
10 information products available via Government
11 electronic information services.
12   And finally, the tenth assumption I'd like you
13 to hold true, a primary electronic FDLP offers
14 opportunities to make more information locally
15 available to the public with enhanced functionality.
16   As the Depository Library Council works with
17 GPO and the community throughout this conference, I'm
18 asking that you continue to be guided by these
19 assumptions.
20   Earlier this year, I wrote President Obama and
21 laid out how GPO could help support his vision for
22 transparency and open government as well as digital
0016
1 access to much more information of the Government.
2 Specifically, I proposed five goals and accompanying
3 actions that GPO was prepared to undertake. The goals
4 are, first, position GPO's Federal digital system as
5 the official repository for Federal Government
6 publications; second, enable and support Web 2.0
7 functionality through FDsys to support comments on
8 pending legislation; third, establish a demonstration
9 project to apply Web 2.0 features to rule-making
10 document; fourth, participate in and lead efforts to
11 standardized electronic publishing formats; and
12 finally, fifth, to link the White House's web site to
13 FDsys for public searches of Government documents.
14   As part of GPO's response to these goals, we
15 work closely with the National Archives' Office of the
16 Federal Register to convert the text of the Federal
17 Register from year 2000 to 2009 into XML, which is the
18 extensible markup language, and placed it online in
19 numerous Federal Government portals including GPO's
20 Federal Digital System, the Federal Register web site,
21 and the Government's new portal for Government data
22 data.gov.
0017
1   We've also recently been called upon by
2 Congress in joint explanatory statement on HR1105,

3   which was the Lynch Branch Appropriations Bill, to work
 4   with the Library of Congress including the
 5   Congressional Resource Service and the Law Library of
 6   Congress to discuss access to bulk data. I'm going to
 7   read you the report language, and it specifically says:
 8   "Public access to legislative data. There is support
 9   for enhancing public access to legislative documents,
10   bill status, summary information, and other legislative
11   data through more direct methods such as bulk data
12   downloads and other means of no-charge digital access
13   to legislative databases. The Library of Congress, the
14   Congressional Resource Service, and the Government
15   Printing Office, and the appropriate entities of the
16   House of Representatives are directed to prepare a
17   report on the feasibility of providing advanced search
18   capabilities. This report is to be provided to the
19   committees on appropriations of the House and Senate
20   within 120 days of the release of Legislative
21   Information System 2.0."
22   As soon as the occurred, I called together all
0018
 1   the principals at the Library of Congress as well as
 2   the House of Representatives, and we've started a task
 3   force. This task force is working jointly to develop a
 4   position on bulk data, but in parallel with this
 5   effort, GPO is also starting to talk with groups about
 6   applications programming interfaces, or API, with the
 7   goals of developing a specification what will help
 8   enable other systems to access our data, or, for those
 9   of you who are in the electronic world, so folks can do
10   mashup with all this great information that we have
11   available.
12   We would like to work with the Depository
13   Library Council to further define requirements that may
14   enable future digital deposit of authentic files in
15   depository libraries through FDsys. This will enable
16   GPO to serve as both an official repository of Federal
17   Government publications through FDsys and also a
18   distribution channel for these publications.
19   This will continue to support the
20   geographically dispersed collections of contents in the
21   digital world in a manner that they have been supported
22   in the traditional print environment for libraries. I
0019
 1   believe that the Federal Government has an obligation
 2   to provide complete legal and regulatory information on

3 line in an electronic format that is fully usable by
 4 the American people free of charge. We should start
 5 with the Constitution annotated showing how Supreme
 6 Court decisions have affected Federal statutes all the
 7 way through public law, slip decisions, Code of Federal
 8 Regulations, and proposed laws and regulations. We
 9 need a citation standard that is media neutral. This
10 citation standard needs to be in the public domain and
11 support permanent links so that the fidelity and
12 integrity of documents will be maintained indefinitely.
13   We also need to create smart systems that
14 realize the value that XML and Web 2.0 can provide. As
15 one example, the Federal Register is a daily
16 publication and on a regulation published in the
17 Federal Register is incorporated on an annual basis
18 into the appropriate Code of Federal Regulations
19 volume. GPO working with our partner, the Office of
20 the Federal Register, is looking at how we can create a
21 so-called point-in-time system. With such a system,
22 you could dial in a specific date and see what
0020
 1 regulations were in effect on that date.
 2   What if we could create a point-in-time
 3 capability for the entire legal and regulatory
 4 framework of the United States? It's an ambitious
 5 goal, but one that I think is worthwhile and one that
 6 we are pursuing at the Government Printing Office.
 7   I mentioned FDsys earlier and the fact that
 8 we've received additional funding, but I'd like to talk
 9 a little bit about what we have recently released the
10 new collections into FDsys: The Congressional Record,
11 105 Congress to present; The Congressional Record
12 bound, 1999 to 2001; The Congressional Record index,
13 1996 to present; GAO reports and Comptroller General
14 decisions, 1994 to 2008; history of bills, 1983 to
15 present; the United States Government Manual, the 1995-
16 '96 edition to present; the United States Statutes at
17 Large, 2003 to 2006. Those are the newest collections.
18   In addition, the Congressional Directory, the
19 Congressional Record bound, the United States
20 Government Manual, and the United States Statutes at
21 Large are available with authenticated digital
22 signatures. Additionally, the list of CFR sections
0021
 1 affected, the Weekly Compilation of Presidential
 2 Documents, and the Daily Compilation of Presidential

3 Documents Collections have been authenticated with
4 digital signatures and are also currently available.
5 GPO is in the process of digitally signing the Federal
6 Register collection, which will occur in a year-by-year
7 basis.
8   In continuing the migration from GPO access,
9 the next set of collections that will be made available
10 include: the United States Code, the Code of Federal
11 Regulations, the Public Papers of the Presidents of the
12 United States, House Precedents, Hinds, Deschler, and
13 Cannon.
14   Now that I've showered you with some good news
15 and I hope I have a happy audience --
16   (Laughter)
17   MR. TAPELLA: -- I'd like to discuss the
18 problems we experienced recently with access to our
19 Persistent Uniform Resource Locators, or PURLs. Yes, I
20 was aware of the failure.
21   (Laughter)
22   MR. TAPELLA: And as you know, we had a
0022
1 significant hardware failure on August 24, 2009. The
2 hardware was restored, but then we encountered problems
3 with the application script used to operate this
4 service related to systems configurations and Uniform
5 Resource Locator, URL, Resolution. While we did have a
6 problem, I want to emphasize that although access to
7 the system posed an issue no data was lost. The script
8 was executed and run at a rate of 10,000 PURLs every 12
9 hours, and PURLs were made accessible on September 8,
10 2009. And I can tell you, it was a rough period, and I
11 did hear from a number of you.
12   (Laughter)
13   MR. TAPELLA: And we're paying attention.
14 GPO's Information and Technology Services have
15 conducted testing of new procedures for the backup of
16 the PURL application and server, and the testing has
17 been successful. I do know Ric and I were talking --
18 we were down just last week for a brief period of time.
19 I think, what, an hour or two?
20   MR. RIC DAVIS: Probably an hour.
21   MR. TAPELLA: About an hour. We are paying
22 very close attention to this.
0023
1   We recognize how critical these systems are
2 and the importance of having stable and redundant

3   systems to access online content. An off-site
4   redundant backup of all critical hardware and software
5   systems is and will continue to be a priority for GPO,
6   and we're moving as quickly and as prudently as
7   possible. We're exploring hosted services, an
8   expansion of real-time fail-over capability as well as
9   other options to build a bridge of stability for this
10 service until FDsys is fully enabled.
11   After the PURL failure, Ric and I got
12 together and realized that we have other legacy
13 computer systems and applications at GPO that also are
14 vulnerable. I've got a list of five of them that are
15 still vulnerable and we're working on. The first: The
16 Depository Distribution Information System, DDIS,
17 manages information including item number and SuDoc
18 class stems, item-selection information, and basic
19 information on the FDLP library such as addresses.
20   Second: ACSIS, the Acquisition Classification
21 and Shipment Information Systems, maintains application
22 classification, bibliographic acquisitions and shipment
0024
1   processing information for all the titles in the FDLP
2   and cataloging and indexing program.
3   The Automated Depository Distribution Systems,
4   ADDS, fulfills the distribution of Government materials
5   to depository libraries nationwide and within U.S.
6   territories.
7   Fourth: The Item Lister system allows Federal
8   depositories to review their current item number
9   selection information.
10   And finally, Shipper Lister enables the
11 Federal depositories to retrieve an official version of
12 a depository shipping list in a PDF format from FY 2001
13 forward with microfiche shipping list added starting
14 with FY 2009 shipping list.
15   Ric and his folks are developing
16 documentation on requirements for each one of these
17 legacy systems so that we can work on the migration and
18 Mike Wash's Information Technology and Services
19 organization will be responsible for migrating the
20 legacy hardware and software application to more
21 current and stable solutions that will follow industry
22 best practices and the agency's enterprise
0025
1   architecture.
2   These activities and their progression in time

3   are all contingent on the approval of funding for
4   implementation, but it is a priority, and we are
5   working hard on it.
6   Next I'd like to talk about digitization. In
7   2004, GPO proposed digitizing all retrospective Federal
8   publications back to the earliest days of the Federal
9   Government. We conducted a pilot project in 2006. We
10 evaluated it in 2007, and then in 2008 we issued and
11 RFP for cooperative relationship with a public or
12 private sector participant or participants where the
13 uncompressed, unaltered files created as a result of
14 the conversion process would be delivered to GPO at no
15 cost to the Government for ingest into GPO's Federal
16 digital system.
17   Since this was a Federal procurement, we
18 originally posted the requirements on the Federal
19 Business Opportunities, FedBizOpps, web site. As a
20 result of the posting, we received only one offer.
21 Although a decision was made by GPO to make an award,
22 it had to be approved by our oversight committee.
0026
1   Committee staffs were briefed on the process, and
2   additional questions were provided to GPO to answer
3   with regard to the RFP and the digitization process.
4   The offer's bid acceptance period was set to expire
5   before GPO could aware the contract. The vendor
6   extended their offer more than once, but at the end of
7   the day, the contract did not come to fruition, and I'm
8   disappointed.
9   However, we are currently developing new
10 digitization alternatives. In addition to our
11 longstanding goal of serving as one of the repository
12 of electronic files through the submission of material
13 into FDsys, we will be following the Depository Library
14 Council's recommendation to focus on coordinating
15 projects among institutions, assist in the
16 establishment and implementation of preservation
17 guidelines, maintain a registry of digitized project,
18 and ensure that there is appropriate bibliographic
19 metadata for titles in the collection. We'd like to
20 encourage any of you who are digitizing materials who
21 would like to join GPO in this important effort to
22 digitized historic publication to submit proposals
0027
1   through our partnership page located on the FDLP
2   Desktop.

3   Another good site to review is the Federal
 4 Publications Digitization and Public Access Files
 5 Initiative web page. This page links to our registry
 6 of U.S. Government publication digitization projects
 7 and GPO's work with others on guidelines and
 8 consideration of digitization specifications for still
 9 digital images.
10   Finally, I'd like to give an update on PACER,
11 which is the Public Access to Court Electronic Record.
12 At its September 2007 session, the Judicial Conference
13 endorsed a joint pilot between GPO and the
14 Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts that was to
15 not exceed two years in length. GPO sought volunteers
16 to participate in the pilot from among the depository
17 libraries; 49 depository libraries responded for the
18 call to volunteer. In consultation with the GPO, the
19 Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts selected 17
20 depository libraries to participate in the pilot. The
21 pilot commenced in October 2007, and was suspended
22 after 11 months for an evaluation. The data collected
0028
 1 during that time suggest that the target population, a
 2 segment of the public that would be unlikely to go to
 3 the courthouse or establish a PACER account was not
 4 reached as anticipated. Although the pilot was
 5 initially well-publicized, the level of ongoing public
 6 outreach about the pilot didn't reach the desired
 7 level; and more fundamentally, PACER is a tool and not
 8 really a program. Therefore, AALL, American
 9 Association of Law Libraries, has been contacted to
10 discuss ways the pilot could be reinvented to make
11 PACER part of a legal research and training program for
12 librarians and end users.
13   Once a proposal is developed, it will be
14 submitted to the Judiciary's Advisory Groups, the Court
15 Administration and Case Management Committee of the
16 Judicial Conference, and the Judicial Conference
17 Committee on Court Administration and Case Management
18 for consideration. I am very hopeful that we'll have a
19 new PACER pilot started or at least approved during
20 this fiscal year.
21   (Applause)
22   MR. TAPELLA: And with that, I'm going to
0029
 1 turn on the podium to Acting Superintendent of
 2 Documents, Ric Davis. Ric.

3   (Applause)
4   MR. RIC DAVIS: Thank you, Bob.   First,
5   good morning, and welcome, I want to welcome all of you
6   to the Fall Depository Library Conference and Council
7   Meeting. As I always like to reiterate at the start of
8   these meeting, I encourage you to network with GPO
9   staff, other Federal agency staff, and with each other
10   while you're here. As you all know, you can also use
11   our customer relations tool, RightNow Technologies, to
12   contact GPO with any questions after the Conference,
13   but I also like hearing from all of you directly. My
14   email address, again, is rdavis@gpo.gov, and I
15   encourage you to contact me with any concerns or issues
16   that come up after the Conference.
17   I want to join Bob first in welcoming our new
18   Council members as well. James, Jill, Dan, Ann, and
19   Camilla, I'm very happy that you've decided to join us
20   on Council. We look forward to your energy and ideas
21   throughout this session and during your tenure. As
22   part of joining Council, one thing that we ask new
0030
1   members to do is to go through a two-day boot camp at
2   the Government Printing Office prior to coming onboard,
3   and I hope that experience was valuable for all of you
4   to see the sort of the inner workings of the Government
5   Printing Office, and I know it was good for us as GPO
6   staffers to have a chance to dialogue with you prior to
7   the conference.
8   At this year's Spring Depository Library
9   Council Meeting in Tampa, the Depository Library
10   Council put forth a set of recommendations for GPO, and
11   one the things that John and I talked about doing a
12   little bit differently in addition to the setup that
13   you see is rather than giving an update on all of the
14   various things we're working on to kind of walk through
15   at a strategic level some of GPO's responses to these
16   recommendations. This is also going to set the stage
17   for the rest of the Conference. What we're doing a
18   little bit differently this time is rather than seeing
19   a lot of presentations directly from the Government
20   Printing Office we're going to have a heavy focus on
21   these recommendations to help them drive a lot of the
22   plenary sessions that will also be supplemented by the
0031
1   Educational Sessions, of course, and we're setting this
2   up so it can be more of a collaboration to reach

3   solutions and outcomes.
4   With that, let me walk through
5   these briefly.
6   On Recommendation number 1, New Models for the
7   FDLP, the recommendation was to meet the goals of
8   providing no-fee permanent public access to Government
9   information. Council recommended that GPO seek funding
10 to hire an outside consultant to deliver a range of
11 models on how libraries can better provide information
12 in the 21 Century. In your packet, it was noted that
13 funds were not made available as part of the omnibus
14 appropriation; but the good news, as Bob mentioned, is
15 that we did just receive funding as part of our FY 2010
16 budget submission to support this Council request.
17 We've got a lot of work ahead of us now. What GPO and
18 Council are going to need to do immediately after this
19 Conference and based upon feedback that you give us at
20 this Conference is work together on a spend plan that
21 GPO can submit to the Joint Committee on Printing to
22 make use of those funds. Additionally, as Bob
0032
1   mentioned, I think that the Ithaka S+R report that was
2   recently released is a good building block as part of
3   this effort, and we should talk about that in this
4   Conference as building into this consulting process.
5   The second recommendation was collaborative
6   digitization projects. Council recommended that GPO
7   maintain a list of libraries volunteering to
8   participate in collaborative digitization project
9   according to GPO's standards and the GPO coordinate
10 these projects.
11   As Bob has already discussed, GPO has been
12 working with the library community, other Federal
13 agencies, and the public on this national digitization
14 project effort. The objective is to ensure that the
15 digital collection once complete is available in the
16 public domain for no-fee permanent public access. As a
17 result of the Nunn Award of the digitization contract,
18 GPO was seeking to do at no cost to the Government and
19 the fact that the one bid that we were seeking to
20 approve was withdrawn from further consideration at
21 this point, we are developing new alternatives. I
22 think that it's very important that we continue work on
0033
1   this goal and, most importantly, not give up.
2   In recent days, something very interesting has

3   happened as part of the budget process. In our FY 2010
4   budget, GPO received funding associated with
5   digitization that we did not have before to the tune of
6   about $500,000. When the budget request was submitted
7   months ago, it was our hope that these funds would be
8   approved to complement an award that would be given and
9   to complete the digitization of miscellaneous materials
10   and also associated with the transportation of
11   materials. What we need to do now given the stage that
12   we're at is, again, work with Council on a spend plan
13   for these funds in FY 2010, take the spend plan back to
14   JCP, and decide how best to get this thing moving.
15   The third recommendation was state-based grant
16   programs for digitization. Council recommended that to
17   encourage digitization project GPO request funding for
18   a state-based grant program for depository libraries to
19   fulfill the goal of digitizing the legacy collection.
20   Unfortunately, after consultation with our General
21   Counsel's office, GPO did investigate the possibility
22   of entering into these, but we have no legal authority
0034
1   under such partnerships. The General Counsel
2   recommended that for appropriated funds on digitization
3   we would need to go through the formal contracting
4   process. This is different from what Bob mentioned in
5   regards to partnership with the depository community,
6   which we're actively encouraging.
7   Recommendation number 4, related to the
8   disposal process. Council recommended that GPO report
9   at this meeting on best practices for streamlining the
10   disposal process, which all of you know is very
11   challenging. The working group for this is taking a
12   two-pronged approach to the disposition of materials
13   and also the needs and offers process. First, as best
14   practices in education, we were able to collect and
15   compile all of the current discard procedures from
16   regional depository librarians. A presentation on this
17   is going to be made at 4 p.m. today, and I encourage
18   all of you to attend that. The intent is to really
19   clarify any misunderstandings of what is required or
20   not required of depository libraries in the disposition
21   of materials. In doing this, we also hope to spark
22   ideas for discussion about how we can streamline this
0035
1   program. After the Conference, we're also going to do
2   an online OPAL presentation and have more collaboration

3   and dialogue quickly with those who can't be with us
4   today.
5   Secondly, we need to develop an automated tool
6   for streamlining this process. Suggestions have
7   already been on the FDLP community site, but we need to
8   hear more information from you here at Conference to go
9   through the process of developing that. Again, this is
10 something we have funding to do in FY 2010, so I need
11 your feedback, and we need to work on it together.
12   Recommendation 5 was retooling of the item
13 selection system. Bob spoke about DIDAS, and what that
14 drills downs to, as all of you know, is increasing
15 granularity of item numbers assigned to different
16 formats, offering up the ability to select EL-only item
17 numbers without the risk of obtaining tangible
18 materials and also being able to receive more specified
19 formats for things like general publications. In order
20 to accomplish this most effectively, we must get off
21 our DIDAS mainframe system that we're operating on to
22 provide the flexibility to meet your needs. At GPO
0036
1   right now, we're writing a requirements document to
2   make that happen. Again, we have approval in FY 2010
3   funds. It's always good to be able to say that after
4   three years of nonfunding. We do have funds to do
5   this, so we're going to be basing these requirements as
6   well and modifying them based on what we hear from you
7   here at the Conference.
8   In the meantime, we've been taking steps to
9   provide selectivity of online materials by removing
10 them from tangible product item numbers and creating
11 their own item numbers when possible. Lori's area has
12 been working on cleanup of the list of classes, and
13 we've been changing the workflow of maintaining the
14 list of class so that it's more systematic and more
15 based on business process efficiencies. There is going
16 to be a session on that tomorrow morning at 10:30, and
17 again, I encourage you to attend and talk to us about
18 what your requirements are for that as we're developing
19 the document to execute this year.
20   There was also a recommendation on public
21 access assessments. As you know, in Title 44, GPO is
22 required by law to do a -- the word is inspections when
0037
1   is indicated. Based on prior Council recommendations
2   from many years ago, we reinvented the inspection

3 program as an assessment program to make it more
4 collaborative in nature. Recent activities in this
5 area include doing assessments based in part on
6 biennial survey data. Additionally, any library can
7 request an assessment at any time. Something you're
8 going to notice this year, because it is biennial
9 survey time, is a very different biennial survey.
10 We've heard loud and clear about how long it takes to
11 complete that survey. We've gone through and tested
12 the one this year. I'm estimating 15 to 20 minutes in
13 terms of doing this, and this also will get us baseline
14 data to compare from years past.
15   We're also in the process of adding two
16 additional assessment specialists to our education and
17 outreach staff. What two does is literally double the
18 size of our staff. Kathy Brazee and Ashley Dahlen have
19 been it. We're getting ready to add two more. We
20 posted a job. The job closed, I understand from our
21 Human Capital Department, that we had a number of
22 interested applicants, and we're awaiting the
0038
1 certification list to make a selection to double staff
2 size, which will greatly increase our ability to go out
3 and visit libraries.
4   Additionally, we recently updated the Public
5 Access Assessment page, which may be found on the FDLP
6 Desktop under Education and Outreach. I encourage you
7 to take a look at the approach that we're taking on
8 that. What we need to do after this Conference is go
9 back and make sure that that maps very clearly to the
10 Depository handbook. I think Chapter 7 deals with
11 assessment, and we want to make sure that's in sync.
12 We have a session here on assessment, and we also want
13 to hear your feedback on the processes that we're
14 employing to do assessments; and again, we're looking
15 for your feedback on how to do it better. But I do
16 want to emphasize, particularly with new funding, we
17 have the ability to travel. If anybody would like us
18 to visit, please fill out the form online. If you
19 don't get an answer quickly, email me directly.
20   Finally, we have a recommendation on quality
21 control issues. I don't believe on the agenda there is
22 a separate plenary session on quality control, but
0039
1 we're going to address these issues not only here at a
2 high level but also talk about then during the

3   operational forum, which I think is tomorrow afternoon.
4   We've developed a large project team under
5   Lori and Robin to address quality control issues in
6   classification, cataloging, and distribution for both
7   paper and microfiche. There are four main goals that
8   we have as part of this process: First, to implement
9   very specific quality control checks; to conduct an
10 assessment of the types of errors that all of you
11 reported through AskGPO; to identify what our staff
12 training needs are, to do it better; and to maintain
13 statistics on the number of questions that we get in
14 the area and look at how those are closed out.
15   At the end of September 30, the following
16 tasks have been completed. We did an assessment of all
17 of the questions received through AskGPO related to
18 classification, cataloging, and distribution and
19 identified the types of errors coming in. We've worked
20 with GPO's quality assurance staff, which is an
21 organization external to the library unit, to develop
22 an ongoing quality assurance plan. Staff have
0040
1   conducted a hundred percent quality control checks of
2   the classification of tangible pubs from June through
3   September, and we're looking to go back further. And
4   Depository distribution has implemented new quality
5   control checks as part of their daily workflow.
6   Again, these are the Council's recommendations
7   that came from Tampa. Throughout the next couple of
8   days, many of the plenary sessions are going to be
9   devoted to having a dialogue on these issues. You're
10 not going to really see a lot of formal presentations
11 beyond the presentations that we're giving today.
12 We're looking to have opportunities to discuss these
13 beyond what we've heard from the Council's
14 recommendations.
15   Finally, I want to talk a little bit about
16 budget matters as well, building on what Bob talked
17 about. GPO received appropriations earlier this year
18 through the Omnibus Appropriations Act for 2009 for
19 several items of note. All of the contracts for these
20 items were put in place and awarded between my staff
21 working together with procurement staff a GPO by
22 September 30. First, data storage; there was an
0041
1   expenditure of funds made to provide for more data
2   storage of FDLP content to further our goal of

3   providing permanent public access and serving as the
4   official repository of information.
5   Secondly, educational instruction modules for
6   Federal Depository libraries; in addition to going out
7   and doing visits and working with you in person, we've
8   gotten good feedback on the OPAL software that we've
9   been using. We're looking to sort of ramp that up to
10 the next level by developing new online modules and
11 training tools to provide additional training to
12 supplement in-person training.
13   Third, systems modernization; Bob went through
14 the list of legacy systems that still need migration at
15 GPO, and we received additional funding for that.
16   And fourth, cataloging and indexing; an
17 expenditure of funds was made to assist with work in
18 Lori's area in cataloging and indexing with the goal of
19 increasing the production of cataloging records and
20 significantly growing the catalog of Government
21 publications. I encourage you to attend her session on
22 this where she's going talk specifically about the plan
0042
1   that we have of how we're doing that.
2   Looking ahead, as I previously mentioned,
3   we've already received more funding in FY 2010. We're
4   obviously going to use this for the consultant. We're
5   going to use it for these legacy systems, and we're
6   going to use it for more data storage and more
7   cataloging and indexing.
8   I want to encourage the members of Council, as
9   I mentioned earlier, when we go back home and break
10 from this Conference starting next week to work with
11 GPO on the spend plans for how we're going to use this
12 money specifically. We have language in our Blue book
13 submission at a general level in terms of how we want
14 to use it. We know we have a lot of specific
15 challenges, and we now have the funds to address the
16 challenges that we really haven't for about three
17 years. So I'm going to need your help doing that to
18 make sure we're going in the right direction.
19   Additionally, it's never too early to plan for
20 the FY 2011 budget. In fact we started working on the
21 narrative for that just last week, and I need to have a
22 draft completed by mid-November. So the other
0043
1   challenge to Council is to work with GPO on what we
2   need to ask for as part of our FY 2011 budget

3 submission to not only complement the things that we've
4 received funding for FY 2010 but to build upon things
5 that come out of this Conference to further the goals
6 of the FDLP.
7   Last but not least, it's never too early to
8 talk about the next event. If you haven't heard, the
9 GPO Spring 2010 Depository Library Council Meeting will
10 be April 26 through 28, and we're going to be in
11 Buffalo, New York.
12   (Applause)
13   MR. DAVIS: So if you had challenges packing
14 for this event, I'd have no advice on how to pack for
15 the next one.
16   (Laughter)
17   MR. DAVIS: As always, I want to thank all
18 of you for your dedication, for your hard work, and for
19 your collaboration with each other and with the
20 Government Printing Office. We couldn't do this
21 without you, and your work help makes us stronger and
22 make this program better. Thank you for your time.
0044
1 I'm available throughout the Conference, and I'd now
2 let to turn the program over to Bob Tapella, who's
3 going to announce our Library of the Year. I also want
4 to mention that we're going to celebrate during our
5 3:30 break today. Thank you all for your time.
6   (Applause)
7   MR. TAPELLA: Thank you, Ric. Before I
8 announce Library of the Year, I realized there are a
9 few new faces in here from GPO that you folks may not
10 know that are not part of Ric's team, Library Services
11 and Content Management, and are not part of the FDsys
12 team that you guys know and love so well.
13   So first off, in the very back of the room is
14 the Deputy Public Printer of the United States Paul
15 Erickson. Paul, stand.
16   (Applause)
17   MR. TAPELLA: If anything happens to me, he
18 runs the place.
19   (Laughter)
20   MR. TAPELLA: And actually I guess everyday
21 he does run the place because he's the Chief Operating
22 Officer. I also saw Herb Jackson, our Chief
0045
1 Acquisitions Officer earlier. There we go. Herb is in
2 the front row.

3   (Applause)
 4   MR. TAPELLA: Got Gary Somerset, Manager of
 5 Public Relations.
 6   (Applause)
 7   MR. TAPELLA: Trenholm Boggs, who is my
 8 right hand man.
 9   (Applause)
10   MR. TAPELLA: I see all your FDsys people.
11 Is there anyone else from GPO that is not part of FDsys
12 or Library Service and Content Management?
13   Okay. Just wanted to do my housekeeping. Now
14 it's time to celebrate the Library of the Year Award.
15 Now I know that all of you are dedicated to the job,
16 and I do know that it is a lot of hard work in the
17 Government information space. You really are the first
18 line or the front line in helping we the people access
19 the documents of our democracy, but each year we
20 recognize one library that goes above and beyond, and I
21 know that the staff of GPO struggles to try to make the
22 pick and suggest who should win this award. So, a drum
0046
 1 roll, please.
 2   This year's Federal Depository Library of the
 3 Year Award goes to the Oklahoma Department of
 4 Libraries.
 5   (Applause)
 6   MR. TAPELLA: And accepting the award will
 7 be Steve Beleu. Come on, Steve.
 8   (Applause)
 9   MR. TAPELLA: We'll wait for them to come
10 up so that they're standing up here when I talk about
11 why they were selected.
12   (Pause)
13   (Applause)
14   MR. TAPELLA: So now with me is Steve
15 Beleu, the regional depository librarian and Director
16 of the Oklahoma State Data Center, coordinating agency
17 of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, and Clif --
18   MR. CLIF BROADWORTH: Broadworth.
19   MR. TAPELLA: -- Broadworth -- Thank you --
20 who is the reference librarian. So I'd like to share
21 some to the activities and accomplishments -- Pardon?
22 Do I have all that?
0047
 1   Oh, okay. Okay. Now I'd like to share some
 2 of the activities and accomplishments going on in

3 Oklahoma. So ODL provides education and training for
 4 libraries in their regions that has significantly
 5 increased awareness of U.S. Government resources and,
 6 more importantly, how to use them. ODL has focused its
 7 energies and resources on educating librarians through
 8 workshops and other training sessions. This practical
 9 training enables staff at those libraries to better
10 serve their constituents and the public with
11 information from Federal resources.
12   In the past six years, they have presented
13 over 170 workshop reaching more than a thousand
14 participants at both the local and national level. ODL
15 developed a national web conference offering
16 instructions for the U.S. Department of Energy web
17 sites in conjunction with the Oak Ridge National
18 Laboratory staff. ODL has continuous efforts to add
19 other libraries to the FDLP including tribal libraries
20 and tribal college libraries. ODL works with the
21 National Institutes of Health to learn about NIH
22 information resources and develop a training session
0048
 1 for librarians using PubMed Central. ODL developed
 2 instructional modules for use with the American Memory
 3 Program for the Library of Congress, which makes
 4 materials available from its vast archives. ODL is
 5 very proactive and supportive of selective libraries in
 6 Oklahoma as part of its regional depository
 7 responsibilities. They visit every library in their
 8 purview plus other request annual for consultation and
 9 training. And finally, ODL engages in substantial
10 cooperative efforts with other depository,
11 nondepository libraries including hosting the annual
12 meeting for the Oklahoma depository libraries
13 alternatively with Oklahoma State University,
14 participating in annual conferences for the Oklahoma
15 Library Association and coordinating the Central
16 Oklahoma Metrodocs Biannual Meetings and Training
17 Sessions.
18   And with that, we have an award for Steve
19 and Clif. It says: Federal Depository Library
20 Program; Federal Depository Library of the Year 2009;
21 Oklahoma Department of Libraries; from the Government
22 Printing Office.
0049
 1   (Applause)
 2   MR. TAPELLA: I just don't want that

3   crystal crashing to the floor.
 4   (Laughter)
 5   MR. TAPELLA: And with that, I'm going to
 6   turn it over to Stephen Beleu. Stephen.
 7   (Applause)
 8   MR. STEVE BELEU: My staff and Clif
 9   Broadworth, who is the regional reference librarian,
10   and the people who are back home, Mike Cameron,
11   administrative assistant, and Cynthia Black, library
12   technician, and I thank the Government Printing Office
13   for this award; but even more than that, we need to
14   thank first our customers without whom nothing is
15   possible; our host libraries and their librarians, who
16   sponsored our workshops; our library administrators,
17   who allowed us to travel throughout our state of
18   Oklahoma with occasional forays into Arkansas, Kansas,
19   Missouri, Texas, and here at the Federal Depository
20   Library conferences to deliver workshops about thorough
21   online Government information sources.
22   The Oklahoma Department of Libraries began to
0050
 1   formally receive Federal Government publications in
 2   December of 1890, and the state library, then the
 3   territorial library, of course, joined the FDLP in
 4   1893. Some of the things we've done, he's mentioned
 5   them, I'll throw a little bit more flesh on the bones
 6   here. Together with OSU we started organizing and
 7   hosting an annual meeting of Oklahoma's Federal
 8   Depository libraries each fall in Oklahoma. This
 9   particular year it's going to be at ODL. It's actually
10   November 17. We also invite FDLP librarians from other
11   states, contiguous states, to join us. So we use a
12   couple of listservs that get Arkansas -- Arkansas,
13   Missouri, Kansas, north Texas. Together with the Tulsa
14   City-County Library we hosted and presented two
15   national web workshops in 2009. Maybe your library is
16   one of those who were a web portal for that, and I've
17   already got the first one planned for the fall of 2010.
18   So Tulsa City-County Library there was our partner and
19   will continue to be, and we actually do it at Tulsa
20   City-County Library, not at ODL.
21   We are the coordinating agency of the Oklahoma
22   State Data Center, so we do a lot of census training
0051
 1   and other census work in Oklahoma. Essentially,
 2   there's -- we've actually been to all the 77 counties

3 in Oklahoma. We've trained someone, whether it's
 4 librarians or being a state library we also train city
 5 and county government employees as well as people from
 6 501(c)(3)'s and the business sector. We've trained
 7 people from all 77 counties of our state.
 8   Once a year or more we actually do visit our
 9 selected depositories. We always offer optional,
10 informal training modules, usually two or three. They
11 can -- we tell them they can choose as many as they
12 want. Some of them they want us to give them all two
13 or three. There's only one depository library who
14 doesn't want any of the optional training modules --
15   (Laughter)
16   MR. BELEU: -- because they already know it
17 all.
18   (Laughter)
19   MR. BELEU: We've been working with Janet
20 Scheitle, who's GPO's informal tribal library
21 initiative lead officer; and after Janet retires, we'll
22 continue to work with her successor Ashley Dahlen to
0052
 1 get tribal libraries and tribal college libraries to
 2 join the FDLP. And starting November 12 we're going to
 3 start offering training in our state, primarily of
 4 tribal librarians and tribal government staff. It's a
 5 little bit different types of workshops there than
 6 we'll be presenting just to all other types librarians
 7 and to nontribal library government staff.
 8   Of course, we do thing at the Oklahoma Library
 9 Association Annual Conference. Metrodocs is a thing
10 that exists because if you belong to the Oklahoma
11 Library Association you have to pay money to join, and
12 if you work at a Federal depository library in
13 Oklahoma, you're a member of Metrodocs automatically.
14   Now, workshops, which may be the main reason
15 we're up here. In 2001, I was sitting around with my
16 reference librarian named Karen Fite (ph), and we
17 decided that after the Internet had become widespread
18 in our nation's libraries everything changed then,
19 whether we realized it yet or not, for our industry
20 subsector here. So we decided what we have to do is
21 transition to being a service-oriented Federal
22 Government information service center. So I spent the
0053
 1 years of 2001 to 2003 researching and developing our
 2 current Federal information workshops. Now what that

3   usually consisted of -- as I came here to D.C. I spent
4   a week at the Library of Congress learning how to teach
5   -- learning about American Memory; went through the
6   fellowship program at the National Center for Education
7   Statistics, a week over at NCES. I have attended two
8   biennial data workshop in the National Center for
9   Health Statistics. Every year I come I go over to the
10 National Library of Medicine to get trained, but you
11 get the idea. I'm working with people in the Federal
12 agencies to present the workshops that want taught they
13 way they want it taught. And we communicate via email
14 with usually one person in those agencies to keep our
15 workshops updated, and if there is anything they want
16 us to particularly stress, we'll mention that next time
17 we give the workshop.
18   We currently offer 18-, 22-, 3-, and 5-hour
19 workshops. If you came in by the backdoor and saw a
20 bunch of handouts, I took over one table this morning
21 to put our current workshops flyers on it.
22   (Laughter)
0054
1   MR. BELEU: And some of the workshops titles
2   are "Get Ready for the 2010 Census," "Using the Census
3   for Economic Development," "American Memory for
4   Oklahomans, or "American Memory for Arkansans," "Or
5   American Memory for New Hampshirans," E-Government
6   Service in Libraries," Making Informed Health Care
7   Decisions," "Online Consumer Resources from the Agency
8   for Health care Research and Quality." Two Clif
9   teaches here: "Forecast Your Own Weather," "National
10 Weather Service and the Oklahoma Mason (ph) Net." And
11 he also teaches one on Internet GIS sources called
12 "Geodata.gov and other Federal and State of Oklahoma
13 Internet GIS Resources."
14   We started offering workshops in September of
15 2003. As of today, among the ones that are 2-, 3-, and
16 5-hours, we've delivered 175 of these and have indeed
17 trained over 1,000 librarians, city, county, and tribal
18 government staff, small business owners and their
19 employees, the employees of nonprofit organizations,
20 and the public in general.
21   I look upon this also as being a training --
22 as being a marketing opportunity with you. If you
0055
1   haven't picked up one of our workshop flyers off the
2   back table, please do so.

3   (Laughter)
4   MR. BELEU: And there is also a flyer there
5   about requirements, since we're a state agency, for our
6   delivering out-of-state workshops for you.
7   I've brought something, since we are the
8   coordinating agencies of the Oklahoma State Data
9   Center, about how to use the new American Community
10 Survey, a multiyear population estimate, because if you
11 haven't realized it yet multiyear population estimates
12 are our new paradigm and how we do data just as much as
13 the multirace category was on the 2000 census.
14   The last thing I have to say here is don't
15 forget to attend the Tribal Depository Interest Group
16 lunch tomorrow, Tuesday, 12:15 to 1:45 in the Jackson
17 Room, where we're going to be talking about our efforts
18 to get more tribal libraries and particular tribal
19 college libraries to join FDLP. So thanks to the GPO,
20 and thanks to all of you our colleagues.
21   (Applause)
22   (Pause)
0056
1   MR. SHULER: Thank you. I would now like to
2   ask the Council to come to the Council table. I'd like
3   to thank GPO for joining everyone up here on the high
4   table, and let this manifest the new way the Council is
5   doing. This may be the last time you'll see the high
6   table used in the Conference. From now on, we're going
7   to have a conversation and an interaction with GPO
8   staff members, and I hope the Public Printer will join
9   us for a short 20 minutes at the lower podium for a
10 conversation. And while they're gathering together, I
11 would like to read from the Book of SuDoc --
12   (Laughter)
13   MR. SHULER: -- Chapter 13, verse 4: "Though
14 I walk through the valley of digitization, I will fear
15 no evil."
16   (Laughter)
17   MR. SHULER: And just give us a moment to
18 organize ourselves. Bye-bye high table.
19   (Pause)
20   MR. TAPELLA: So how are we doing this,
21 John?
22   MR. SHULER: We're turning it over to the
0057
1   Council members. I'll step back up there for a moment.
2   What we had talked about as you -- that we would like

3 to ask you a few questions or have a conversation with
 4 you about issues you've raised in your remarks as well
 5 as other things that have been going on with you.
 6   MR. TAPELLA: Okay. Ric is staying as
 7 well.
 8   (Laughter)
 9   MR. SHULER: So, Council members, ask your
10 questions.
11   MR. TAPELLA: Well, that was easy.
12   (Laughter)
13   MR. SHULER: Anybody?
14   MR. TAPELLA: Actually, Jill. Or Justin.
15   MS. JILL MORIEARTY: First --
16   MR. TAPELLA: Ladies first.
17   MS. MORIEARTY: What can we do to help you
18 -- what can we do to help you get more money for 11?
19   MR. TAPELLA: It's --
20   FEMALE SPEAKER: What was the question,
21 please?
22   MS. MORIEARTY: What can we do to help you
0058
 1 get more money for 11?
 2   MALE SPEAKER: You have to push the button.
 3   MR. TAPELLA: By the way, for Council, you
 4 have to push the button and it turns red, and that
 5 means your microphone's on.
 6   MS. MORIEARTY: Yes, but they could hear me
 7 without it.
 8   (Laughter)
 9   MR. TAPELLA: I'll tell you, we were
10 thrilled with this year's budget process, and I think
11 Ric made a call to action to you all in his talks
12 about working collaboratively with the GPO staff so
13 that we can do proper budget justifications. If what
14 we are requesting makes sense, Congress will listen and
15 if we do the proper justification. What also helps,
16 and I know there are many people in this room that
17 contact the authorizers and appropriators during the
18 budget process to support specific requests, and that
19 does help. So rather than just saying "Support GPO's
20 budget request," talk about the specific items and why
21 and how they are relevant to your organization.
22   So the first process is deciding what we're
0059
 1 going to ask for, then making sure that we have a good
 2 justification, and then being very specific when we go

3 forward to request that Congress approve our request
 4 with that --
 5   MR. DAVIS: May I add to that? Yes, what I
 6 want to add to that -- it's a good question. What we
 7 need to do immediately after this meeting is create
 8 spend plans, and the Omnibus Appropriations Act that I
 9 had mentioned earlier provided funds to GPO several
10 months ago. We created spend plans for those. They
11 were all approved. Working with procurement, we got
12 all the contracts awarded. We need to do the same
13 thing with what was approved in the FY 2010 funds, and
14 we have a bit of latitude about how we craft that
15 language.   Obviously, we're very happy we got funding
16 for the consultant. What we really need to figure out
17 is with half a million dollars associated with
18 digitization where we are, what do we want to do. And
19 I'm looking very forward to working with Council on
20 that, but FY 2011 I think what we need to do as well is
21 look at any gaps that cannot be completed as a result
22 of this Conference from FY 2010 funds. Think about
0060
 1 where we need to continue those activities but what new
 2 initiatives have we not received funding for in the
 3 last three or four years that we knew were major
 4 initiatives that we now have an opportunity to try to
 5 get that funding for.
 6   MR. SHULER: Justin.
 7   MR. JUSTIN OTTO: Thanks. I'm Justin Otto
 8 from Eastern Washington University. Well, I think you
 9 may have answered my second question. But my first
10 question was since we're going to be in Buffalo this
11 next spring, do you think that we could have the spring
12 2011 Conference in Hawai'i perhaps?
13   (Laughter)
14   MR. SHULER: Nicely put, Justin.
15   MR. OTTO: Thank you. I try. So since many
16 of the Council sessions that we're going to have over
17 the next couple of day are going to be more of a
18 discussion of the issues that we brought forth in our
19 recommendations, what -- after we have this discussion
20 what's going to be the mechanism for continuing that?
21 Because we're trying to bring -- we're trying to bring
22 in ideas not just from the members of the Council but
0061
 1 from everyone here, and then I'm wondering who are we
 2 going to follow-up on that. Shall we continue

3 discussions with the GPO liaisons who are going to be
4 at our sessions or is there going to be some other kind
5 of mechanism for that? Not only for us but also for
6 people who have had suggestions that want to know what
7 is happening with that.
8   MR. SHULER: I think -- and again, I
9 apologize, I think we're supposed to state our names
10 for the court reporter at the beginning of each one.
11 Ric Davis, GPO.
12   MR. DAVIS: I think that we can make good
13 use of the community forum on the Desktop. We can set
14 up locale in that for doing it. I think that we need
15 to take -- something John and I have talked about
16 offline the last week or so is the Depository Library
17 Council page and expanding the use of that,
18 particularly in terms of how we provide recommendations
19 and then provide ongoing updates on recommendations.
20 It shouldn't be we get a recommendation, we come report
21 on out on it, and then we move on to the next
22 recommendation. The recommendations we have from you
0062
1 guys are very critical, I think, to the future of the
2 FDLP, and I think we need to look at how we can make
3 use of the Desktop to do that. Karen Seeger (ph), who
4 is our web content manager had an unfortunate accident
5 and has a broken leg unfortunately and will be here
6 tomorrow, but she's not here today. I think at the 4
7 o'clock business meeting tomorrow she's going to come
8 in and address some of the ideas about how your guys
9 can make better use of the Desktop, and I think we need
10 to add that to part of the discussion, so we can keep
11 the dialogue continuing other than normal conference
12 calls. We need the ability to share information and
13 get feedback.
14   MR. TAPELLA: Just in answer to your first
15 question, Gwen -- would Hawai'i like to talk to --
16 where's Lance? Is Lance --
17   (Laughter)
18   MR. TAPELLA: Lance is at the back. Why
19 don't the three of you -- you two talk to Lance and see
20 what happens about Hawai'i.
21   MS. SARAH HOLTERHOFF: Mr. Tapella, you
22 mentioned that possible goal of creating a point-in-
0063
1 time system, which sounded very interesting for the
2 entire Legon (ph) regulatory system. I had a smaller

3 question than that, but the ECFR, which is such a great
4 point-in-time system for the CFR regulations, I
5 wondered is that going to be migrated to FDsys and when
6 will it be going off beta, which it's been for many
7 years?
8   MR. TAPELLA: I am going to deflect this
9 question to Mike Wash, Chief Information Officer of
10 GPO.
11   (Laughter)
12   MR. TAPELLA: For the timetable piece.
13   (Applause)
14   MR. TAPELLA: Mike, why don't you go to a
15 microphone?
16   MR. MIKE WASH: Thank you, Bob.
17   MR. TAPELLA: You're most welcome.
18   MR. WASH: I'm awful shorter. This is very
19 tall. We're working on the ECFR project now. We have
20 been working with the Federal Register on the ECFR
21 since it was put up, and it's actually their request to
22 create the point-in-time system for the ECFR, and we
0064
1 see that moving into FDsys. We don't have a timeframe
2 for that yet. We're at the very early stages right now
3 of gathering the requirements and creating a plan, but
4 we're probably at least six months away before we would
5 even have a plan. Maybe it's something that we can
6 status at the Spring Meeting in beautiful Buffalo. I
7 can say that because I lived in Upstate New York a long
8 time.
9   (Laughter)
10   MR. WASH: The other part of the question was
11 a general point-in-time or was it just the ECFR?
12   MS. HOLTERHOFF: Just when it was going to
13 be going off beta.
14   MR. WASH: Oh.
15   (Laughter)
16   MR. TAPELLA: I think you have your answer,
17 Sally.
18   (Laughter)
19   MR. WASH: I don't know. Ric, is that a
20 shared decision with the Federal Register on the beta?
21   MR. DAVIS: Yes --
22   MR. WASH:
0065
1   MR. DAVIS: -- it appears to be
2 administrative (inaudible: over talking).

3   MR. TAPELLA: Yes. Actually, Sally, I
 4 could probably add a little bit more. That's actually
 5 a decision that needs to go to the Administrative
 6 Committee of the Federal Register, which is chaired by
 7 the Archivist of the United States -- I'm on the
 8 committee -- and a representative of the Attorney
 9 General's Office. As you know, we don't yet have an
10 archivist. He's not yet been confirmed, but as soon as
11 he is confirmed, we are planning on holding an
12 administrative committee meeting, and I'll make certain
13 that that gets in the discussion topics with Ray
14 Mosley, who is the Director of the Federal Register,
15 who is the secretary of the committee, to see if we can
16 perhaps make a decision at the next meeting.
17   MR. DAVIS: And I guess I'd like to add one
18 more thing to what Mike said to answer the question
19 about new systems. Since Mike took over the IT
20 responsibilities at GPO and joined us -– wow, I guess
21 it's almost, what, five years ago -- any system that we
22 do we now have a phases and gates process. It starts
0066
 1 with the concept of operations. It then moves into a
 2 requirements phase and so on, and so we are very
 3 systematic about making changes as we move forth and
 4 following a very careful process that is all done very
 5 publicly through our program office and up on the web
 6 page.
 7   And so as we progress in this everyone will be
 8 able to see where we are with any one of these projects
 9 from the migration that we were talking about earlier
10 on some of the legacy systems as well as this ECFR
11 migration.
12   MR. DAVID CISMOWSKI: In Tampa, we were all
13 just very excited about the digitization RFP
14 announcement that it was imminent that an award was
15 going to be given; and now, unfortunately, it's all
16 come crashing down. My question is has there been any
17 consideration, was there any possibility of issuing a
18 new RFP revised according to what we learned with the
19 failure of the first one to try to interest more than
20 one possible entity in doing a very careful and long-
21 term digitization project at no cost?
22   MR. DAVIS: That is a good question. I
0067
 1 think that what we need to do -- and I might have
 2 mentioned it earlier, and if I didn't I apologize -- I

3 think we need to go through a good, sound process of
4 how we do this. Sound process meaning I think we need
5 to go back and look at some of the questions that arose
6 after GPO decided that we as an agency were ready to
7 make an award. Issues around personal identifiable
8 information, issues around what role the true funding
9 model and cost be for a national digitization project,
10 what are the long-term cost to the Government Printing
11 Office, how is the information ingested into FDsys and
12 authenticated, and what does authentication perhaps
13 mean for digitized content. In talking to our
14 procurement staff -- and Herb Jackson is here, and
15 he'll be at our afternoon session, where we can drill
16 into this in more detail. We've talked about doing
17 another industry day to have discussions with,
18 obviously, partners who may be interested in doing this
19 again.
20   Looking back at our requirements that we put
21 forward, there were also some questions about our
22 standards, are our standards too rigid? Should we
0068
1 focus on access first or access and preservation
2 together as we did the last time? I think those are
3 things we need to talk more about this afternoon as
4 well. We also need to look at where potential
5 partnership opportunities from the library community
6 fit into this overall scheme. Since September 30, I've
7 been approached by three different library groups about
8 formal partnership and what does that mean in regards
9 to the work that they're doing, whether that content
10 meets the standards for preservation and access for
11 ingest into FDsys. I think we need to have that
12 dialogue.
13   And then also the other thing that's changed,
14 of course, is we have funding, and we didn't have
15 funding before. How can we use the funding and how can
16 that perhaps be an enticement that didn't exist when we
17 had no funding.
18   MR. SHULER: I think we have time for one
19 more question. Anything down this way? Chris.
20   MR. CHRISTOPHER GREER: I was pleased to
21 hear the direction to pay attention to capabilities for
22 large-scale data download. One of the things that I've
0069
1 championed on Council has been application program
2 interface capability, or API capability, for FDsys.

3 And so I hope that we'll have a chance during this
4 Council meeting to talk a little bit more about how
5 enhanced API capability is going to be built into that.
6 One assumes that people in the audience are amongst
7 those who are going to download those dataset and
8 create the kinds of mashups that you mentioned using
9 Federal data in combination with local data to meet
10 local interest.
11   So it seems to me one of the things we ought
12 to talk about terms of FY 2011 funding is what would it
13 take to enable the group to make maximum use of that
14 capability.
15   MR. TAPELLA: Great question, Chris. And
16 Jim Jacobs, one of our new Council members, is actually
17 holding a session -- Pardon? Oh, James --
18   MALE SPEAKER: Jim.
19   MR. TAPELLA: -- Jim -- What?
20   MALE SPEAKER: The other Jim is holding the
21 session.
22   MR. TAPELLA: Oh, the other Jim is holding
0070
1 session.
2   (Laughter)
3   MR. TAPELLA: Who's holding session?
4   (Laughter)
5   MR. TAPELLA: Oh, two Jims.
6   FEMALE SPEAKER: There's a Jim and there's a
7 James.
8   MR. SHULER: It confuses us all the time.
9   MR. TAPELLA: Oh, Jim --
10   (Laughter)
11   MR. TAPELLA: The other -- the other one is
12 holding a session.
13   (Laughter)
14   MR. TAPELLA: Just to confuse me.
15   MALE SPEAKER: Yes.
16   (Laughter)
17   MR. TAPELLA: Okay. Whatever. There's
18 going to be a session later on --
19   (Laughter)
20   MR. TAPELLA: -- on this. So maybe I ought
21 to let Ric answer this question.
22   (Laughter)
0071
1   MR. DAVIS: We're having this educational
2 session coming up on the topic of digital deposit and

3   what that means in terms of the future of the FDLP.
 4   Bob mentioned in his speech our interest in continuing
 5   to serve as an official repository but also looking at
 6   how GPO can be a distribution channel in partnering
 7   with federal depository libraries, keeping with Title
 8   44 mandate about permanent access so we're not just
 9   having one copy of these materials long-term in a
 10 single location with the Federal Government, that it's
 11 a distributive model in a digital environment similar
 12 to the digital -- similar to the environment we had in
 13 the print world. So I think in terms of looking at the
 14 agenda that session is probably a good place to have
 15 the discussion about where we go with API as well as
 16 digital deposits.
 17   MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. We're about
 18 at the noon hour, which I have learned after 26 years
 19 in academia you never want to get between anybody and
 20 their lunch.
 21   So I want to thank the Public Printer and the
 22 Superintendent of Documents for willing to work with
0072
 1   this, but I have a couple of more announcements, so
 2   don't jump away yet. So thank you, Bob.
 3   MR. TAPELLA: Thank you, Ric.
 4   MR. DAVIS: Absolutely.
 5   (Applause)
 6   MR. SHULER: You can tell that we've got this
 7   new routine down like -- but the afternoon session
 8   begins promptly at -- somebody remind me --
 9   MALE SPEAKER: Two.
 10   MR. SHULER: -- 2 o'clock. Thank you. And
 11 before we go, the Regional Selectives Lunch is today.
 12 Check the message board. The D.C., Delaware, and
 13 Maryland region members who would like to gather for
 14 lunch Monday should meet with Bill Sleeman near the
 15 hotel's main desk.
 16   And finally, for the law librarians, dinner
 17 tonight, sign up in the registration area. And I'm
 18 beginning to feel like Garrison Keillor here. Finally,
 19 this is important, the hotel café is doing a lunch
 20 buffet; menu on the message board. So if you're
 21 heading back to get your lunch, keep that in mind. And
 22 I think that's it. Thank you very much. We'll see you
0073
 1   during the afternoon. Oh, wait a minute. Somebody's
 2   leaving.

3   FEMALE SPEAKER: New York meets here. Our

 4 regional isn't here we just discovered. The region is

 5 going out to lunch. We can gather right here.

 6   MR. SHULER: New York meet there. Anybody

 7 else? Any other states that are lost?

 8   (Laughter)

 9   MR. SHULER: See everybody after lunch.

10   (Off the record)

11   (On the record -- Afternoon Plenary Session)

12   MR. SHULER: All right. We've come together.

13 Find a seat. We'll continue with the plenary sessions,

14 the ones for this afternoon, and since I got slapped

15 upside the head about my responsibilities by the GPO

16 staff, I will say this once and very clearly. This

17 room is built for wireless. Let's hear it for that.

18   (Applause)

19   MR. SHULER: So if you've been mucking around

20 on your computer back there, you can get on the

21 Internet courtesy of GPO. Thank you very much.

22   Also very important and this is even in

0074

 1 capital letters; I'll even read this out very

 2 carefully: When speaking, please state your name and

 3 your place of origin for the court reporter, and

 4 particularly the folks in the back do not be shy, step

 5 up to the mics; they're there for you. We want you to

 6 use them. And the people in the front, the same

 7 because the people in the back can't see the people in

 8 the front; the people in the front can't see the people

 9 in the back. You get my meaning.

10   So without further ado, I would like to

11 explain a little bit why we're in this situation where

12 we find ourselves on the same floor level as you all.

13 And what we have tried to do is to take the

14 recommendations instead of turning them into a series

15 of presentation first by GPO followed by questions from

16 Council and then questions from the audience, we want

17 to turn this into more of a conversation first among

18 Council members and then with members of the audience.

19 We are very, very interested in what you have to say.

20 We have studied on these things for the last six months

21 and have come up with a structure and approach to many

22 of these recommendations. And what we decided during

0075

 1 the summer is we selected five of the recommendations

 2 that we felt were extremely important to the community,

3 and we developed these smaller sessions, these plenary
4 sessions, this afternoon around those issues. So the
5 reason why we are closer to you in this fashion with
6 our arms opened up in solidarity to purposes is to
7 invite you to interact with us, to raise questions, to
8 raise points, and return the Council to what was a very
9 long and honorable tradition that still exists where we
10 use these working sessions to get feedback from the
11 community.
12   So without further ado, the rest of the 90
13 minutes before the break will be turned over to the
14 group that is looking at the digitization project
15 aspects, and I ask Suzanne Sears to step up to the mic
16 and run the operations. Thank you.
17   MS. SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University
18 of North Texas Libraries.   I welcome you all here.
19 I'm glad to see a larger turnout. I know we're not up
20 against anything, so I guess that helps.
21   (Laughter)
22   MS. SEARS: But for those of you who were

1 not at the Spring Meeting, we did -- Council presented
2 several recommendations to GPO. Some of those were
3 read and responded to this morning. I don't know if
4 you received in your packets the recommendations or
5 not. Did they get the --
6   Okay. Today what we're discussing is
7 Recommendation 2 and Recommendation 3. We've combined
8 them for this meeting. So just briefly, Recommendation
9 2 is that Council further recommends that GPO maintain
10 a list of libraries volunteering to participate in
11 collaborative digitization projects according to GPO's
12 standard and that GPO take the lead in coordinating
13 these projects. And Recommendation 3 was that Council
14 further recommends that to encourage collaborative
15 digitization projects GPO requests funding for a state-
16 based grant program for depository libraries to fulfill
17 the goal of digitizing the legacy collection. And so
18 those are the two recommendations that we would
19 primarily like to discuss today.
20   Basically, what we're looking for is an open
21 discussion. We would like to hear from you things that
22 you're concerned about, things you would like to see.

1 We also are hoping to get out of this session a
2 possible listing of actual libraries that would like to

3 work on collaboration with GPO so that we have a
 4 starting point; so if you do feel that, yes, there are
 5 digitization projects that you would be wanting to
 6 collaborate on, we need to get started with a list so
 7 that we have "these are the libraries that we can call
 8 on to help with this."
 9   Parameters for the discussion, can we -- we
10 would like to try and keep this as general as possible
11 and not institution specific if possible. And the
12 Public Printer this morning asked us to also work --
13 now that they did get funding this year -- on creating
14 a spending plan for the digitization money, so we can
15 expand our discussion to talk about that too because we
16 will be trying between now and Buffalo to get something
17 together as far as the money, the $500,000, that Ric
18 talked about this morning, so we can expand it to that.
19   So we want to just start first with
20 Recommendation 2, and we had a couple of questions
21 outlined in case we needed them to get the discussion
22 started. We would like to know what libraries are now
0078
 1 considering digitization projects. Can we see like a
 2 show of hands? I know my library is.
 3   (Pause)
 4   MS. SEARS: And so I know I would like to
 5 ask that maybe at the end of this session if you could
 6 come forward and at least let us get your name and your
 7 institution down. That would be extremely helpful for
 8 us to get a starting point.
 9   I guess I should also introduce the four of
10 the Council members who are working on these two
11 recommendations. Chris Greer, who's down here, and
12 Victoria Trotta, and James Jacobs and myself are the
13 four that are working on these two recommendations.
14   We also had a question from Council as far as
15 what percentage of library digitization projects are
16 actually registered. So for those of you who raised
17 your hand that you are working on digitization
18 projects, can I see a show of hands of who is not yet
19 registered with GPO on the digitization registry site?
20   (Pause)
21   MS. SEARS: Okay. So you guys we really
22 need you to come up and get your name because we need
0079
 1 to get those projects registered. They need to be up
 2 so that everybody knows what everybody is doing so that

3   we can collaborate together.
 4   Do one of you want to take -- we were
 5   interested in the steps to get registered and how to
 6   get nonGPO digitization projects ingested into FDsys.
 7   We talked a little bit about that this morning. One of
 8   you want to take it further or are we asking it from
 9   GPO?
10   (Pause)
11   MS. VICTORIA TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona
12   State University. It was very interested -- really
13   appreciated the remarks that Mr. Tapella and Mr. Davis
14   gave us this morning about these two projects, and I
15   guess I would like to hear a little more from them.
16   One of the things that I thought that came out this
17   morning that was new to me was that GPO was going to go
18   back and rethink about the standards that they had set
19   out in the RFP and whether or not those could be
20   reconfigured, and I thought that might be sort of a way
21   to talk about how to interest libraries in digitization
22   projects. I know from my own library I'm happy to do
0080
 1   something, but I don't know where to start or I don't
 2   want to duplicate effort. I don't want to do any of
 3   those things, so I'm wondering how as a group we can
 4   help manage that process or assist GPO in managing that
 5   process.
 6   So I guess my first question is, Ric, what
 7   did you mean or could you give us a little more
 8   information about how you were thinking about the
 9   standards that were put forth in the RFP and how they
10   might be liberalized?
11   MR. DAVIS: What I was looking for on that
12   was I think David asked me the question about what
13   efforts we might want to make to expand interest in
14   this given that there was only one bidder, and what I
15   was proposing and I think we need to talk about this is
16   what our goals are. When we put out our RFP the first
17   time, our goal behind that was to get a preservation-
18   level quality file from which access-level derivates
19   could be created to expand access.
20   One of the questions that I think I have is,
21   is that being too restrictive, and it's something we
22   ought to talk about is, is our goal to revisit the
0081
 1   standards with the first goal of expanding access or
 2   should we continue to focus on a preservation-level

3 file from which access derivates can be created. And
4 the reason I bring that up is when I look at a lot of
5 the projects that are in the registry and also in
6 conversations that I've had with others who are engaged
7 in digitization projects what I'm often hearing is
8 focus on access. So that's what I meant when I brought
9 that up and maybe a topic or discussion about what our
10 approach should be.
11   MS. TROTTA: Thank you.
12   (Pause)
13   MR. CHRISTOPHER GREER: I guess I'd like to
14 hear from my fellow Council members as well as from GPO
15 on this particular point. What I didn't hear was if
16 you focus on access, relatively low quality, high-
17 speed, low-cost scanning what's the next step and how
18 far off is the next step? What's the community willing
19 to accept in terms of a timeline? Is access something
20 that's okay for the next 24 months? Next 7 years?
21 What's really the goal and what's the community willing
22 to accept in terms of delaying in some sense the
0082
1 business of creating preservation-level documents?
2   MR. SHULER: I think at this point I should
3 look at the community and ask -- redirect the question
4 because, obviously, the Council and GPO have been in
5 this dialogue for over six months. What we would be --
6 especially with a dozen or so of you already doing
7 these digitization projects what do you think and what
8 would you be interested in how these projects shape up
9 in terms of standardization?
10   MS. MARGARET JOBE: Peggy Jobe, the
11 University of Colorado at Boulder. And one of my big
12 fear is original is if we go with an access model as
13 opposed to a preservation model that a lot of selectors
14 will be drastically reduced their collections, and we
15 won't have preservation-quality copies to do the second
16 pass. So that's just my basic fear. And I know that
17 whenever I see digits projects I immediately get a rush
18 of request to downsize.
19   MS. MORIEARTY: This led me to wonder how
20 many of you are digitizing projects as part of a state
21 plan or a coordinated state effort?
22   (Pause)
0083
1   MS. MORIEARTY: One.
2   (Pause)

3   MS. TROTTA: That's where the selectors were.
4   Bill.
5   MR. SLEEMAN: Responding to your question,
6   John. I guess I would
7   MS. TROTTA: Bill, can you do your name and
8   institution, please.
9   MR. SLEEMAN: Oh, yes. Bill Sleeman,
10   University of Maryland School of Law. I guess I would
11   urge GPO to keep that standards high and not look at an
12   access model as their response. I find it unlikely
13   that -- from my perspective that the only reason the
14   vendor -- you only got one vendor in response was the
15   standards for digitization I suspect there's probably
16   other issues like the return on investment that might
17   have been a bigger consideration. But really if you go
18   to an access model, you're not going to have the long-
19   term project -- long term reliability. I think
20   digitization for access is something that we can do
21   more readily in the community, but we really can't
22   invest the dollars to do the high-quality preservation.
0084
1   A lot of us cannot do that. We don't have the funds
2   for that. We can do a pretty, fast, easy-access
3   project. And I guess I'm relying on GPO and NAR (ph)
4   and groups like that to do the high-level preservation
5   access, and I would urge you not to change or
6   reconsider your standards because I think your
7   standards are very good and very high as they should
8   be.
9   MR. GREER: So that's the first time I've
10   heard that, that the community effort might be viewed
11   as an access-level effort, and presumably each of you
12   would be focusing on those things for which access is
13   most important to you while GPO would for its part be
14   focusing on preservation-level issues, and I'd be
15   interested in hearing from others about how they view
16   that strategy.
17   MS. TROTTA: Geoffrey.
18   MR. GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoffrey Swindells,
19   Northwestern University. I agree with everything
20   that's been said about preservation-level copies, and I
21   think that's certainly a role for GPO. However, I
22   would like to make sure that access-level copies, and
0085
1   those of us who are doing this from access-level
2   preservation that that material get out there and be

3 available for folks to use until we get preservation
4 copies. And I'm not sure how best to do that, but
5 centralizing discovery tool so this is available
6 whether this use copy can go into FDsys, etcetera,
7 etcetera, as an interim measure is something that I
8 think is very important because those use-copy projects
9 are going to be much faster than preservation copy
10 projects although those preservation copy projects do
11 need to be taking place.
12   MR. SHULER: Let me ask the question -- Let
13 me ask the people that raised their hands and said they
14 were doing digitization projects let's ask
15 specifically, are you doing those digitization projects
16 for preservation purposes, raise your hand if you are?
17   (Pause)
18   MR. SHULER: Not as many. So the rest of
19 you are access only or primarily focused on access?
20   FEMALE SPEAKER: Both.
21   MR. SHULER: Both. How many of you are doing
22 both?
0086
1   (Pause)
2   MR. SHULER: A few more. Okay. Thank you.
3   MS. TROTTA: Larry.
4   MR. LAWRENCE MEYER: Larry Meyer, San
5 Bernardino County Law Library. And in answer to John's
6 first question, I would hope that any standards would
7 not forget about the authentication of primary
8 authority and make sure that there is a chain of
9 custody and authentication because many of these -- our
10 users and I'm sure many other people's users here need
11 that assurance in digital products, and we don't have
12 that assurance on a lot of those products now.
13   MS. SEARS: That does bring up something
14 that I had a conversation last week about chain of
15 custody and possible being able to put in metadata
16 where the original source was from. For instance, at
17 UNT, we have the cyber cemetery and we have the Office
18 of Technology Assessment Documents. Some of those
19 documents that we have in the cyber cemetery came
20 directly from the OTA and were never distributed to
21 depository libraries. So being able to view in the
22 metadata that that material came directly from the
0087
1 agency as opposed to the depository library copy, as
2 opposed to gift, I think is something that we need to

3 be thinking about including into the metadata or in
4 some way making it so that we can see. I do think
5 chain of custody is a large issue.
6   MR. CHRIS BROWN:
                Chris Brown, University of
7 Denver. To me there seems to be a missing piece to all
8 of these standards, and that is metadata creation. We
9 have all these wonderful digitization projects but no
10 mandate or recommendation from Council that if you want
11 to be a partner with the GPO you must also create or
12 clone the corresponding marked records, so it doesn't
13 do any good to have a digitization project for which
14 libraries cannot load the records. What I'm proposing
15 for Colorado libraries and partnership University of
16 Denver with the University of Colorado at Boulder there
17 will be a SunRise scanner purchased in the next coming
18 months, and we plan to digitize our microform
19 collection. At the same time that we do that, I don't
20 know that we can create preservation-level copies from
21 that, sad to say, because they are microforms, but we
22 certainly can create access copies.
0088
1   What I propose to do at the same time as
2 making this collection is that we take the marked
3 records and clone them. We would contribute them to
4 OCLC, but we would also genericize them by stripping
5 out any proprietary marks, and we would genericize them
6 and put them up on a server for the depository
7 community, so that way they could be loaded into FDsys.
8 They could be downloaded by any depository library, and
9 they would be a way in which depository libraries if
10 they should want to selective could eliminate parts of
11 their fiche and eliminate the records but then
12 simultaneously load the marked records in. So I see
13 that as a good model that we should be working toward,
14 not just creation of preservation- or access-level
15 digital copies but also creation of metadata that can
16 be loaded instantly into our catalogs.
17   MR. GREER: I'm interested in this chain of
18 custody question. And a question for GPO is even for a
19 project that -- digitization project that GPO is
20 conducting, you may need to get some of the documents
21 from outside the agency. Have you decided on a chain-
22 of-custody plan for dealing with those situations and
0089
1 how does it apply to the example we just heard?

2   MS. ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED:
                  Robin Haun-Mohamed,
3 GPO. We believe, as you do, that the material is not
4 all at GPO, and in fact we have been collecting it for
5 the last several years, and we've been keeping track of
6 what we've collected and where we've collected it from.
7 That information has got to go into the metadata
8 record, and in fact Suzanne and I were having that
9 discussion when I was visiting. I think it's very
10 important that we're able to trace as far as we can
11 that chain of custody, and it may be that the
12 information is unknown, but that should also be in the
13 records so that people can make up their minds is this
14 is the best source or not. It also allows us to be
15 able to make that material available but still look for
16 a different copy of a -- a copy that you can trace
17 back.
18   MS. TROTTA: Okay. So again, I just want to
19 encourage everybody in the audience to participate. We
20 want as much dialogue back from you as possible
21 because, like John said, we've talked amongst ourselves
22 and with GPO, so we are needing your feedback.
0090
1   What specifically would you the community like
2 to see from GPO to help facilitate digitization
3 projects at your own institutions?
4   MR. SHULER: Let me rephrase the question.
5 For those of you who did not raise your hand, why
6 aren't you digitizing? Why aren't you contributing to
7 this greater project?
8   MS. BETH ROWE: John, I got up before you
9 asked your question. Beth Rowe, UNC-Chapel Hill. I've
10 been wanting to hear more from GPO about digital
11 deposits as a regional, slightly different subject, but
12 I'll tie it in, trust me, for a couple of years now
13 because I had wondered if they're depositing records
14 with us a regionals would be a mechanism that we could
15 use to deposit back digitization projects with them.
16 So I'm interested in whether or not that is a
17 possibility.
18   MS. MARY JANE WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh,
19 Colgate University, and I'll answer John since I
20 inherited his collection.
21   MR. SHULER: Thanks.
22   MS. WALSH: You're welcome. The original
0091

1   question is those of you who are considering
2   digitization, so I raised my hand. Small, liberal
3   arts, undergraduate college, few resources, many more
4   than many of my colleagues. I freely admit that, and
5   I've had a Cold War-era duck-and-cover pamphlet project
6   on the backburner for the past five years because of my
7   boss. Now, I don't think GPO can help me with that,
8   unfortunately.
9   So what can we do? I have a couple of fears
10 about digitization is the sort of thing that I've been
11 pulling out of my collection to digitize are those
12 things I think are going to be gray materials that are
13 gone. And John, I'll tell you my said story about the
14 Bureau of Indian Affairs pamphlets, which directed
15 Native Americans into selected careers where I weeded
16 from our collection; and as soon as I did that, I had a
17 senior research student looking for exactly that sort
18 of information. So it's these sorts of things that GPO
19 is probably not going to put high on their priority
20 list. Yes, I want to see the important legislative
21 materials, which make up the bulk of the use of my
22 collection, digitized, and I want GPO to concentrate on
0092
1   making or accepting for deposit preservation-level
2   scans because what good are the access-level scans --
3   50 years from now they'll be no better than the fiche
4   that's crumpling in our hands.
5   So small libraries like me I appreciate the
6   fact that standards are posted on the web site. I had
7   -- I will freely admit I don't know if we have the
8   quality machinery although we brought two expensive
9   scanners in the last five years as we try to get our
10 acts together. That's probably why we can't afford to
11 scan; we're too busy scanning. So it's a matter of
12 personnel, and it's a matter of technical expertise. I
13 think if the standards are there and we what sorts of
14 things we need to do to help we can maybe pull that
15 off. The next few years in this economic climate I
16 don't think many of us are going to be able to help
17 because anybody who leaves in our institution is not
18 being replaced including a retirement next year. So --
19 anyway, hope I answered both your questions. And, no,
20 I haven't registered because I'm still thinking rather
21 than doing.
22   MS. SEARS: Before you leave. So in April
0093

1 in Tampa we heard from the community that perhaps one
 2 of the things that they needed was from GPO to approach
 3 the director and say it's important that you digitized
 4 this set here. Would that help move your director one
 5 way or the other do you think?
 6   MS. WALSH: Probably not. It's not that
 7 she's put a roadblock in the way, but there was a time
 8 period that -- there was a window of opportunity to
 9 scan, and, unfortunately, it was at a time period of
10 turnover, and the new boss has a new way of doing
11 things, and perhaps, but the concentration now is -- I
12 don't know. I don't know the answer. I will go back
13 and ask her.
14   MS. SEARS: And if --
15   MS. WALSH: We're concentrating on our
16 special collections. I think the duck-and-cover
17 pamphlets are a special collection, but --
18   MS. SEARS: If you could ask --
19   MS. WALSH: I will.
20   MS. SEARS: -- and then let one of us on
21 Council know the answer --
22   MS. WALSH: Certainly.
0094
 1   MS. SEARS: -- that would be very helpful.
 2   MS. WALSH: Okay.
 3   MS. SEARS: Thank you. Arlene.
 4   MS. ARLENE LIDDELL: Arlene Liddell, from
 5 the Oregon State Library. I guess I'm still kind of
 6 trying to understand why we're talking about libraries
 7 doing all of this work when in fact Google has already
 8 don't it. And that's certainly if I think about
 9 talking to my director about digitization projects
10 that's his first answer, "Well, isn't Google doing
11 this." And what we need to do is figure out how to get
12 access to the stuff that's already been done. And I
13 know CIC is working on a project with them, but I would
14 like to know what GPO plans or doesn't plan to do with
15 working with Google and what is out there in existing
16 projects.
17   MS. TROTTA: James.
18   MR. JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
19 University. I'm not sure how much I can legally say
20 about that, but I know that Google is not digitizing
21 everything. They have specific size, dimension, and
22 other types of issues, so in my collection maybe 40
0095

1   percent. That's a gross estimate. Don't quote me on
 2   that, but Google is not doing everything.
 3   A couple of, well, one comment and then an
 4   idea. I don't know that this preservation versus
 5   access is such a good dichotomy to be discussing
 6   because in the digitization effort a lot of times what
 7   you're doing is you're digitizing to TIFF, which is a
 8   preservation standard, and then you're converting from
 9   TIFF to PDF or text or other kinds of standards, which
10   are access standards. So in the process of
11   digitization, you're doing both already. So I don't
12   know that we should get bogged down in that sort of
13   discussion.
14   The idea that I was thinking of the
15   digitization registry is already happening, and there
16   was a July document called "Priorities for Digitization
17   of Historical Collections," GPO July 20, 2009. It's
18   available on fdlp.gov. There is a list of some
19   priorities, but I think that list could be expanded and
20   could be expanded with the help of the community in
21   that it doesn't have to just be GPO saying digitize the
22   hearing, and digitize this and digitize that. It could
0096
 1   the community saying, "Hey, we need you to digitize or
 2   we need somebody to digitize the BIA pamphlets." That
 3   kind of stuff. So I'd like to see an expanded sort of
 4   registry in which the community could help build that
 5   registry.
 6   MR. SHULER: Another answer to that why do we
 7   have to do this if Google has done everything. Many of
 8   the publications such as the hearings include
 9   copyrighted material, which throws it out of complete
10   viewing under Google standards. I have found this with
11   many hearing throughout the decades. Some you get
12   lucky on, but I've become more cautious about
13   recommending those hearing that have been digitized by
14   various Google projects for exactly that reason. They
15   fall under the copyright gray area.
16   MS. TROTTA: I think Ric has a comment.
17   MR. DAVIS: I don't want to speak for Mark.
18   Is Mark Samler (ph) in the room?
19   Well, I guess I get to speak for Mark.
20   (Laughter)
21   MR. DAVIS: Mark and I have been having
22   discussions not only in the past week but in the past
0097

1   months about the effort. GPO is certainly supportive
2   of any digitization effort, but it fall under certain
3   parameters: Open, free, permanent access. And if the
4   CIC would like to make that project available in the
5   registry, we're very happy to point to it. One thing
6   that gets a little bit tricky though is -- I think Bill
7   Sleeman made a very good comment about what the
8   Government's role should be and sticking with this
9   approach about preservation-level quality. I think as
10 we're approached by various parties about giving us
11 content to also put in FDsys -- I'm sort of asking this
12 as a question of Council and the community as well --
13 is that something we want to do? If the CIC or another
14 group was to make that information available, is it
15 enough to point to it through a registry like we have
16 or even an enhanced registry? Do you also want to
17 duplicate the effort of putting it in FDsys if it
18 doesn't meet a preservation-level standard?
19   And my second point to that is one of the
20 things I'd like to talk about as well during the
21 Conference is what can we do to make the registry
22 better so that you will want to come to it. One of the
0098
1   comments I heard on break was they'd like to see the --
2   someone said they'd like to see the registry give a
3   complete title listing of every project. I'm
4   interested in hearing things like that as well.
5   MS. LAURA HORNE-POPP: Laura Horne-Popp,
6   University of Richmond. We actually do have projects
7   registered. We do the America of War 1941 and 1945
8   project, and I like to think of our project as a
9   success because the standards that GPO helped
10 established are so good. That's just the platform we
11 use for all of our digitization now. So I think the
12 way that we were able to go about it because we were
13 very careful in selecting our parameters, we only
14 wanted to look at the life of the soldier during World
15 War 2, we could consider high level of preservation
16 because we weren't doing something like all the
17 hearings or anything like that.
18   So I think for some people if you can get your
19 parameters situated in such a way where you get to
20 focus on a collection that means something or you can
21 meet a need because I think you had an excellent
22 suggestion about matching needs with want to do
0099

1   something -- you get a better handle on it, because I
 2   don't think my institution would be willing to just
 3   make access-level material because they don't want to
 4   do it again in a few years.
 5   So I think because we were able to make this
 6   argument these standards are so good, we could use it
 7   across all of our collections. And because of that now
 8   we're integrating our Government documents into larger
 9   projects, so we're actually in the process of doing
10   kind of "America's Occupier," where we're digitizing
11   all the Japanese criminal war trial material, and we're
12   doing it with the strategic bombing survey.
13   So we're not even trying to separate out those
14   materials anymore. We're trying to pull them together.
15   And we would not have been able to do that if we
16   weren't able to kind of wave those high-level
17   standards. So I strongly advocate for it. I think
18   it's a matter of parameters and biting off what you can
19   actually chew.
20   MS. TROTTA: At the back mic. I think you
21   were first.
22   FEMALE SPEAKER: I think we came up about
0100
 1   the same time.
 2   MS. RAMONA HILTON: I'm Ramona Hilton. I'm
 3   from East Stroudsburg University in northeast
 4   Pennsylvania, in the Pocono area. I have a collection
 5   that I've been looking at digitizing on Tox Island, on
 6   the whole Tox Island situation, which I believe took in
 7   Federal agencies. I'm also part of the depository
 8   librarians of State system of Pennsylvania's libraries.
 9   I know that there are some collaborative efforts that
10   are taking place in digitizing things. The thing that
11   comes up for me is money, grants. I'm open to
12   accepting if there is something that I'm missing, but
13   grants and money is not staring me in the face like
14   where are the dollars are going to come from.
15   I'm a small depository, a selective
16   depository. A lot of the other state system libraries,
17   document collections are also selective. I hear money,
18   a grant information from our state collaborative, but
19   I'm not hearing enough from GPO. So I think -- I don't
20   know about everybody else, but I think that money is
21   big in this, and if you could give us some grants that
22   might inspire us; also that might help us to take it to
0101

1   our supervisors because people like to, they always --
 2   it always good when you say that I got a grant and I
 3   did this great things, so maybe we might want to
 4   consider grants. Money. Funding.
 5   MS. SEARS: That sort of takes us into
 6   Recommendation 3, and I'd like to defer to GPO to
 7   explain their legal authority on grants.
 8   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I'm at the end of the
 9   row. It got passed down to me.
10   (Laughter)
11   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: GPO does not have grant
12   funding authority. We did check in response to the
13   Council's Recommendation 3, and Mr. Priebe had
14   conversation with our General Counsel. That's not
15   within our purview at this time, but we would like to
16   hear further discussion on ways of perhaps moving that
17   discussion forward to another level.
18   MR. GREER: Robin, I wanted to follow up
19   real quickly on that. Did you General Counsel have a
20   position on whether you can contract with a contractor
21   who would be responsible for a grants-making program or
22   a subcontracting program with state entities?
0102
 1   MR. TED PRIEBE: I think there was a handoff
 2   that just happened. Ted Priebe, GPO. The answer to
 3   your question is, yes, we had the discussion with them
 4   in terms of what options, as you described, based on
 5   our salary and expenses appropriations being just that,
 6   an appropriated fund source, there would not be a
 7   vehicle like that for us to use appropriated funds. On
 8   projects such as digitization, it would need to be
 9   conducted in a competitive bidding process. So we
10   would in essence be required to go out with formal
11   requirements. And even though you're a depository
12   library, since it would be a competitive bidding
13   situation, you would literally be submitting proposals
14   in that type of a format were we to even be able to
15   expend fund in that type of manner.
16   So unfortunately, in the answer to that
17   question from a grant perspective, we don't have the
18   authority and we don't have the legal means or ability
19   to go through any organization or another Federal
20   agency that would. I'm sorry to report, but that is
21   the facts, and from the legal perspective, that's
22   really the response that we got.
0103

1   MS. SEARS: Before you sit down, Ted. So
 2 what are our options then?   Would it be possible for
 3 GPO to have like maybe a best practices site where if
 4 we're trying to get a grant we have like some experts
 5 that we can talk to because it may be the first we've
 6 filled out a grant, or is there any way that GPO can
 7 alert us when a grant is available that we could go out
 8 for? I mean are those within your legal purview?
 9   MR. PRIEBE: I think what you're suggesting
 10 to me is another opportunity for the community to look
 11 at as a whole what we can do versus GPO exclusively.
 12 So when you look at community site and we look at all
 13 of the grant opportunities that are out in the Federal
 14 Government, not just in the Federal Government, in the
 15 private sector, and how those grant opportunities are
 16 leveraged and successes that some of you may have had
 17 in terms of getting grant that you won and how you went
 18 about doing that and how that kind of information can
 19 be shared in a collaborative environment to say "Here's
 20 a new opportunity that came out from a public or
 21 private sector group." I would suggest, and I'd be
 22 interested in Council's perspective as well, would that
0104
 1 perhaps not be a better way for the community to
 2 interact and have multiple opportunities, not just say
 3 one depository that puts in a grant proposal, maybe
 4 several.
 5   MS. TROTTA: James, you have a comment?
 6   MR. JACOBS: I'm thinking -- I know that the
 7 legal parameters are pretty strict on that for good
 8 reason I'm sure, but I wonder if as part of the
 9 registry, as Suzanne was mentioning, having a list of
 10 granting agencies and the possibilities that -- I know
 11 that IMLS has not in the past couple of years been all
 12 the interested in one-off digitization efforts, but if
 13 they had a stamp of approval from GPO that this was not
 14 just a one-off digitization that a library submitted a
 15 grant for but instead part of a larger permanent
 16 preservation and access initiative, I think that would
 17 go a long way toward helping those with funding give
 18 that funding out to libraries. So just an idea.
 19   MR. PRIEBE: Thank you, James. And another
 20 perspective I might add to you, we have had requests in
 21 the past and LSCM would be happy to continue to support
 22 these requests when folks have grant proposals that
0105

1   they want to put forward that they come through GPO and
2   certainly request a letter of support or as
3   appropriate. That's another vehicle that we are here
4   to try to help and strengthen that regardless of the
5   funding source or funding vehicle that you have, so
6   please consider that as well.
7   MS. TROTTA: Thank you. Okay.
8   MR. MARK ANDERSON: I'm Mark Anderson, from
9   the University of Northern Colorado. I was one of the
10 people that raised my hand when you said how many
11 people have digitization projects that you haven't
12 registered. And so I thought maybe the perspective
13 from somebody who hasn't registered his projects would
14 --
15   MS. TROTTA: And it would be very helpful.
16 Are there barriers to registration or --
17   MR. ANDERSON: No. The reason is because
18 our project was put together in response to a local
19 request. One of our history professors got a great big
20 grant from the Department of Education to put on a
21 series of workshops for K-12 teachers in the -- well,
22 the Navajo reservation region, the Four Corner, yes,
0106
1   southwestern Colorado and -- well, what we call the
2   Four Corners region, and basically he asked me to
3   digitize as many old reports from the Bureau of Indian
4   Affairs and old maps and just anything that had to do
5   with Navajo history that I could find in Government
6   documents that could be scanned without worrying about
7   copyright. Basically, he had the history department
8   grant was paying for the graduate student who did the
9   actual scanning; basically, where I'm going with this
10 is that none of that stuff is going to conform to GPO
11 standards. We just threw it up there because we -- and
12 we also had an imminent time deadline, so we just ran
13 it through the scanner and made it into PDF documents
14 and put it on a web page and -- but there is no
15 metadata or anything. So I've been kind of reluctant
16 to register it because I was afraid I'd get a call from
17 GPO telling me that that doesn't have -- that it
18 doesn't conform to standards. I know that, but there
19 is a lot of really terrible scans in there. It was
20 kind of a rush project, but it was being paid for by
21 somebody other than GPO or the library, so that's --
22   MS. TROTTA: Ric, do you a comment?
0107

```
 1        MR. ANDERSON:   Do you still want that
 2  registered?
 3        MR. DAVIS:   Yes.
 4        (Laughter)
 5        MR. DAVIS:   I want to go on record as saying
 6  we want to know, and --
 7        MR. ANDERSON:   Oh, okay.
 8        MR. DAVIS:   -- it's not about standards in
 9  terms of that awareness.  If any of you have projects,
10  I'm encouraging you to register; and if you find it in
11  any way difficult to register, please let me know
12  because I want to make it as easy as possible to expand
13  full awareness of all of these projects.
14        MR. ANDERSON:   Okay.  Well, the other thing
15  about it is there are some documents where we would
16  just scan four or five pages out of a 200-page document
17  because that was all that had all that related to the
18  Navajos, and we didn't do the whole thing; like we have
19  about 80 or 90 years worth of Bureau of Indian Affairs
20  reports, but just the four or five pages that were
21  actually written by the Navajo agent, so ...
22        MS. TROTTA:   Robin, do you have a comment on
0108
 1  that?
 2        MS. HAUN-MOHAMED:   Yes.  I think it's
 3  important that information like you just explained is
 4  conveyed in the registry, and that's why it's a
 5  registry of collections.  It works to our advantage if
 6  people -- if we know what people are working on.  And
 7  if you have a limitation like that, there is a field
 8  that allows that kind of information and also the
 9  specifications to choose from would include PDFs not to
10  standard, so to speak.  So as Ric said, if you're
11  finding it difficult to register a project, please do
12  let us know because we took the registry from static
13  web pages to the rather unique format that it's in now,
14  and we want this to be useful to all.
15        So I think your project if you would consider
16  registering it would be great.  Thanks.
17        MR. ANDERSON:   Okay.
18        MS. HAUN-MOHAMED:   Thanks.
19        MR. ANDERSON:   I didn't say it was
20  difficult.  I just said I never tried.
21        MS. TROTTA:   I think it's --
22        (Laughter)
0109
```

```
 1        MS. TROTTA:   -- I think it's a very important
 2   question, and I really appreciate that you brought it
 3   up because I do think that maybe that is why some
 4   people have not registered is that they feel that they
 5   don't meet the standards, and it is important for the
 6   entire community to know that you have those available
 7   because we could access them too.  So thank you.
 8   Julia.
 9        MS. JULIA STEWART:   Julia Stewart, Southern
10   Methodist University.  Let's see.  I look forward to
11   working on a digital project some day.  I've in the
12   past year have worked on -- ran into some stumbling
13   blocks, and I'm hoping that can -- can find out some
14   more information here.  I was working on a group of --
15   it was from the Department of Social Research, which
16   does not exist any longer.  It had to do with photos.
17   It had to do with charts and graphs put together that
18   centered around WPA projects.  We didn't even register.
19   We did -- my team did contact GPO in regard to
20   copyright because we were concerned about the photos
21   because they were from very high-profile photographers.
22   Basically, the response we got back was that GPO didn't
0110
 1   know the copyright and that it was on us to find that
 2   out, and I mean that's fine if it's true.  We had in-
 3   house counsel, but that's time.  That's time, that's
 4   three people working on community, stopped right there.
 5   And as the depository coordinator, I was kind of looked
 6   at as -- I should have known more I guess.  So we never
 7   moved forward on that project because we -- Well, first
 8   of all, we figured out that our quality was not going
 9   to be very good and there were others things in
10   American Memory.
11        So the things -- the two questions I have:  It
12   would be helpful to know a little more about copyright,
13   be able to find out more about copyright issues on a
14   project because we can't -- we don't want to -- I can't
15   devote the time to it until I know it's something that
16   can be done within copyright guidelines.
17        And the other suggestion would be -- we didn't
18   even register this, but if there's a -- somebody who
19   could serve as a development-type person because, like
20   I said, we got to a point and we realized the quality
21   wasn't there, and American Memory had a lot of the
22   photos.  I mean yes -- we had everything all in it
0111
```

1 together, and it was a really cool collection that we
2 had the whole run of, but it was done better quality in
3 American Memory as far as the photos were going. So
4 somebody -- if there were somebody in a development
5 situation who could say, "Stop, you're not -- this
6 isn't going to -- this is not unique, this is not
7 quality, we would advise you not to move forward
8 because this isn't going to -- this digital collection
9 won't work. Please move on to something else."
10   And we're fine. We're moving on. I think
11 we're looking into doing something with the military
12 now, something with the Department of Defense. But I
13 would -- I have a great collection I would love to
14 digitize. I need to start out slowly because I don't
15 know a lot about it, but I do have someone to do the
16 metadata. I do have a digital specialist. I have
17 equipment, but I don't -- it's just discouraging when
18 you start doing something and then your -- GPO's
19 response is, "Well, we don't know about the copyright
20 either. If you don't know about it, we don't know
21 about it either." That doesn't make you want to move
22 forward. So that's all I have to say.
0112
1   MS. TROTTA: And Robin, you have a comment?
2   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Yes. It really wasn't a
3 flip answer. It was an honest response. I asked in
4 the agency for specifics on that, and consensus could
5 not be obtained about that particular issue. So the
6 language that I proposed back was --
7   MS. STEWART: Sure.
8   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: -- the language that's
9 found on the American Memories page essentially saying
10 we did our best to do due diligence on this and at this
11 point forward we're putting it forth; and that was our
12 best suggestion. A lot of the material in -- you're
13 going to find it in the Congressional Record, you're
14 going to find it in hearings, as you said, that there's
15 copyrighted material there, and releases were never
16 obtained. If you remember the Royal News Connection
17 and the FBIS fiche, releases were not obtained for much
18 of that material also.
19   That's a really good question, and the timing
20 is excellent, but I hope that people don't think we are
21 being flip at -- what we put forward is our best
22 recommendation in response to that.
0113

1   MS. STEWART: Thanks. We'll looking
 2 forward to moving on and doing something different, and
 3 we understand -- we ended up finding out that it was
 4 more of a quality issue, but believe me, we're trying
 5 to do the best we can too, so -- and that's why we
 6 contacted GPO when we do have questions, so thank you.
 7   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Uh-huh.
 8   MS. TROTTA: Barbie.
 9   MS. BARBIE SELBY: Barbie Selby, University
10 of Virginia. And there's a grants program at this
11 Conference, I think, on Wednesday maybe, so that's --
12 GPO is helping us somewhat with grants by having
13 programs where people who have gotten them can tell the
14 rest of us how to do it.
15   Just in response to what she was saying. I
16 mean I was thinking of like a mentoring thing where
17 somebody like the University of Richmond, who's done a
18 successful project -- there be some putting together of
19 people that could happen through the registry. But the
20 main reason I came up here was we talked by FDsys and
21 the registry and there's WorldCat and there's Google
22 and there's the Catalog of Government Publications and
0114
 1 -- I don't think it has to be the registry is here and
 2 FDsys is there and they don't talk to one another. I
 3 would like to see some more transparency because people
 4 in this room know those things, but Google will it find
 5 it all for us? Probably not. So having some pointer
 6 from FDsys to the registry or something like that might
 7 make some of this a little bit more discoverable than
 8 maybe it is now.
 9   MS. TROTTA: Justin, did you have a comment?
10   MR. OTTO: Yes. Thanks. I've been sitting
11 here thinking about, John, your question: What about
12 all the people who didn't raise their hand? And I'm
13 one of them. And it's not that I don't want to help.
14 It's that at my library -- sorry, I'll move this thing
15 over here -- at my library right now for the next
16 couple of years my time is pretty much all spoken for
17 with my regular work duties. There is no spare student
18 employee time that I can requisition to work on these
19 things in a -- in a big way. But I hear -- everybody
20 is talking about and using the term digitizing sets or
21 digitizing collections. What about just digitizing
22 items, individual items? I think the overall goal --
0115

1 an I'm not saying that anybody is wrong in thinking
2 about things in terms of sets and collections, but I
3 think the overall goal that we're all thinking about is
4 eventually having a digitized full, retrospective
5 collection of documents. So what about all of the, for
6 lack of a better word, scraps that are falling outside
7 of these collections? I would love to have the ability
8 to see things that are not being digitized and when I
9 have time -- like I can't justify a big project, but I
10 could absolutely justify some of my time here and there
11 to try to identify things that are falling outside of
12 these big collections and just pitch in.
13   We have the equipment at my library to produce
14 high quality TIFFs that can be submitted either to one
15 of these big projects or submitted, I'm not sure,
16 straight to FDsys or something like that. I don't know
17 if I'm the only person in the room who thinks, "Well, I
18 can't tackle one of these big things, but I would sure
19 like to pitch me because I feel it's important to try
20 to get these digitization moving forward, but I would
21 love to help." And so I would hope that that idea
22 could become part of the discussion, and I think I may
0116
1 be starting to ramble now. I've got a name tag. I've
2 got a mic.
3   (Laughter)
4   MR. OTTO: Thank you.
5   MS. SEARS: Can I see a show of hands?
6 Would there be others in Justin's situation?
7   (Pause)
8   MS. VALERIE GLENN: Valerie Glenn, University
9 of Alabama, and I'm also one of those people who did
10 not raise my hand before, but I wanted to offer another
11 way that people could contribute to other people's
12 projects, which is what I've, I guess, made my focus
13 on. My institution's priorities do not involve
14 digitizing Government documents. I'm not going to
15 change their mind or try to change their mind at the
16 moment. However, I am a regional, and I have a lot of
17 multiple copies in my collection, and so what I have
18 done is filled in gaps for other people and sent them
19 -- I've sent some to Bill of Civil Rights Commission
20 things. I've sent some to UNT because I know that
21 they're doing a lot, and so I think that's another way
22 for people to help. Even if you don't have the
0117

1 resources to digitize, you can help somebody else.
 2 That's all I wanted to say.
 3   MS. TROTTA: Thank you.
 4   MS. DOROTHY ORMES: I'm Dottie Ormes, from
 5 New Mexico State University, and I had to sit on my
 6 hand to keep it from going up, and that's partly
 7 because I'm a little confused since I've only been at
 8 New Mexico State for a year. Previously, I worked at
 9 Southern Oregon University and worked on a digitization
10 project and did the metadata for some of it. So I'm
11 very excited about digitization, but I find myself in a
12 place that really has no resources and very little
13 understanding of digitization although we just hired
14 ourselves a new metadata library and are thinking about
15 digitization, and I would like to put my two cents'
16 worth in and say, "Ooh, how about Government
17 documents." I'm hesitant to do that because I know
18 from my experiences at Southern Oregon this is very
19 equipment heavy, technology heavy, staff heavy. It's
20 amazing. It's an incredibly complicated process, and
21 I'm a little bit gun shy knowing what we went through
22 at Southern Oregon University to get our project off
0118
 1 the ground and where we got to with it where literally
 2 librarians were at each other's throats almost in terms
 3 of "What's more important that this library," and
 4 digitization was kind of taking over everybody's lives,
 5 and the ones who were into it wanted it to continue to
 6 take over and the others didn't.
 7   I guess what I would say is that when I
 8 thought about it in listening to Justin and what he had
 9 to say that would be the better way for me to go would
10 probably be even to have a suggestion from someone who
11 said, "Ho, we know you've got a really collection in
12 this. Would you like to work with that and present it
13 to your dean" because I do have a dean that's very
14 positive about Government documents and want to support
15 it. And if I came up with a really good small project
16 that could push us to the point of getting the
17 equipment we needed.
18   But the other thing I learned at Southern
19 Oregon University is also making decision on that
20 equipment is a huge piece; deciding whether you're
21 going to do text mostly and really concentrate on your
22 OCR; are you going to do images. I mean there is a lot
0119

1   of decisions that have to be made, and from my
2   experience, a lot of libraries don't have the --
3   sometimes don't have a systems librarian that get it.
4   I know we don't. At Southern Oregon University, we had
5   a systems librarian that got it, but his whole time was
6   consumed doing it, so these are huge issues. We had an
7   IMLS grant. We also got Leader (ph) grants, but then
8   at a certain point, you don't have the grant anymore
9   and your equipment's getting old. So to me those are
10 big issues, and I don't know what GPO can do, but --
11 that's why I did raise my hand. (Laughter)
12   MS. TROTTA: David.
13   MR. CISMOWSKI: The end of the second
14 recommendation is that GPO takes the lead in
15 coordinating these projects. I think that that's a
16 very important desire. I've been listening to
17 discussions about digitization here for over five
18 years, and there is a certain amount of coordinated
19 chaos in both incoming -- the ingest and also what do
20 you do with what's already been digitized, how to
21 organize it, how to find it. One thing that we haven't
22 mentioned at all in this discussion are the
0120
1   digitization projects that Federal Government agencies
2   have been doing on a very large scale. The United
3   States Geological Survey had digitized a tremendous
4   number of heritage documents, so had NASA, the
5   Department of Defense. I'm not sure I know what
6   standards they followed when they did this
7   digitization. I don't know whether they would be
8   willing to share their products with FDsys, whether any
9   discussions have taken place along these lines, but the
10 big thing that's missing for me in this is some kind of
11 coordination. I know that $500,000 is not a whole lot
12 of money, but perhaps some of that $500,000 could be
13 spent toward getting a grip on this whole problem that
14 we have here trying to develop some kind of a map of
15 where we are, where we want to go, and trying to
16 coordinate where we go in the future so that we don't
17 have to repeat what we've done before, so that we
18 realize that there will be these sort of small projects
19 that are not going to be done to specification, which
20 are very valuable for the short-term, maybe even for
21 the long-term, and it should be registered, but they're
22 not really part of the ultimate solution of what we're
0121

1 talking about here.
 2   MS. TROTTA: James Mauldin, do you have a --
 3   MR. JAMES MAULDIN: Yes, James Mauldin, GPO.
 4 In regards to your question, GPO does participate in a
 5 group called FADI, which is the Federal Agencies
 6 Digitization Initiative, where there are approximately
 7 15 different agencies that are doing digitization as we
 8 speak. There's the National Agricultural Library that
 9 has done a lot in the realm of digitizations. LC,
10 Library of Congress, they've done the stats at large.
11 They're doing the bound Congressional Record, and we're
12 working collaboratively with them to ensure that we
13 don't duplicate efforts.
14   So, yes, we do work with other agencies.
15 Other agencies are welcome to add their entries or
16 collections into our registry of Government
17 digitization projects, and eventually we would hope to
18 have those also welcome to FDsys.
19   MR. CISMOWSKI: Thank you. I very much
20 appreciate that. One other thing that I forgot to
21 mention was the day-to-day difficulties that we all
22 have in trying to find out who has done what and what
0122
 1 is available on the Web. There isn't a week that goes
 2 by that I don't see a question posted to gov.al (ph)
 3 from some depository saying "Does anybody know if such
 4 and such a series or such and such a document is
 5 available on the Web." And quite often somebody will
 6 come in, Bill Sleeman or somebody who really knows
 7 what's going on out there and say "Yes, if you go to
 8 the American Presidency web site at UC-Santa Barbara,
 9 you will find all of the presidential papers,
10 etcetera." The problem is that we try to remember all
11 this stuff --
12   (Laughter)
13   MR. CISMOWSKI: -- but my mind fills up
14 after a while and --
15   (Laughter)
16   MR. CISMOWSKI: -- I forget stuff, and I'm
17 sure that you have the same problem, so part of the
18 coordination is discovery.
19   MS. TROTTA: Cindy, did you have a further
20 comment along that line or is -- Okay.
21   MS. CYNTHIA ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Just
22 to add to what James said and to address David's
0123

1 comment about coordination of all of this stuff. In
 2 the beginning of August, I participated in a two-day
 3 meeting at the Library of Congress where the whole
 4 topic was "A National Strategy for Public Policy
 5 Information on the Web." There was a lot of
 6 frustration, as you just expressed, David, in the room
 7 over the two days. By the end of the two days, it was
 8 sort of begging for somebody to coordinate all this
 9 although everybody in the room knew that not any one
10 institution or any one agency could do it all. When we
11 left, there was the suggestion that LCNR and GPO take
12 the lead and work collaboratively together to create
13 that coordination that you're talking about. Now I'm
14 waiting for follow-up on that, but --
15   (Laughter)
16   MS. ETKIN: -- but we have had those
17 discussions.
18   MS. TROTTA: I want to let the lady in the
19 red coat go. She's been standing there for a while.
20   MS. DEBBIE MADSEN: Hi, I'm Debbie Madsen,
21 from Kansas State University. Suzanne, a few minutes
22 ago you asked one of the other questioners whether a
0124
 1 letter to the library director would be beneficial, and
 2 I believe it would be actually. K-State, for example,
 3 is a land grant. I'm thinking that a letter to the
 4 directors at the land-grant libraries could be very
 5 useful. In my experience, directors confined resources
 6 to do what they really want to do, and perhaps a little
 7 push or a little encouragement from GPO might encourage
 8 those of us who did not raise our hands to be able to
 9 raise our hands the next time.
10   MS. TROTTA: Okay. Robin, did you have a...
11   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Cindy, you are a little
12 shorter than I am. David and Council, we had developed
13 the registry, and we have the open forum. We have the
14 discussion here. What else could we do to help
15 collaborate, to coordinate? I will tell you that we
16 have agencies visit GPO waiting for the opportunity
17 ingest materials into the Federal digital system. They
18 are very excited about the possibility of taking the
19 materials that they have either digitized themselves or
20 we'll be digitizing and have a safe place to park it.
21 So that definitely is in the schema and the formulation
22 for the future. But how else can we do it? I did hear
0125

1 the letter. That's a pretty cost-effective way of
2 putting forth. We have a pile of money now. We're not
3 sure quite what to do with that pile of money. I was
4 hoping that we would hear some direction from Council
5 and the community on the spend plan -- Ooh, I like that
6 term, spend plan -- for the digitization efforts. What
7 is the most effective way of doing that.
8   And also Barbie's comment about the
9 information be available via WorldCat, via FDsys, via
10 CGP, via the registry; and like our FLIC group is
11 looking at doing pieceable record. Well, that's
12 already in WorldCat. So can we come together with some
13 of this whole mixture of things with some concrete
14 directions or proposals besides what I'm hearing, and
15 maybe you can confirm that, that you want us to do it
16 to preservation level, that you want us to do it to
17 TIFF images.
18   MS. TROTTA: Justin, did you have a comment?
19 Okay.
20   MS. MARIE CONCANNON: Marie Concannon,
21 University of Missouri-Columbia. When we speak about
22 Federal agencies that have digitized materials on the
0126
1 Web, I wonder whether we can completely trust that, and
2 I would like to give an example. The Current
3 Industrial Reports, of course, long ago it started out
4 as a paper document; and then at a certain point in
5 time, I believe in the 1990's, they changed it, and
6 they said "Well, you look at this electronic bulletin
7 board on this new thing called the Web," and so people
8 looked to that. And then later on, they started taking
9 down the older editions of the Current Industrial
10 Report; and as of last summer, when I was working with
11 it pretty heavily with a patron, we discovered that we
12 could get it back on the Web back to 2002, but anything
13 before that was historic, and you had to pay the Census
14 Bureau $15 for each report that you wanted. Now as of
15 a couple of week ago, the patron who I was working with
16 alerted me. He said "Do you know that they took down
17 that stuff? Now we can only get it back two years."
18 And I looked, and he was right. Now you can only see
19 the Current Industrial Reports back for two years, and
20 everything before that is historic, and you have to pay
21 $15 for it.
22   Now there's a couple of things that concern
0127

1 me. Is this a copyright thing? I know that GPO
 2 they're system with PURLs if -- they will point to the
 3 agency's web site, and if the agency should take it
 4 down, they would then point to their archived version.
 5 But if the agency takes it down because they want to
 6 start collecting money for it, will GPO still be able
 7 to point to their own archived version. And further,
 8 libraries, which I'm sure we would all like to have a
 9 complete collection of Current Industrial Reports, if
10 some library should volunteer to digitize the early
11 paper versions when the Census is trying to sell them,
12 will be able allowed to display them on the Web? Thank
13 you.
14   (Applause)
15   MS. TROTTA: I was hoping somebody would
16 respond to that, but --
17   FEMALE SPEAKER: That's what I was waiting
18 for.
19   (Laughter)
20   MR. SHULER: I'll respond to it. I think
21 you're absolutely right that there are a lot of
22 decisions being made about what is kept on the Web and
0128
 1 what isn't kept on the Web that is out of the control
 2 of GPO, the depository libraries, the ordinary citizen,
 3 and it is a form of vigilance that has always been part
 4 of our community that none of this discussion precludes
 5 or excuse us from. I'm hard pressed in a coordinated
 6 fashion how GPO would take on the Census Bureau about
 7 that.
 8   (Laughter)
 9   MR. SHULER: Not to say that they shouldn't.
10 There is a certain righteousness in our community that
11 we have quick access to that we've deployed in other
12 situations, and we look to our library associations for
13 that righteousness. So I think we do have mechanisms
14 that we can use and to deploy in those situation, but a
15 specific administrative mechanism from just GPO, I
16 don't know if that is in a part of our existence.
17   MS. TROTTA: Robin, did you have a comment?
18   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: No, but I will. If the
19 material is copyrighted, it takes us outside of the
20 scope of the program. That doesn't mean that you can't
21 become incensed and go to the parties that can make
22 changes, and in the past, some of these changes have
0129

1   been made. You can go way back to a Census publication
2   where it's made up CRADA, Cooperative Research and
3   Development Agreement, that the folks over there did
4   provide to depository libraries, and that was in part
5   because they knew the response from the community, but
6   we can't lobby. You all can. So if it's that
7   important, then that's a direction that you all can
8   work on.
9   Now with regard to the industrial reports, I
10 don't know if we captured those before they went away.
11 That's one of the things I wrote down to do a follow-up
12 on, Marie; but if they were copyrighted, you have a
13 good question there especially if they were selling it.
14 Remember under Title 44 they must be sold to be self-
15 sustaining, not within scope of the program. And I'm
16 sorry, that's what we have to abide by.
17   MS. TROTTA: Justin.
18   MR. OTTO: Robin, in response to your other
19 question, what can be done to -- just to facilitate.
20 Getting back to what I was talking about before, and I
21 saw there were a numbers of hands that went up of
22 people who would like to help. They just don't -- they
0130
1   don't think they have the means or the time to take on
2   like big collection-level projects. Am I getting
3   picked up by the mic okay?
4   Okay.
5   MR. OTTO: As I'm looking over James's
6   shoulder here, and we're looking at the registry site
7   something that -- and I know this would be a huge
8   project to get it going, but something -- what I've got
9   in mind is just like a huge item-level checklist, and
10 people who are doing large-scale projects would just go
11 into this huge list and click the little checkbox by
12 all the items that they're -- I know you're going "Oh,
13 you gosh" because you're thinking about --
14   (Laughter)
15   FEMALE SPEAKER: Go ahead.
16   MR. OTTO: But -- and then we would see
17 who's spoken for what, and then I can find things and
18 say "I'll do this. I'm from Eastern Washington
19 University and mark it as well." And then people could
20 sort of help fill in gaps. And if GPO could facilitate
21 something like that, then -- as part of the registry
22 then that could kind of help keep things moving for
0131

1   people who can do a little bit at a time.
 2   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Boy would I love to have
 3   an inventory that allowed me to list exactly what
 4   you're saying. And the reason I say smiled is because
 5   the one comment that we had when we rolled out the
 6   registry was it's too much work to list the individual
 7   titles, and that's why it's a registry of collections.
 8   That said, Lori Hall's group is working on it -- she's
 9   shaking her head "Why me" -- Lori Hall's group is
10   working on digitization of the shelf-list project, and
11   it could be that we are able to marry those together a
12   little bit farther down the road so that we have that
13   capability, that inventory. It also would be a great
14   way to do disposals automated process, and I think
15   there is another whole section. Cindy, when is that
16   being done? After this session, we're going to be
17   talking about that just issue. Come on back for more
18   of that discussion.
19   MS. TROTTA: James, you have a comment?
20   MR. JACOBS: Just one quick addendum to that.
21   I think Chris Brown's idea about metadata and pulling
22   mark records as part of that could feed into that giant
0132
 1   shelf list idea.
 2   MR. OTTO: David used the phrase "map"
 3   before, and I think that if we could get that kind of a
 4   list it would probably help move people to action
 5   because they would have -- they could see objectives.
 6   They could see things where they can take action
 7   themselves and contribute. So instead of like me just
 8   sitting around saying "Well, I would like to help, but
 9   I don't know where to help or how," it would show me
10   ways that I can do it; and then if I had a plan of
11   action like that, I would definitely take action.
12   MS. TROTTA: Arlene.
13   MS. LIDDELL: I'll follow-up a lot of what
14   I was going to say Justin talked about, but I do think
15   that if GPO with all of this money could maybe focus
16   some staff time into being a little bit more proactive
17   in populating the registry. Right now it's relies on
18   us doing it, but if -- it doesn't really take a whole
19   lot of effort to kind of go out there and kind of sift
20   around and see what's out there, and so if some GPO
21   staff time could be devoted to identifying some things
22   that aren't on the registry and then either contacting
0133

1 the folks that are working on it to enter the data or
2 enter the data themselves. Why do -- why does the
3 person who does the project have to enter the data in
4 the registry? So seems to me that would be a really
5 helpful use of staff time at GPO.
6   And then another aspect of that is just the
7 analysis where you see, "Well, we got 10 libraries
8 digitizing this title; but, hey, guys, you know what
9 nobody is doing this," and just drawing more attention
10 to where the gaps are, put that out in the community,
11 and sparking the ideas of folks who are interested in
12 doing something, but they're not quite sure where to
13 focus. "Ho, hey, nobody is doing that. Maybe I will
14 try that." So I think just kind of taking the registry
15 and having it be less -- less driven by -- making --
16 hoping that people will enter their data and actually
17 proactively go out and enter data for people that
18 aren't. I think that's a way that you could use some
19 of your resources to help.
20   MS. TROTTA: Okay. We have about 10 more
21 minutes. I'm going to let Robin comment on that.
22   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: We have not taken the
0134
1 stance of entering the data itself because the
2 information can vary pretty dramatically. We have
3 increased promotion of the registry, Arlene. I think
4 the flyers and the recent discussions, but I think your
5 point is well-taken, and one of the things that I
6 leaned over and nagged at Ric about is filling of my
7 preservation librarian to assist with the collaborative
8 and cooperative piece of this whole project. I think
9 it's very important that together we identify these
10 materials and work to make this happen. No single
11 partner's going to make -- Google by itself isn't going
12 to do it. Internet archive by itself isn't going to do
13 it. It's only by working together, the small pieces,
14 the monographs one by one, by one as well as the larger
15 collections.
16   But if you have other ways of outreach for the
17 registry, please do let us know because we know that we
18 can go to agencies and we're increasing our visibility
19 there, and we're taking the flyers to ALA and the other
20 events that we attend SLA, PLA, etcetera, AALL. Tell
21 us how else, other opportunities.
22   MR. DAVE MORRISON: Hi, my name is Dave
0135

1   Morrison from the University of Utah in Salt Lake City,
2   Utah. This is an example drawn from my background
3   working with the Patent and Trademark Depository
4   Library Association, of which a number of folks here
5   have belonged to over the year. But for more than 15
6   years, we have been trying to get the United States
7   Patent and Trademark Office to go back and recover the
8   data from 1790 through the end of 1975, to recover that
9   data and put it into something very, very usable like
10 Excel or comment delimited file so that people could do
11 searches and can do analyses based on classification
12 and show historical changes in time and space for
13 different technologies. When we have mentioned this
14 over the last 15 years, basically the officular
15 position has always been "We don't have the money for
16 this." And the unofficial opinion has been "Well, you
17 know, we are, our mission is to put out patents and
18 trademarks in as timely a fashion as we can. That's
19 what we are given money to do. It's not part of our
20 mission to maintain our historical products in the way
21 in which our larger community like researchers and the
22 -- people across the United States would like them to
0136
1   be preserved in." And I'm thinking that when we
2   mentioned that the preservation of our historical
3   information product is larger than just what GPO can or
4   cannot do, I'm hoping that maybe we'll see a change in
5   attitude higher up in the administration that might
6   point out to agencies that they do have a mission to go
7   back and make sure that what they've done over the
8   course of the American experience is being preserved
9   and possibly as simply as making sure that it gets
10 scanned into some sort of preservation image. Thank
11 you.
12   MS. TROTTA: Thank you. We have time for
13 just one more.
14   MS. HORNE-POPP: I actually have two
15 proposals for Council and for GPO. And the first, in
16 terms of a place to start -- and I'm piggybacking on
17 Justin's recommendation that if we could fragment this
18 a little bit more. Several years ago now -- and it's
19 escaped me how long -- we had a survey of what titles
20 we thought were the most important to digitize first.
21 I think we could easily use the results of that survey
22 as a place to start. We've already decide what those
0137

1   priorities are, and I think it's a great pilot.
2   The second recommendation would be -- and this
3   is piggybacking on Barbie Selby's comment about
4   mentoring -- I think we have OPAL -- and we can talk --
5   maybe in some fashion GPO could be coordinating
6   libraries to talk with one another so institutions that
7   have been able to digitize are able to talk to
8   libraries that haven't; they're able to talk about some
9   of these things; it's in the repository; people can
10 come back to it. So it's a way for GPO to establish
11 networking basically. So those are my two suggestions.
12   MS. TROTTA: Thank you. I would like to
13 encourage all of you -- I know from experience it can
14 be intimidating to come to the mic your first time, so
15 I would like to encourage you that if you do have
16 comments about this topic, if you're sitting there
17 talking among yourself, "Oh, well, what about this,
18 what about that," please, please, please, put that into
19 an email and send it to somebody's on Council so that
20 we're getting feedback from you so that that
21 information is contributing to our discussions that
22 we're having because we want to make sure that we're
0138
1   considering all of the angles. Are there any other
2   comments from my fellow Council members?
3   MR. SHULER: The follow-up to Chris Greer's
4   early remarks about priorities and timelines. Is there
5   anybody in the audience who believes we have another
6   five years to discuss this?
7   (Laughter)
8   MR. SHULER: Is it a better sense of the
9   community that if we don't accomplish something of a
10 reasonable nature within the next year or two, it's
11 much more realistic, otherwise we might as well just
12 forget it? Is there a sense of impending sooner than
13 later?
14   (Laughter)
15   MR. O'MAHONY: Just to underscore John's
16 point of sooner than later. While the current
17 discussion with respect to what to do with the $500,000
18 is focused on the historical collection, every day we
19 sit here we're losing web content of contemporary
20 materials. So that's the next $500,000 project.
21   MR. SHULER: Thank you.
22   (Applause)
0139

1   MR. O'MAHONY: I don't need that yet.
2   MR. SHULER: I want to thank -- that was
3 excellent. Thank you to the group for guiding us
4 through that discussion. Thank you to the audience for
5 participating. And now I get to say very simply, it's
6 3:30, a little bit before maybe, I guess we get to eat
7 cake now.
8   (Laughter)
9   MR. SHULER: So let us eat cake in
10 celebration of the library of the year. Thank you very
11 much. We'll see you back here at 4:00.
12   (Applause)
13   MR. SHULER: Thank you, group. Well done.
14   (Off the record)
15   (On the record -- Afternoon Plenary Session)
16   MR. SHULER: All right. I'm going to begin
17 the proceedings for the second afternoon session, which
18 is going to be a very deep, significant analysis of the
19 discard process, and we've going to learn much from it;
20 but before we do, I've been asked to announce that
21 Goddard (ph)/SLA is having happy hour from 5 to 9 p.m.
22 in the Skydome Lounge. Be there or be square. Gwen.
0140
1   MS. GWEN SINCLAIR: Good afternoon. I'm Gwen
2 Sinclair with the University of Hawaii at Manoa
3 Library. I'm here to introduce this afternoon's
4 session on discard. This session is the product of
5 Council Recommendation 4, which states "Council further
6 recommends that GPO report at the Fall 2009 Meeting on
7 best practices for the streamlining of the disposal
8 process. So Cindy Etkin of GPO is going to present the
9 requested report. She'll be followed by Lisa Russell,
10 who will be talking briefly about needs and offers.
11 So, Cindy.
12   MS. EKTIN: When John put everybody down
13 here, he wasn't thinking about short people.
14   (Laughter)
15   MALE SPEAKER: Harder.
16   (Laughter)
17   MS. EKTIN: Was that Larry?
18   (Laughter)
19   MS. EKTIN: As you all heard from Ric this
20 morning when he was talking about the responses to the
21 recommendations, he mentioned that for this particular
22 recommendation we were taking a two-pronged approach:
0141

1 One is the best practices and education, and the other
 2 is the creation of an automated tool that will help
 3 with the needs and offers process. So I'm going to
 4 talk about the best practices and education, and Lisa
 5 Russell will follow with the discussion about an
 6 automated tool, and I get to use one of these for the
 7 first time. I was told to go slow, so I hope I can and
 8 in the right direction.
 9   One of the things that came to mind and was
10 actually mentioned a couple of different places was
11 that we were talking about two different processes
12 here: The discard process and the needs and offers
13 process. While they are very related, they have
14 different purposes, so we'll look at them a little bit
15 separately.
16   The discard is, of course, letting depository
17 material or selective take depository material out of
18 their collection, those materials that are unwanted;
19 and the needs and offers provides the sharing that's
20 required. For this we have consensus. Nobody likes
21 these processes. Not your depository coordinators, not
22 your staff, not your directors, not regionals, not
0142
 1 selectives, and maybe perhaps used book dealers would
 2 like it, but we finally have consensus on something
 3 here.
 4   (Laughter)
 5   MS. EKTIN: So what does Title 44 tells us
 6 about this. Everything in relations to the discard
 7 process and the governance is in Section 1912, where it
 8 says that the regionals within the regions served will
 9 provide assistance for depository libraries and the
10 disposal of unwanted Government publications. Further
11 down it say "Regionals may permit their selectives to
12 dispose of Government publications which they have
13 retained for at least five years after first offering
14 them to other depository libraries within their area,
15 then to other libraries." So the first part is the
16 discards, and the second part is the needs and offers.
17   Of course, we have a little bit of a change
18 with the substitutions, so the five-year thing is sort
19 of not absolute. Back in around 1973 and -- Jill, you
20 were here? You may remember --
21   (Laughter)
22   MS. EKTIN: -- when Council --
0143

1   (Laughter)
 2   MS. MORIEARTY: Let me make this real
 3   clear: No, I was not here.
 4   (Laughter)
 5   MS. EKTIN: I thought you were left standing.
 6   I apologize.
 7   (Laughter)
 8   MS. MORIEARTY: '77.
 9   MS. EKTIN: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.
10   (Laughter)
11   MS. EKTIN: I apologize. The Depository
12   Library Council around 1973 developed some guidelines,
13   and the guidelines were a recommended level of conduct
14   and -- in quotes there. And the guidelines included
15   these responsibilities for regionals. The first was
16   "Attempting to complete their retrospective collections
17   of major serial, annuals, and other research materials
18   by means of gifts, exchange, or purchase including
19   microforms, screening all lists of documents withdrawn
20   from selective depositories to ensure their future
21   availability in the region, and providing guidelines to
22   selective depositories for preparing disposal lists of
0144
 1   unwanted documents." So if you can find out who was on
 2   the Council 1973, you can thank them.
 3   (Laughter)
 4   MS. EKTIN: In 1995, there were problems
 5   that this procedure that is an onerous one for
 6   depositories. Compiling lists of materials is labor
 7   intensive. It's difficult to find space for storing
 8   documents to be discarded for months until the lengthy
 9   procedure is completed. Okay. It's 14 years later,
10   and we're still having this same problem, which sort of
11   brings this all to a head this fall.
12   In 1995, a memorandum was sent to regional
13   depository libraries from what was then Depository
14   Services -- in Library Program Service, and it granted
15   regionals greater flexibility and more latitude and
16   more discretion within the weeding process of this
17   selectives. It allowed them to permit discards of
18   materials by visiting the library and eyeballing rather
19   than requiring a list. It allowed regionals to issue
20   needs, "I need this. If you have anything else that
21   you're discarding, go ahead." Allows regionals to
22   eliminate listing of fiche. Allows regionals to
0145

1 identify materials that always need to be listed and
2 materials that do not need to be listed. And actually
3 the last bullet item permits the development of an
4 automated discards list in conjunction with the
5 superseded list. That actually was done, and some of
6 those things you'll find incorporated into the
7 substitution guidelines, which will also be discussed
8 at this meeting. Things like dated material. If
9 there's an expiration date on something, you can go
10 ahead and withdraw it even though you haven't had it
11 for five years. Things like that.
12   In the Federal Depository Library Handbook, it
13 says the principal responsibility of a regional
14 depository library is to ensure the comprehensiveness
15 and integrity of the Federal depository resources in
16 the state or region, and that come from that same
17 guidance. And the 1974 instructions drew heavily on
18 the recommendations in the Council guidelines. This
19 has been brought forward in the various versions of the
20 instructions since that time. But note that it doesn't
21 say that the regional collection has to be located in
22 the regional library proper.
0146
1   We were trying to get an idea of what you all
2 thought about the whole process and what you would like
3 to see retained in this process or given up in this
4 process. In early August, we created a discussion
5 forum on the community site, and we asked -- it related
6 to needs and offers and discards for questions. I've
7 only got three here. Lisa will deal with the other one
8 in just a bit.
9   We asked -- Section 1912 is your only
10 requirement. That is what I showed you earlier on the
11 slide. "If you were starting with a blank slate and
12 had to design a discards, needs, and offers process,
13 what would it look like." We got four responses. "Are
14 there any issues that impact you as a regional
15 depository library that you want addressed in a revised
16 discards and/or needs and offers process?" And we got
17 one response. "Are there any issues that impact you as
18 a selective depository library that you want addressed
19 in a revised discards and/or needs and offers process?"
20 And we got zero responses to this question. So we are
21 still seeking input. I'm very thankful for the five
22 people that submitted, but it would be nice to have
0147

1 more. It's really hard to make policy on the opinion
 2 of five people.
 3   But this is what they said: "Current system
 4 creates pressures to dumpster unwanted materials rather
 5 than getting them to people who need them. If we get
 6 no takers from needs and offers, I'd like to give them
 7 to a bookseller. Set up an eBay account to sell the
 8 discarded materials and have the proceeds go to GPO.
 9 Let libraries sell discarded materials and have
10 proceeds go toward digitization." And that was
11 actually mentioned twice, that same suggestion.
12 "Regionals can identify agencies for which they have no
13 or few publications. Create agreements with selectives
14 in their area for them to hold them locally or to send
15 them to the regional." Another suggestion: That the
16 regionals inventory 3,000 item numbers most frequently
17 collected by their selectives, and then you can
18 identify gaps. "Authorize all but two selectives to
19 withdraw specific SuDoc stems for specific years, and
20 then what's left in the backup you can divide the
21 responsibility among the selectives in the state so
22 that everybody is participating in the creation and
0148
 1 maintenance of the comprehensive collection."
 2   So while we only had five comments -- or five
 3 submissions, we got some pretty good ideas here. I
 4 don't know what we can do about the funding thing, but
 5 the suggested uses for those monies I think are good.
 6   We also started to collect all of the discard
 7 policies from the regionals, and I want to thank Ann
 8 Sanders and Janet Fisher. Is Janet here? Thank you
 9 for helping me gather all these together and for Ann
10 for putting them up on the community site under the
11 regional site accessible to all of us. And I also want
12 to thank Ann for this wonderful summary. She sent me a
13 summary that she had provided -- what, to Regional, is
14 that correct?
15   FEMALE SPEAKER: Huh?
16   MS. EKTIN: Oh, to Regal. I'm sorry. And
17 her first line was that she could tell that plagiarism
18 was alive and well, and I told her that was certainly
19 the case because these next two slides are her summary
20 --
21   (Laughter)
22   MS. EKTIN: -- although I may have shorten
0149

1   the lines so they fit on the screen. Five states don't
2   have written guidelines. About half the regionals
3   don't limit the size or number of lists that can be
4   sent to them. Three states require libraries to follow
5   a calendar that is limiting disposal list to certain
6   SuDoc classes, certain months. Eleven states don't
7   exempt microfiche from listing, and a number of states
8   don't require listing CDs or DVDs.
9   Continuing on, three states ask selectives to
10 contact them prior to weeding, and the regionals offer
11 to visit. So here we get into a little bit of the
12 eyeballing that was allowed in 1995. Three states are
13 now doing that. Ten regionals covering 13 states have
14 procedures that are intended to reduce the amount of
15 listing required. For instance, they identify
16 materials that don't need to be listed or, they just
17 ask for certain date ranges or SuDoc stem ranges that
18 are on their discard list to make it less labor
19 intensive to create the list. And most states use web
20 pages or electronic discussion list to distribute the
21 list to a broader community. One state uses a wiki and
22 another one uses FaceBook.
0150
1   So in looking at some of the comments that we
2   got back, not from the community site but from the
3   report that we did last year for JCP on the condition
4   of regional libraries. There was a lot of discussion
5   in there about needs and offers and discards lists, so
6   I'm just putting on a thinking cap and looking at
7   possible alternatives to detailed lists, and some
8   libraries are already doing some of these things, but
9   not all libraries are. Visits by the regionals, we've
10 already three. One libraries is doing what they call
11 the laptop-and-cell phone method, where the regional
12 will go to visit the selectives with a cell phone and a
13 laptop, and they'll go through the stacks and look on
14 the laptop if it in the catalog. And they'll call back
15 to the office "Do we have this, da, da, da, da." So
16 it's a real-time process. When the regional leaves,
17 the discard decisions have been made.
18   Checking the regional OPAC, this assumes that,
19 of course, the collection is cataloged and that the
20 records are maintained very well. Reducing the
21 information provided on the list. We've already
22 mentioned that. Titles on lists already reviewed by a
0151

1 regional don't have to be listed by other libraries for
2 a specified period of time. So that if I'm a regional
3 and I have a list from selective A and they've given me
4 10 pages of titles and I've gone through them and I
5 don't need them, I can say to the other selectives in
6 my regional "I've gone through all of these titles; if
7 you're getting rid of these titles, go ahead. I've
8 seen this list. I don't need to see them on another
9 list from you."
10   Where a regional permits selectives to send to
11 another regional that is collecting retrospectively by
12 checking their OPAC, this would be where a regional
13 would, for instance, say to their selectives "These are
14 the things I need, and if you have any of those that
15 you are discarding, send them to me. If not, anything
16 else you want to discard, I know this library is
17 collecting comprehensively. Check their OPAC. If they
18 need it, you can send it to them." This, of course,
19 would be through memorandum of understanding or
20 agreements between the institutions. So these are just
21 possibilities, and I'm sure that you all have other
22 thought of what could be done, and maybe we'll have
0152
1 time to, hopefully, get into some of those ideas.
2   As I mentioned, Ann put all the discards
3 procedures up on the community site,
4 community.fdlp.gov. if you are registered, you can go
5 on in there and take a look at them. You'll find under
6 file sharing I think there are about 10, and those are
7 procedures that the files are actually loaded onto the
8 community site. And you can also go under Web Links,
9 and then you'll find links to all the others on the
10 regionals' web sites. So all of them are there either
11 under file sharing or under Web Links. If you are not
12 a registered user of the community site, I encourage
13 you to do so. Just go to the URL and click on that
14 Register button.
15   I'm going slow. Factor or myth. Regionals
16 must collect retrospectively? That's a myth.
17   Regionals are required to retain what's
18 distributed to them and there is not an obligation to
19 go back and collect materials prior to when they became
20 a regional? As I've shown, it's been in the guidelines
21 and brought forward; and even as it is today, the
22 regional itself does not have to hold the materials.
0153

1 It's just the integrity of the collection that's in a
 2 state.
 3   Selectives must submit lists to regionals?
 4 That's a myth. Most regionals still do to varying
 5 degrees, but there are other options now.
 6   Selectives must obtain their regional's
 7 permission to discard most material? Yes, indeed.
 8   Regionals must retain all formats of all
 9 titles? No. They only need to retain one format.
10   Regional permission is required of selectives
11 to substitute online for tangible publications? Yes.
12   Maybe this little chart will help clarify some
13 of the requirements. So what I'm suggesting as a best
14 practice is that regionals need to work with the
15 selectives to determine what's best for their regional.
16 You all need to sit down at a table and talk about it.
17 Let everybody know what your resource issues are.   You
18 need to consider the needs of those you serve, and you
19 need to implement a process that's best for the entire
20 region and recognize that compromises may be necessary,
21 and you want to revisit the process to evaluate its
22 success and revise it if necessary. And you can always
0154
 1 consult with our staff if you have any questions.
 2   So this is two processes, remember. So we've
 3 talked about the discard process, and now under Section
 4 1912 we get to the part of depositories are still
 5 required to discard only after permission received from
 6 the regional and after first offering them to other
 7 depository libraries within their area and then to
 8 other libraries, and that's the needs and offers
 9 process. Lisa is going to talk about that. So I'll
10 turn it over to her.
11   (Pause)
12   MS. LISA RUSSELL: I'm actually not going to
13 talk very much. I'm going to try to get you all to
14 talk. But I did want to start with SMimaging (ph). We
15 put some stuff out on the community web site to get
16 some discussion started. One of the questions was if
17 you were building an automated tool for needs and
18 offers database, what would it look like. As of last
19 Friday, we had 12 comments. I didn't try to go through
20 and say this many people said this and this many said
21 that. Hopefully, you'll all go and take a look at it.
22 A number of people said that they wanted to see it
0155

1   linked to the CGP or the ILS to sort of fill in a
2   template. We got that quite a bit. We also got --
3   Cindy mentioned the laptop-and-cell phone method.
4   Somebody suggested that it should be something you
5   could you on a mobile device and go out and check you
6   stacks with it. Of course, we had they wanted to be
7   able to search by SuDoc number. We want to be able to
8   sort by date range. A lot of those kinds of things.
9   One of the other things that we heard was
10 people wanted to be able to indicate if something was
11 needed for disaster response; if you've had a flood and
12 lost 10 years of something, you want to be able to put
13 that in and indicate it's for a disaster. What I think
14 I heard in the last session is that maybe we ought to
15 be able to indicated that something is needed for a
16 digitization project.
17   So with that, I'll throw it out there for
18 comments.
19   MR. SHULER: Does anybody on the Council have
20 any thoughts or questions?
21   MR. CISMOWSKI: In your thinking about this
22 and in your comments whether they come now or in the
0156
1   future, I think all of us would like you to really
2   think outside of the box here especially for that
3   second part, how to automate the needs and offers
4   process. Right now in many regionals and states it's a
5   very, very labor-intensive process that involves a lot
6   of duplication in many ways. For instance, in our
7   state, we require that people do lists. The lists come
8   to me via email attachment. I review the list or my
9   staff does. Then I send instructions back to the
10 selectives. Then they post the list, as an attachment,
11 to our state electronic list, CalDocAl (ph). The
12 duplication there comes in having to pass attachments
13 back and forth in emails, so I'm thinking for our state
14 is there any kind of a way that we can use a wiki or
15 Goggle Docs or some mechanism like that where people
16 can post things once, and then collaboratively we can
17 review these lists. That is a regional I would do
18 mine's first. I would claim the stuff first, but we
19 wouldn't have to pass Excel file back and forth via
20 email.
21   So that's the type of thinking that I'd like
22 you to pursue in your own regions and states. Look at
0157

1   your procedures, look at what your regional want you to
2   do, and is there any way that we can use technology to
3   simply that process.
4   MS. MARGARET JOBE: Hi, I'm Peggy Jobe from
5   the University of Colorado at Boulder, and we're the
6   state that uses a wiki unless somebody else had joined
7   us. But for the things that we require a list on, they
8   send them to us; we search our collection; we delete
9   everything that we're taking, and then we post the list
10 to a wiki; we never send out the list again; we just
11 send an announcement once a week on Fridays saying
12 which stems we're posting. So something will go up on
13 the wiki by stem. We say what the date is, and then
14 people are building. Like if they're building in the
15 A's they have a certain amount of time to claim it.
16 Otherwise, once that's done, we allow people to
17 withdraw. We found that really using the wiki has
18 really speeded up the process, and it eliminates
19 passing those files back and forth. It's wiki-lite
20 because we're really doing all the posting. We're not
21 letting other people post to it, but we do use other
22 wikis in the state; like we're writing a state plan via
0158
1   a wiki and that kind of thing. So we're using wikis a
2   variety of way. I think the selectives in my state
3   would say that they much prefer it to getting the lists
4   -- the emails with the lists attached and everything
5   like that. They can just know which stems they're
6   trying to collect in, know what the expiration date is,
7   and then they're good to go.
8   MS. SINCLAIR: It's seems to me in a vague
9   recollection that my very first Depository conference
10 in 2000 somebody addressed the regionals meeting, and
11 it may have been Connecticut, and talked about an
12 automated system that they had developed. Does anybody
13 know anything about that or remember that?
14   MS. SANDERS: That was Maryland. Michigan
15 also dabbled it in, but ours ran afoul of Y2K, and it's
16 that long ago, but I don't know if there's anybody here
17 from Maryland who can speak to whether or not that
18 system is still running.
19   MS. LORI SMITH: Me? Should I go ahead?
20   MS. RUSSELL: I think we got someone from
21 Maryland who's going to take a shot at answering that.
22   MS. CINDY TODD: My name is Cindy Todd. I'm
0159

1 from the University of Maryland. I've only been doing
2 documents for three years, and I'm not aware of any
3 such process at Maryland. What we do sounds very much
4 like what's been described here. We pass list -- Excel
5 list -- through email, but we do post -- the different
6 libraries post them on their web sites, and then they
7 send messages to the selectives that their lists are
8 posted on their university web sites.
9   For example, I look through the list from one
10 of the selectives. Once I've cleared it, they post it
11 on their web site; then they send out a message to the
12 other members of the community that the material is on
13 the web site. Our listserv doesn't permit us to pass
14 attachments through the lister. Hence, we have to host
15 them on the web site. Does that help?
16   MS. RUSSELL: I think we've got a former
17 Maryland person behind you who's going to add a little
18 bit more to that.
19   MS. ASHLEY DAHLEN: Hi, Ashley Dahlen. I
20 used to work at the University of Maryland. We did
21 have a database set up. We ran into problems though
22 because at that point I think we had like 65
0160
1 depositories in our region. We had a high staff
2 turnover, which made it very hard to train people how
3 to use it and how to use it consistently, and we also
4 had problems with consistent formatting. Some people
5 would submit lists and the column would be in the wrong
6 order, or they would submit one line that would have
7 all the information in it. So we just -- it wasn't
8 workable for us given the amount of libraries we had in
9 our region and the staff turnover, so consistency is
10 very hard to get.
11   MS. SMITH: Now me.
12   MS. RUSSELL: Now you can go.
13   MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern
14 Louisiana University. Our regionals are now working
15 from some sort of 1998 list, I think it is, that was an
16 agreement among the regionals of specific SuDoc numbers
17 that they would collect retrospectively, so they now
18 ask us also to list superseded items in those areas
19 that were assigned to Louisiana. So we are not only
20 listing the regular stuff and doing that via email.
21 We're also listing superseded thing, and if you think
22 people don't like the regular superseded process -- the
0161

1 exchange process, this superseded listing really grates
 2 a lot of people. But our regional asked us, and we
 3 want to help them, so we're doing it. But does anybody
 4 else know about that agreement and is anybody else
 5 doing that?
 6   MS. MORIEARTY: Was that part of their
 7 state plan?
 8   MS. SMITH: No, my understanding is it was
 9 an agreement among the regionals at some point. I
10 think it was 1998, but I couldn't swear to that.
11   MS. ANN SANDERS: Ann Sanders, from the
12 Library of Michigan. I don't know how I ended up to be
13 the repository of all this weird information because --
14   (Laughter)
15   MS. SANDERS: -- I really knew more about
16 disposal than anybody in America wants to or should,
17 but --
18   (Laughter)
19   MS. SANDERS: -- that agreement between the
20 regionals is actually older than '98. It goes way
21 back. I can't even tell you what the first iteration
22 of that is. When the first superseded list came out --
0162
 1 actually I think when that happened -- Michigan also
 2 does ask. We don't -- we don't come with a big stick.
 3 I don't know if somebody doesn't put something on their
 4 list, but we do ask if there's a title about Michigan
 5 or the Great Lakes we don't care if it's superseded or
 6 what it is we ask that you list it. Do they really do
 7 that? I don't have any way to know. It's a courtesy
 8 kind of a thing. It's not a requirement, and we're not
 9 going to not pass a list because we suspect that you
10 didn't list everything. It's just not that -- -it
11 doesn't seem to be that big of a deal. But I know that
12 superseded agreement among the regionals was not really
13 intended to add that much, that big of a layer of
14 bureaucracy to the whole process.
15   MS. RUSSELL: I think Cindy's got a follow-
16 up, and then we'll go back there.
17   MS. ETKINS: You didn't get to the little "r"
18 thing, and I think what they're referring to, Lori, is
19 in the superseded list there are some of those entries
20 that have R's by them, and those are the ones in the
21 superseded list where various regionals have agreed to
22 keep retrospectively. The superseded list doesn't tell
0163

1   which regional is keeping which "r," but those are the
2   things that are covered under this agreement.
3   MS. BETH HARPER:
                        Beth Harper, University
4   of Wisconsin-Madison. I can say from being on the
5   regional's list in a very great while someone will say
6   "I have someone looking for this item that was really
7   supposed to be superseded, but now they want it in
8   print." So as much of a pain as it is, it has come in
9   handy one and a while.
10   I was going to go back to -- kind of pie in
11 the sky what would I like in a needs and offers
12 automated list. I do picture something where you can
13 like check off the -- put the SuDoc in the Needs and
14 Offers List and something that would allow you to
15 collate a bunch of lists at a state level; like our
16 list come out the third or fourth week. We go up on
17 the third or fourth week, and I'm looking for certain
18 SuDocs, and I like to scan one list to look at all the
19 SuDocs, not go through the ten or whatever.
20   MS. WALSH: Again, being encouraged to think
21 outside of the box, we've got basically two conditions
22 for problems. If you stuff is catalogued, it's a heck
0164
1   of a lot easier for you to generate that list from your
2   catalog and shoot it someplace. So you need a system
3   that can import, say, a list of item numbers or a list
4   of SuDoc stems or whatever in some sort of delineated
5   fashion that we don't have to manually check off. Then
6   of course, we've got the 18XDX through 1974, which many
7   of us haven't catalogued yet, which we would prefer to
8   have something we could check off boxes on rather than
9   to have to -- or maybe even that if we only had to key
10 in the SuDoc and maybe the title and the date. It
11 would be helpful.
12   But how you get that list, do you work from
13 the 1908 checklist? Do you spend your $500,000 buying
14 access to some of the retrospective digitized database?
15 I don't know that answer to that, and I'm not
16 technologically savvy enough, but -- so you've got the
17 old stuff, the new stuff, the cataloged stuff, the
18 uncataloged stuff. Ideally for stuff that's newer
19 and/or cataloged we want to be able to shoot automatic
20 concatenated lists so that we don't have to look
21 through this list and this list and this list and this
22 list. And I'm with Wisconsin on that one. And then

0165
1 what do you do with the old stuff. Having said all of
2 that, I've just made a connection for my Bureau of
3 Indian Affairs pamphlets. Yes, I'm so excited.
4   If anybody has them, come see me. As much as
5 this is a pain in the petuti, there are -- in the
6 things that you may not think are valuable may be
7 really valuable for everybody, so I hope that we don't
8 end up saying, "No, don't need to list anything" or
9 just going to say, "I'm getting rid of A's this month,"
10 because that's not going to help the people. That puts
11 the onus on the people who are trying to
12 retrospectively collect rather than discard.
13   MR. SHULER: I'm going to say a comment here.
14 It has nothing to do with what we're talking about, but
15 I need to make an observation. We've been requested by
16 several people in the audience that when Council
17 members speak they somehow stand to be recognized. I'm
18 going to say back rather than trying to -- this is all
19 new to us as we're doing this on the floor. We've
20 going to discuss that during the Council meeting and
21 see if we can find and elegant way to address the
22 problem from those that you can't see us when we're
0166
1 talking, like I am now, and maybe come up with a
2 solution.
3   (Applause)
4   MR. SHULER: So if you don't see it right
5 now, it isn't because I didn't listen to you. I just
6 haven't figured out an elegant way to introduce the
7 problem. Thank you.
8   MS. MARTHA CHILDERS: Hi, Martha Childers,
9 Johnson County Library, in the Kansas City metro area.
10 This is a little bit outside of the box of the problem
11 that we're discussing here, but I wanted to present to
12 the group to things that we are doing. If specialized
13 libraries might be interested in some of the things
14 we're discarding after they've gone through the whole
15 process, we are offering them to them. We've given
16 five boxes of things to the Library of Congress. We're
17 going to be giving some things to the Linda Hall
18 Library. The Eisenhower is interested in some things
19 we have. Truman's taken some things. The World War 1
20 museum is interested in something. They're chomping at
21 the bit for something that's waiting for the process.
22 If we are not able to get rid of things in this way,

0167
1 then we put them out for the public on carts, and they
2 take them.
3   MS. SELBY: I'm not going to ask for a show
4 of hands or anything, but a selective asked me
5 wondering how many selectives really look at these
6 needs and offers. You've got this state-level version,
7 and then the national-level version. Could it be one
8 version instead of two, where they were advertised once
9 to everyone?
10   The other thing I was just thinking about:
11 We check our things out that we know we're missing, and
12 so my state has to review that list before they then
13 -- then they send me those things that they've got, and
14 then I can look at the list. I'm wondering if there is
15 any way to use CGP to do that at a national level
16 somehow so that there is one review list that's checked
17 out in CGP and UVA needs this and Maryland needs that
18 or something?
19   MS. HOLTERHOFF: This may be a far-fetched
20 comment, but I guess it just occurs to me to wonder
21 when I see the statement about regionals only need to
22 keep one format that there are some things that only
0168
1 regionals get in print like the serial sets, the bound
2 Congressional Record, and maybe nobody would ever get
3 rid of that to keep some other format, but I would just
4 hope that that would be sort of an exception that they
5 would have to keep that or at least offer it to
6 somebody else in their state like a law library if they
7 didn't want to keep it.
8   MS. BETTY FEBO: Betty Febo, Wellesley
9 College. One thing that I do that makes it a little
10 bit easier is when I send out a discard list I send it
11 to the regional and to the other selectives libraries I
12 sent it to at the same time with the caveat that the
13 regional library has first choice of any materials that
14 they need. I give the other selectives a deadline.
15 The regional has no deadline, but then at least I know
16 that when I get information back from the regionals
17 whatever they need I send it to them; whatever they
18 don't need, I've already taken care of the other
19 process, so I can then just discard the materials.
20   To answer Barbie's question a little bit about
21 the national Needs and Offers List, I do not usually
22 look at it. I had a grand plan at one time about

0169
 1 making it a student task to look at the Needs and
 2 Offers List, to look for publications on women because
 3 as a women's institution I thought perhaps that was a
 4 role that we could fill, to collect retrospectively
 5 women's publications. It didn't work out very well,
 6 but thinking about it, I may go back to it and see what
 7 I can do.
 8   The other thing is at one point decided to get
 9 rid of duplicate copies of the Economic Report of the
10   President and Statistical Abstracts, and I decided that
11   was important enough that I was going to post it on
12   gov.al. I had put it to our state and local area
13   first, but I put it out on gov.al and got response,
14   which led me to a problem that nobody's addressed yet,
15   and that the issue of postage. Because we, our
16   institution could not afford to pay the postage to send
17   these materials out, if somebody wanted one item that
18   was fine; but I had responses back that said "We'll
19   take anything you can send us," which led to multiple
20   cartons. So then I felt in good conscience I had to
21   tell them an estimate of how much this would cost just
22   so we all knew, which led to weighing cartons and
0170
 1 sending them and how we were going to get labels; and
 2 it led to sort of a big process that made me wonder why
 3 I did it in the first place.
 4   (Laughter)
 5   MS. FEBO: But anyway, that led me to wonder
 6 is there a way the GPO could help with postage in some
 7 manner whether we tell them how much it will cost and
 8 they send us a prepaid label, whether they give each
 9 library a certain sum. I hadn't worked it out, but I
10   was wondering is that a role that GPO could play so
11   that postage does not become an issue?
12   MS. RUSSELL: That's a good question. I'll
13   have to follow-up on that one. Here comes Robin.
14   She's going to follow-up on it right now.
15   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: It is a good question.
16   My initial gut reaction is I don't think we can do
17   that, but it doesn't ever hurt to ask, so we'll check
18   that out.
19   MR. ROB LOPRESTI: Rob Lopresti, Western
20   Washington University. You're talking about thinking
21   outside the box, let me just tell you what I think
22   would be wonderful to see happen, which should be a

0171
1 national computerized system which, as someone
2 suggested, we could download stuff directly from our
3 catalog into it or type stuff in. This would be a form
4 so that you'll have a place to put the SuDoc number and
5 the title and the year, and I think that's probably all
6 most people want or need. And since it was a national
7 system and we have to go through the regionals first,
8 you could set it up so that the first week or the first
9 month only the regional of your state could see it, and
10 then only the ones in your state could see it, and then
11 the whole country could see it, and then it'll be one
12 system. So you would have to reinvent the wheel or put
13 anything in twice or three times.
14   And at the same time, you could put in offers
15 on that -- I'm sorry -- needs onto that system, and the
16 computer could do the matching for you because computer
17 can match things real easy. Okay.
18   MS. JUDY SOLOMON: Judy Solomon, from
19 Seattle Public Library. Just throwing this out: As a
20 public librarian, I'm the one that actually types up
21 the offers list. The library spends $33 an hour to
22 have me do this. More hours than I care to imagine,
0172
1 and I am only in census right now, so I have a ways to
2 go for evaluating our collection and putting up the
3 offers. Yes, ideally it there was some way that we
4 could have some system to be able to offer things
5 without having to type up a list.
6   MS. BARBARA LEVERGOOD: Barbara Levergood,
7 from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. I have
8 a concern about particularly old and valuable
9 materials. We recently had several volumes from the
10 American State papers that we offered through needs and
11 offers, and we go takers for two or three out of the
12 four or five volumes. I'm told within our state that
13 after we go through this process no one wants them but
14 we still want to withdraw the materials the next step
15 is to pulp the documents. That's against my
16 professional ethics, but the only other alternative for
17 us is to put the materials back into the collection and
18 then hope that next time we weed someone will take
19 them. So I'm wondering whether you might have a last
20 resort collection somehow for materials such as these
21 that we want withdraw from the collection but can't
22 find an immediate home for.

0173
1   MR. JOHN STEVENSON: Hi, John Stevenson,
2   University of Delaware. The question about postage and
3   postage reimbursement for offers comes up pretty
4   frequently. A lot of us don't have the authority to
5   issue stamps, but in our library, we were able to
6   reimburse quite well by using the same carrier as the
7   other library offering us items was using and our
8   number could be then applied so that it was basically
9   like a C.O.D. And this maybe really advantageous if
10 you're getting several boxes from a source to simply
11 have it billed to your library, and someone in your
12 acquisitions department who does this with other
13 vendors may be able to help you set this up.
14   MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.
15   MS. CONCANNON: I'm with a regional, and I
16 know that I have the authority to eyeball collections
17 and point to huge swatch and say "Well, this part you
18 should definitely list. This part we want. This part
19 perhaps we don't have to." And what I need is more
20 collective wisdom about what is considered desirable
21 and needed and what isn't based on what gets claimed
22 from lists. Because it's usually the selectives that
0174
1   receive the requests from these exchange lists, they
2   know more, I think than I do, what tends to get
3   requested from their list. I'm in a little bit of an
4   unusual situation because I have quite a bit of backlog
5   that I've been listing myself. I've been typing
6   exchange lists. We've been doing them ourselves and
7   sending them out, things we had in storage that were
8   just -- we don't know the status of, so we're just
9   listing them. And I see people don't want CDs. They
10 really love the historic hearings. Fiche, people don't
11 seem to request that. And even down to different title
12 -- I have heard that the Mineral yearbooks, nobody
13 wants these things.
14   (Laughter)
15   MS. CONCANNON: I tried to list census
16 materials, and had some difficulty placing those, and
17 the Congressional Record I've got -- I can't even tell
18 you how many hundreds of volumes that I could not
19 place, and they were on the national needs and offers;
20 and like a previous speaker, I feel very uncomfortable
21 throwing the Congressional Record into the dumpster;
22 500 years from now or 100 years from now these would be

0175
 1 extremely rare, and I'm sure that the public, whose tax
 2 money paid to have them printed, would like to have
 3 them exists.
 4   What I would like to see, to sum this up, I
 5 would like to see more collective wisdom from the
 6 selectives who are making these lists, a sentence or
 7 two after their list has expired to say "This is what
 8 was popular and this wasn't." This would help me as a
 9 regional quite a bit.
10   MS. RUSSELL: Just to follow-up on that.
11 Would it be helpful if we developed a system that could
12 provide some sort of statistics on particular stems
13 that are claimed more often than other?
14   MS. CONCANNON: Statistics would be nice,
15 but even some qualitative data would be fine. By the
16 way, the library of literature does not seem to address
17 this.
18   MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.
19   MS. SMITH: In this theoretical automated
20 system for creating lists that we're spitballing,
21 everybody seems to want to be able to search by SuDoc
22 number, but we have in our Dewey Decimal Classified
0176
 1 collection lots of documents that predate our
 2 designation as a depository, and we don't have SuDoc
 3 for those. So keep in mind that we will need to be
 4 able to look it up by title or some other -- ISBN or
 5 something to do that automated list. And also, if it's
 6 serials, we're going to need some place to designate
 7 exactly which issues we have to offer -- probably not a
 8 check-off box, but something if it's serials to say
 9 which ones we have.
10   MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.
11   MS. CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Hi, Carmen Orth-
12 Alfie, University of Kansas. I'm one of the few people
13 that actually posted some suggestions, and I have no
14 idea how widely it was read, so maybe it was an
15 important -- an embarrassing thing, but I actually
16 posted that maybe something very similar to a library
17 thing could be used so that we could have -- get away
18 from having high expectations about what the record
19 quality is, that we'd have something out there. We
20 would access to over 600 online catalogs that you could
21 search and pull records into so that -- I know there's
22 a lot of students that do a lot of the data entry for

0177
1 these lists, and at least they would not have to know
2 quite as much as -- they don't know very much. I've
3 seen some lists that students do.
4   (Laughter)
5   MS. ORTH-ALFIE: And I understand that the
6 selectives have very limited resources, and so if you
7 could have a student go pull off a library thing, which
8 they'd probably kind of start to understand already
9 because it appeals to them, have them search by calling
10 -- not by calling everybody -- by title, find the
11 matching record. If we started having a database or
12 our own collection within something like library thing,
13 then that would be the first place she'd go look. And
14 we could have it -- within that we could have
15 collections of this is being digitized, collections of
16 this is needed, and collections of this is being
17 offered. And you could create a whole national list.
18 Now I don't think we could probably do this with
19 library thing, but maybe there's a way we can make an
20 agreement with library thing. But I think it's
21 definitely an outside of the box way to approach it and
22 a national level of approaching it. I echo some of the
0178
1 same concerns other people have. If I just go eyeball
2 something as a regional, I might be allowing something
3 to be discarded that is desperately desired by
4 someplace else.
5   And also, the other thing I wanted to point
6 out is that the way we're doing lists right now -- we
7 did a small little survey within the state of Kansas,
8 and I know that my selectives pretty much are not
9 looking, and if they are looking, there's so many lists
10 that are posted on email that if it doesn't clearly
11 have some kind of clue as to what it is, they won't
12 bother to open it. So if you just say "We have a new
13 list," I really doubt there's a lot of people looking
14 at that; and that the list that they're taking the time
15 to look at and the list that I take a moment to look at
16 are the ones that give me some kind of clue to that
17 call number range, that date range, etcetera. Thanks.
18   MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.
19   MS. WALSH: She sort of beat me to it, but
20 we've heard it now from several people. We're more
21 likely to look at lists that have been pushed to us
22 rather than lists that we have to go in and search.

0179
1 I'm not quite sure -- maybe we need to be talking with
2 Amazon.
3   MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.
4   MR. CISMOWSKI: I think that your comment
5 fits in with Rob's comment earlier because I've been
6 thinking about the possibility of a national list that
7 is much more technologically robust than the current
8 Needs and Offers List is on the GPO web site. You can
9 bad-mouth the SuDoc number system a lot, and there's a
10 lot to bad-mouth about it, but one of the really
11 wonderful things about the SuDoc number system is that
12 every SuDoc number is unique if carried through to its
13 fullest extent; that is, every single piece has a
14 unique SuDoc number. So what if we could develop a
15 system where you could input titles into a national
16 Needs and Offers List, and I know as a regional that
17 people don't know how to input SuDoc numbers correctly,
18 but maybe that doesn't matter because you can normalize
19 the SuDoc numbers. Then people who are looking --
20 depositories who are looking for material, who have
21 needs could input SuDoc or ranges of SuDoc numbers, and
22 then the system could do that automatic matching that
0180
1 Rob was just talking about and send out an alert; that
2 is, yesterday somebody posted what you need. And I'm
3 wondering if that could be technologically possible. I
4 think it can.
5   The other thing I'd like to say about
6 automation is that I've thought a lot about the
7 mechanism that's used in documents data miner, the
8 shelf list feature of that, and wondering if that could
9 somehow be applied to automatically creating disposal
10 lists. The problem with documents data miners is that
11 it only goes back to about 1998 or so. The other big
12 problem is that it's based on your current selection,
13 item selection profile. So if you've changed your
14 profiles since 1998, you're not going to get what you
15 selected in 1998 or 1999 if you use the shelf list
16 function. But one of the things that I've brought up
17 with some of my selectives in order to get them
18 thinking about this is that what if you went in to
19 documents data miners and specified "I want everything
20 from 1999 that I selected" and it would be today's
21 current selection, and you would get a lot of stuff
22 that you would have to weed out of that list; but you

0181
1 can download the SuDoc number, the title, the date, the
2 shipping list date. You can download all that stuff
3 automatically in a common delimited form format. Then
4 you can take that and you can strip out the stuff that
5 you've lost, strip out the stuff you've already
6 offered, strip out the stuff that you don't want to
7 offer, and then you have your list.
8   So those kinds of automation could really be
9 used to keep from having to key in every single thing.
10 So those are just some of the things that I think about
11 when I'm taking a shower in the morning.
12   (Laughter)
13   MS. RUSSELL: Gwen.
14   MS. SINCLAIR: One of the frequent comments
15 in the comments that were appended to the report on
16 regionals was that regionals don't review their
17 selectives offer list in a timely manner. So I'm
18 wondering if we can get some feedback from the
19 community about what is your definition of a timely
20 manner.
21   Come on. Someone's got -- pie in the sky, how
22 fast do you want it to happen?
0182
1   (Pause)
2   MS. RUSSELL: Did you want to respond to
3 that?
4   FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes, I would be generous
5 and I would give them one month.
6   (Pause)
7   MALE SPEAKER: That's pie in the sky right
8 there.
9   (Laughter)
10   MS. COLEEN PARMER: I like the way we do it
11 in Ohio. Coleen Parmer, Bowling Green State
12 University. Our regional does not review our list. We
13 put our list up, but we review what they're looking
14 for, and so we can highlight for them if there's stuff
15 they need. And we only have to leave it posted for six
16 weeks, and then we're done.
17   MS. SANDERS: Is Audrey here? Is the
18 regional collection in Ohio really completely
19 cataloged?
20   MS. AUDREY HALL: No.
21   MS. SANDERS: Thank you.
22   MS. RUSSELL: Any other thoughts on that

0183
1 one? Okay.
2   MS. ELAINE HOFFMAN: Elaine Hoffman, from
3 Stonybrook University. I've been a documents librarian
4 for about 18 years, and I'm just curious seeing as we
5 have all the people in the room. How many of you are
6 actually looking for anything?
7   (Pause)
8   MS. HOFFMAN: Okay. There are a few
9 because what I get complaints about from my two office
10 people that are left is we've been doing these lists
11 for years and years and year and nobody ever wants
12 anything; it's a waste of time. So it's good to know
13 there are a few people looking for things.
14   MS. SELBY: I guess -- Thank you. That was
15 my point earlier. I find it interesting that we just
16 had the digitization discussion and what do we want
17 with that, and now we're talking about moving paper
18 documents around the country where we know there are 50
19 -- theoretically. I know there's not 50 copies of each
20 of these, but -- it's a cost benefit here, and we do it
21 at the end of the month; we turn them around in a
22 month; we leave them up for -- and I don't review them
0184
1 all. I eyeball the lists, and do find things that I
2 want and go check those, but I don't check them all,
3 and most of the things are five years old, and there're
4 new when I've got them, and they've -- no, I haven't
5 lost them because they're not checked out to discard or
6 to loot (ph) missing. So I just -- I do think there's
7 a cost-benefit here that we need to examine in this
8 whole issue.
9   (Applause)
10   MR. JACOBS: Barbie, do you think it would be
11 faster to digitized those documents that you wanted to
12 --
13   MS. SELBY: That's what we were saying.
14   FEMALE SPEAKER: Send them to you.
15   MR. JACOBS: Yes, digitized them and send
16 them to FDsys.
17   (Laughter)
18   MS. SANDERS: I guess I'm the professional
19 devil's advocate here. I come from Michigan, which is
20 the land of the obsessive organized when it comes to
21 disposal, but we have a situation in our state in which
22 we used to have two regionals, and now we have one.

0185
1 The one we have is kind of precarious these days, and
2 in reviewing lists from the Detroit Public Library when
3 they stopped being regional and became a selective, the
4 first year I took 10,000 items. So, yes, there's a
5 cost-benefit analysis for you there. I think the key
6 to this whole discussion is that it's different in
7 every state. I was fascinated in looking at the
8 different disposal guidelines in -- I was fascinated by
9 the states that said "We don't have disposal
10 guidelines. Just mail it all to the regional.
11   (Laughter)
12   MS. SANDERS: My staff had palpitations
13 when they read that, okay. I seriously thought I was
14 going to have to do CPR for a minute.
15   (Laughter)
16   MS. SANDERS: A lot of states where you
17 have to contact the regional before you begin to weed,
18 well, that to me suggests that weeding is an occasional
19 process or project rather than a daily process. So I
20 think that's kind of the point I'm trying to get at
21 here is that it's absolutely unique in each state, and
22 the amount of communications between the selectives and
0186
1 the regionals I think is pretty key to making everybody
2 a lot happier.
3   MS. SINCLAIR: For some reasons, your
4 remarks made me think about what states that don't have
5 a regional, that are not served by a regional are going
6 to do and how they're going to fit into this best
7 practices model because it's certainly possible that
8 there will be more and more states that are not served
9 by a regional.
10   MS. RUSSELL: Cindy.
11   MS. ETKIN: I can address -- can you hear
12 me? Okay. I can address Gwen's question there. If
13 they are not served by a regional, they cannot discard.
14 We just had a recent ruling on that from our General
15 Counsel.
16   MS. SINCLAIR: Back again. Maybe we need to
17 take David's pie-in-the-sky, technologically robust
18 system and marry it to Barbie's cost-benefit analysis,
19 okay.
20   (Laughter)
21   MS. SINCLAIR: And instead of listing
22 everything you have to offer because I'm one of those

 1 people who are looking "Did you really throw out the
 2 Congressional Record?" "Hey, I'll talk to you later."
 3 I've got holes I'm trying to fill. If I thought people
 4 were looking at the needs lists on the national Needs
 5 and Offers List, I'd be more comfortable; but since I
 6 know, even though I'm trying to fill holes, unless the
 7 list is pushed at me saying "This has got census
 8 materials, this has got Congressional Record material,
 9 this has got serials set, etcetera," I don't tend to
10 look at it. So maybe we should have a national need
11 list and not worry about the offers. That's real
12 devil's advocate, complete opposite.
13   MS. KIM FOURNIER: I'm Kim Fournier, from
14 Schoolcraft College in Michigan, and I'm going to have
15 to go against the grain here. Our regional posts a
16 list of their needs, and we check it monthly. If we
17 have something that they want, we send it, and then we
18 post our list to the national Needs and Offers List,
19 and I was really amazed to discover that every, every
20 list that I've posted of my offers I've had takers from
21 all over the country, and I was astounded. But it's
22 really gratifying for, and I hope we keep it up. I
 1 don't think -- maybe because it doesn't work well for
 2 everybody we shouldn't throw it out. I think it can be
 3 improved upon and expanded and enlarged because it
 4 really works for me.
 5   (Applause)
 6   MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.
 7   MS. HALL: We do post our needs list.
 8 However, not everything we have need of is on that
 9 list, especially the older material that's not in our
10 catalog. So when I get a list from a selective, I kind
11 of scan it, and if it's something maybe '30s, '40s and
12 earlier, then I take it to the shelf and check, and
13 I've been -- we've been heavily weeding in our state,
14 and I've taken quite a bit of material.
15   MS. SMITH: I did a presentation this
16 morning on how I had to dramatically downsize my
17 collection, and I think that's true for a lot of
18 selectives. We are losing our land to other purposes
19 in the library: Information commons, they want more
20 computers. So I think most of the selectives we're
21 trying to get rid of our collections at this point is
22 my impression. So, yes, we're mostly in the offers,

0189
1 and it does seem like there are some people who are in
2 the needs business and are actually collecting things.
3 So I really like the idea of the national needs list so
4 that we wouldn't have to type up anything. We could
5 just search the national needs list. If our thing that
6 we have is not on that list, then it could go. Of
7 course, after our regional has approved it somehow. I
8 don't know they would do that. But I really like the
9 national needs list idea.
10   MS. SEARS: I like the idea too, but here is
11 my question. Does anybody know exactly what the
12 hundred percent inventory would be so that we would
13 have a list to check against to say what we don't have?
14   MR. CISMOWSKI: I think I have the same
15 concern. As a regional, we have over a million titles
16 in our physical collection, and every time I take a
17 list out to the stacks I find something that is missing
18 or we never got. Granted some of those things are
19 inconsequential I suppose in the larger scheme of
20 things, but if we're supposed to have a comprehensive
21 collection as a regional, maybe they're not
22 inconsequential. But the problem with only have a
0190
1 needs list is if one of the primary purposes of the
2 disposal process is to make sure that your regional has
3 a copy of what you're getting rid of, short of a 100
4 percent inventory, and when you have a million items to
5 inventory, that's just not going to happen with us.
6 How do you just have a needs list? It's a good idea,
7 and I want to do some thinking about that, and I think
8 we'll all going to do some thinking about that, but I'm
9 having a hard time wrapping my mind around that right
10 now.
11   MS. JOBE: I don't want to contradict you. I
12 just want to give people statistics. We've been doing
13 a hundred percent inventory on portions of our
14 collection, and we have 10 percent of the collection
15 that we didn't received or is missing, so that's
16 actually for the areas that are a hundred percent
17 inventoried. That's kind of alarming. That seems very
18 high to me. I'm not sure what other people think, but
19 that number seems high.
20   MS. ETKIN: I just want to ask a question of
21 regionals. Do you all ever say no when people put
22 something on a list and say, "No, I'm sorry. You need

 1 that to cover your area of the state or what have you?"
 2   MS. SANDERS: Believe it or not, yes, I
 3 have. I had a selective library that their catalog was
 4 largely -- their collection was largely uncataloged.
 5 They dated from 1907, and they wanted to get rid of
 6 their run of the monthly catalog, and I said no. And
 7 they fought me all the way to Sheila McGar (ph), and
 8 Sheila backed me up.
 9   (Laughter)
10   MR. SHULER: I've been thinking about
11 Buffalo.
12   (Laughter)
13   MR. SHULER: And I'm trying to imagine what
14 we would discuss about this topic in Buffalo. What do
15 you guys want us to do? I've heard a lot of different
16 things. It still seems to me that I haven't heard
17 clarity yet except somebody needs to do something some
18 time soon. Is that about right?
19   FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.
20   FEMALE SPEAKER: That's true.
21   MR. SHULER: We have a lot of people throwing
22 up stuff to grab. We've got a lot of people wanting
 1 stuff, but it's like eBay with dyslexia nobody is
 2 connecting.
 3   (Laughter)
 4   MR. SHULER: So I'm -- I'm turning toward GPO
 5 folks here. Help me out.
 6   MS. RUSSELL: I would actually like to put
 7 in a plug for the community and anyone here who has
 8 comments when they get back home, if they have comments
 9 that they get a chance to put in today, I'd like to ask
10 you to go to the community site and share them. If
11 anybody -- if you read anything there and it triggers
12 anything, please share your comments. We will be
13 starting on our requirements document, and we can share
14 that out and get comments from the community and see if
15 you like what we come up with based on what we've heard
16 here and what we hear through the community site.
17   MR. CISMOWSKI: When Ann and I and Gwen
18 were talking with Lisa and Cindy about this program,
19 John, it became apparent to us, I think, that GPO is in
20 sort of a brainstorming mode as far as automation of
21 needs and offers. And I guess what I thought that we
22 were doing here is just doing that brainstorming, and

0193
 1 it's got to continue because we have very little
 2 representation from the entire community at this
 3 Conference, and we need to use the community web site,
 4 and we also need to maybe post appeals for other people
 5 to input ideas. But eventually I think that there will
 6 be -- there will be something -- there will be a
 7 product that will come out of this or a methodology
 8 that will come out of this eventually. It's just that
 9 we're not -- we don't have enough raw material to forge
 10 that product yet.
 11   MS. ETKIN: I just want to respond to David.
 12 He's absolutely right. This was a brainstorming
 13 session and to try to encourage use of the community
 14 site so we can gather all of your ideas. We know that
 15 not everybody is here, and so we are planning to do an
 16 OPAL session in early December, sort of a repeat of
 17 this and with the transcription service available we'll
 18 be able to include also all the questions and the
 19 comments that you all have provided us today. But the
 20 end result of this, Lisa is absolutely right, is we're
 21 going to take all the comments and design something and
 22 put a requirements document, and we'll be able to share
0194
 1 that.
 2   MS. MORIEARTY: And I'm about to get in a
 3 whole lot of trouble. We've had this discussion for
 4 decades, which has been pointed out to me that I've
 5 been here --
 6   (Laughter)
 7   MS. MORIEARTY: -- through several --
 8   FEMALE SPEAKER: No, you weren't here in
 9 1973.
 10   MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you.
 11   (Laughter)
 12   MS. MORIEARTY: Guys, one of the things
 13 that also come across is it is flawed, it doesn't
 14 always work, but it works an awful lot. Even people
 15 who admit it -- and I'm the first one to admit -- it
 16 can problematic when you looking for something or when
 17 you're trying to give something that you think is very,
 18 very valuable and your community says, "No, it's not."
 19 I don't want it, no one wants it, and then you're left
 20 with, "Yeah, but somebody's going to want it in the
 21 future." Well, no one wants it now, and they may not
 22 want it in the future. But you know it has worked. If

0195
 1 we could put our collective wisdom together and figure
 2 out how to modify this enough, perhaps make it
 3 electronic, more interactive, certainly faster. We've
 4 all been in that condition that we've taken it off the
 5 shelves, and it's piled up somewhere that GPO can't
 6 find it if they paid a visit, and it's there --
 7   (Laughter)
 8   MS. MORIEARTY: -- in three, four, five
 9 months, respectively --
10   (Laughter)
11   MS. MORIEARTY: I think we've got the bare
12 bones of what works for us, but if we could just move
13 it technologically, make it more interactive, then
14 we've got a pattern already. I'd hate to see we throw
15 this out entirely and invent something new that hasn't
16 been as proven as this. And you can find me tomorrow
17 morning at coffee and tell me how wrong I am. Thanks.
18   (Laughter)
19   MS. RUSSELL: I think we've got about five
20 minutes left, so if the two people who are at the mics
21 want to go ahead and comment.
22   MS. BARBARA REHKOP: Hi, I'm Barbara Rehkop,
0196
 1 from Washington University in Saint Louis. I thought I
 2 heard in last session that GPO was automating the shelf
 3 list. Is that correct?   Could I have 150 word summary
 4 of how that project is going? Thanks.
 5   MS. RUSSELL: Lori is going to address
 6 that.
 7   MS. HALL: The shelf list, the pre-'76 shelf
 8 list, we have transcribed about 6,000 monographs from
 9 the historic shelf list from 1880 to 1992;
10 approximately 850 of those are now available in the
11 CGP. There are also mark record with one authorized
12 LCSH subject heading, and one authorized name authority
13 file. So the project is still continuing. We've just
14 announced the award of a contract for a company to come
15 in and transcribe the rest of the shelf list card for
16 the next two years, so that project will continue till
17 we finish up. That's what the omnibus money was for.
18 Anything else specific? Now remember these are brief
19 bids. They're just from our shelf list card. They're
20 not going into OCLC right now because we do not have
21 the material. We're working with OCLC right now to
22 determine how we're going to batch load these things,

0197
1 but they are -- they're pretty good little records if
2 you take a look --
3   (Pause)
4   MS. HALL: Well, yes, of course, the shelf
5 list is only what we have. We don't know whether it's
6 complete or not. It's what we have. We have not
7 compared it with the MoCat or anything yet. We've just
8 transcribing it. So does that answer the question? Is
9 that okay? Okay. If you have any other questions
10 about it, operational open forum, we can talk a little
11 more about it there.
12   MR. ANDERSON: One of the problems that
13 hurts my soul the most about this whole things is --
14 people have been talking about rare and historical
15 documents when you have a -- when you have some of them
16 too that you want to get rid or you want to leave for
17 the library, but the places that are -- the limits of
18 where we are allowed to offer these things is limited
19 to depository libraries; in other word, if you can't
20 find another depository library that wants it, you have
21 to toss it in the dumpster. Or you can keep it.
22   MS ETKIN:
0198
1 them only to depository libraries. They just have
2 first choice.
3   MR. ANDERSON: But you can't go to the rare
4 books and antiquities dealers and sell them.
5   MS ETKIN: That's not offering them to other
6 libraries.
7   (Laughter)
8   MR. ANDERSON: Well, yes. The things that
9 bothers me about it --
10   (Laughter)
11   MS ETKIN: Yes, I -- I know --
12   MR. ANDERSON: -- is you go on the Web to
13 these rare book and antiquities dealers, and they're
14 selling these things for 4 and $5,000 and so -- there's
15 got to -- there should be a way that we could offer
16 them out on the open market if there isn't another
17 depository that wants them and with the profits going
18 either to FDLP or the library or --
19   MS ETKIN: Yes, and -- you don't know how
20 many times we've heard that --
21   MR. ANDERSON: Uh-huh.
22   MS ETKIN:

0199
1 that we got on the community site too, and maybe it's
2 time we asked that question again of our General
3 Counsel, but for the short term any way, our hands are
4 tied on that.
5   MR. ANDERSON: I've seen maps that were
6 pulled out the serial set probably stolen originally,
7 but they're first -- they're in a nice frame, and
8 they're like $700 bucks a piece and I --
9   MS ETKIN:That's why one of the suggestions
10 was --
11   MR. ANDERSON: -- yes --
12   MS ETKIN: -- set up an eBay account and the
13 proceeds go to GPO.
14   MR. ANDERSON: Yes. That would be --
15   MS ETKIN: I think it's a good suggestion.
16 Now --
17   MR. ANDERSON: Yes.
18   MS ETKIN: -- whether we're allowed to do
19 that is certainly another matter.
20   MR. ANDERSON: Yes.
21   MS ETKIN: Yes.
22   MR. ANDERSON: And I've got probably four or
0200
1 five copies of the Ferdinand Hayden survey of the
2 geological survey of the territories where they went
3 through Yellowstone Park, but anyway.
4   MR. LOPRESTI: Cindy, I'd like you to
5 follow-up on what you just said. He said that you
6 don't -- he said you can give them to depositories or
7 nothing else, and you said, no, that only the first
8 step. There's another step after that. What is it?
9   MS ETKIN: You can offer them to other
10 libraries. Or do as some folks have done and put them
11 out and people just take them.
12   MR. LOPRESTI: Okay.
13   MS. RUSSELL: Robin has something to say,
14 and then we're done.
15   MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: If you are in a
16 multibranch system -- after the regional says, no, we
17 don't them, the selectives say we don't want them, go
18 ahead and share them out to the other libraries in your
19 -- on your campus or your multibranch system. You can
20 also reach out to neighboring public libraries. And
21 yes, a lot of time they'll say "We don't want this
22 stuff," but if you got maps, maps are great things for

0201
1 offering up to other folks, especially folks that are
2 doing instructions, so high school and other media
3 institutions. Go ahead and think outside the box with
4 those. You just can't sell them, and if you do, you
5 have to return the money to the Superintendent of
6 Documents.
7   MS. ETKIN: One final note, John. (Laughter)
8 He's dancing here.
9   (Laughter)
10   MS. ETKIN: The last institution I worked I
11 found great success in sharing some of the materials
12 that we were discarding with the public schools.
13 Always in need.
14   MR. SHULER: Thank you, again to the group.
15 Let's give a great hand.
16   (Applause)
17   MR. SHULER: Personally, I think this is
18 going very well; and to show you how selfless your
19 Council is, while you were out having drinks and
20 whatever with yourself, we will continue to work here
21 selflessly on your behalf considering these important
22 issues you raised. You can stay and watch us before
0202
1 you go drink.
2   (Applause)
3   MR. SHULER: Or not. But thanks again.
4 Session is over. Wait a minute. And Council just stay
5 for a moment, and --
6   MALE SPEAKER: John?
7   MR. SHULER: Yes.
8   MR. SHULER: Five till 7:00 on the very top
9 of this building in the Sky -- excuse 5 till 9:00,
10 Skydome Lounge, the tiptop of the building. Thank you
11 very much. See you guys tomorrow.
12   (Whereupon, session was concluded.)
13   * * * * *

1
2
3
4   2009 FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE AND
5   FALL DEPOSITORY COUNCIL MEETING
6
7   Day Two
8   October 20, 2009
9
10   DOUBLETREE HOTEL
11   300 Army-Navy Drive
12   Arlington, VIRGINIA 22202
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
0002
1   P R O C E E D I N G S
2   MR. JOHN SHULER: I call into session the second
3   morning of the 2009 Depository Library Council, and I thank
4   you all for coming back. We hope we have as an interesting
5   day as it was yesterday for you all to take part of and take
6   part in.
7   First of all, I must under federal law say a few
8   things. Very important when speaking, please state your
9   name for the court reporter. Also, if we haven't said this
10   before, wireless is available in this room courtesy of the
11   GPO, which we should all recognize and applaud.
12   (Applause)
13   MR. SHULER: Very good. We didn't even have to
14   write a recommendation on that either.
15   Finally, public library's lunch, today at noon, meet by
16   the registration table.
17   Okay. This morning is going to be focused on the
18   strategic future of the program and those of us, the
19   librarians, that make up our community of service. And we
20   have -- for the first hour of this session, we have two
21   featured speakers. One will be talking about the report
22   that was distributed last week by the Association of
0003

1 Research Libraries and mentioned by the Public Printer in
 2 his remarks yesterday. The second speaker will talk about
 3 the future model, a future grant that is looking at the
 4 education of government information librarians in a world
 5 dominated by the term "electronic government and digital
 6 services."
 7   What we would hope would happen in the last 30 minutes
 8 of this session is that both speakers will generate a
 9 conversation, first amongst council members and then with
10 the audience, about what these two views of the future might
11 mean for the strategic purposes of the Government Printing
12 Office. Of course, the Public Printer alluded to some of
13 what he's interested in, and we really, really, really do
14 care about what he's interested in, but we are also
15 practitioners who have our own body of best practices that
16 are influenced by both what is happening in our
17 institutions, as well as what's happening with GPO. But as
18 I said, it is a community of expertise that is shaped not
19 only by what these agencies do, but what we need to do in
20 order to inform the public with government information.
21   So I would like to first introduce our first speaker.
22 That's Roger Schonfeld (ph) from Ithaka Consulting Group. I
0004
 1 didn't say the whole name because, you know, that's just the
 2 way I am. And he will give a few remarks about the report,
 3 the summary of the report that was issued last week. So if
 4 I could ask Roger to step up to the podium, thank you very
 5 much. We'll have questions after the two speakers are done.
 6   (Applause)
 7   MR. SCHONFELD: Thank you, John, and thank you to
 8 all the members of the council for having me here today and
 9 to the GPO, as well, for inviting me to speak.
10   I am actually going to try to speak from a laptop
11 because I was too afraid of that clicker thing that everyone
12 was working on yesterday, so I hope that that will work out
13 okay.
14   I'm really delighted to be here. My -- I'm -- oh,
15 sorry. How did that happen? It's still going to have a
16 minds of its own.
17   I'm really delighted to be here today, and I wanted to
18 just start off by giving a quick word of introduction to my
19 organization just because I know many of you in the room
20 will not necessarily be familiar with it. Ithaka S&R is the
21 strategy and research arm of an organization called Ithaka,
22 which is a not-for-profit organization that -- that has been
0005

2

1   in existence for several years that, in essence, supports
2   innovation, especially in higher education, developing
3   sustainable business models for initiatives, as well as
4   organizations themselves.
5   Some of the research and analysis that you may have
6   seen or may not be familiar with basically is on the impact
7   of digital media, and particularly the impact of digital
8   media on research teaching and learning. So we've done some
9   work on the sustainability of online academic resources, a
10 lot of work on the print to electronic transition that
11 libraries are facing, things like the economics and
12 preservation of policy questions associated with that
13 transition, work on university publishing in a digital
14 environment, faculty attitudes and practices where we've
15 surveyed faculty members extensively, so just to give you a
16 sense of some of the kinds of work that we've done prior to
17 this project.
18   Chasetore (ph) and Portico (ph), just to be, you know,
19 sort of full disclosure and let you know are also part of
20 Ithaka. There are other arms of Ithaka along with the
21 strategy and research group. And for those interested in
22 more information, there's a website that I could point you
0006
1   to.
2   On the project that I'm about to -- to share some
3   background on, I just wanted to acknowledge my colleague,
4   Ross Houseright (ph), who's in the audience, was my
5   collaborator in this project from S&R.
6   So the project itself, as John mentioned, was and is an
7   effort that was commissioned this summer by the Association
8   of Research Libraries and an organization called COSLA, the
9   Chief Officers State Library Agencies that many of you will
10 be familiar with, as well, basically to examine the current
11 state of the FDLP and make recommendations about -- about
12 what its future might look like, looking at -- looking
13 towards a sort of comprehensive framework that would take
14 advantage of what the digital environment is all about.
15   Now, the FDLP, as you all know, serves a wide variety
16 of needs across different -- different stakeholder
17 communities, and one of our tasks in this project or
18 priorities in this project was to try to understand all
19 those different stakeholder communities. So we spoke with
20 something on the order of 80 individuals, actually a little
21 larger than 80 individuals, talking to people from 30
22 academic -- excuse me, not 30 academic libraries, 30
0007

3

1 libraries all together, including academic, law, public and
2 state libraries, and we really tried to build a system-wide
3 understanding of the -- of the program.
4   And so while I want to emphasize that although Ithaka
5 S&R's background is in the academic community, we really
6 worked hard, not least through COSLA but also through a
7 number of public libraries and law libraries and the AALL to
8 really understand all of the different communities at work
9 in this program.
10   And one other thing that I would just mention briefly
11 is that Ithaka S&R's experience is principally on the sort
12 of -- on questions that touch on organizational structure,
13 so you'll hear me using words like "incentives" quite a bit
14 during the course of the presentation. But what I want to
15 emphasize is that that's not an effort to undermine or in
16 any way call into question the deep set of public interests
17 that are at stake here and the -- and I want to try to do my
18 best to emphasize that at the same time.
19   And finally, I would like to just say a brief word of
20 thanks to the many individuals in the room who actually
21 participated as interviewees, including several members here
22 up on council, so we really appreciated and valued the help
0008
1 that so many people were able to provide.
2   Now, what I thought I would start with is a vision
3 for -- for the program, and this is a vision that -- I mean,
4 this is not sort of a -- a well widely vetted vision, but
5 this is a vision that -- that at the level of consensus
6 across the various members of -- who we interviewed, I
7 think, is something that probably would ring right at least
8 at a high level sense with many of you. And what I'd like
9 to suggest is that we're -- in this project we're looking
10 for a way to make this vision true not only today, but also
11 in the future, and I think that -- and we also want to
12 examine how well today the program lives up to a vision like
13 this. I imagine this is visible in the back, so I won't --
14 I won't try to read it out, but this is -- this is the kind
15 of vision that -- that we like to look at.
16   So in looking at the state of the program today, at a
17 high level, what can we say about it? Very, very valuable
18 historical collections, hugely important current information
19 that meets a range of important needs for a democracy,
20 services to maximize discovery and expedite support, the use
21 of the information, and I think a number of things that --
22 where access to the workings of the government is actually
0009

4

1 imperative to the work of a democracy in a way that -- in a
 2 way that really syncs nicely with the open and transparent
 3 agenda that the Obama Administration has before it today.
 4 So I think one of -- one of the questions that we've pursued
 5 in the background is what -- how could -- how could this
 6 program sort of fit -- fit in in a certain way to that kind
 7 of -- to that kind of agenda.
 8   Now, this is a graphic that many of you will have seen
 9 from the summary document, but I just thought it would be
10 useful to walk through it, because this basically
11 encapsulates our sort of analysis of what the -- how the
12 FDLP operates today. So what you have going from left to
13 right are a set of con -- what I've called content types,
14 the collections that are managed and preserved and
15 disseminated, we hope, and ways of empowering the use of
16 those collections. So I don't know how well the colors come
17 across, but boxes numbers one, two and three are pink, and
18 the reason those are pink is that those are digital. So
19 born-digital government information, as well as digitized
20 print documents feed into digital collections that then have
21 a set of management and preservation and dissemination
22 affordances associated with them. And then boxes number
0010
 1 four and five, which are blue at least on my screen, are the
 2 print side where print documents are produced and print
 3 collections are, again, managed, preserved, disseminated and
 4 so forth.
 5   The vertical line between digital collections and print
 6 collections indicates that there's actually a substantial --
 7 as we all know in part from the discussion yesterday,
 8 substantial dependency between digital collections and print
 9 collections, in the sense that as more and more collections
10 are being made available digitally, libraries are electing
11 to -- to collect and maintain a smaller amount of print
12 looking from a system-wide perspective. And at the same
13 time, the quality of the digital informs what can be done
14 with the print, and the quality of the print informs the
15 thresholds that are needed for the digital. So there's a
16 very tight set of interdependencies both on that vertical,
17 but also moving from left to right in terms of the quality
18 of information and what that -- excuse me, the quality of
19 the documents and what that means.
20   And then finally, both digital and print collections
21 drive both discover -- drive discovery and outreach and use
22 and all -- and many of the important services that are
0011

5

1 provided around government information.
2   So I think I've -- I hope I've mentioned the
3 dependencies here adequately, but what I also want to say is
4 that there's a very particular set of incentives that are
5 baked into the program the way that they -- the way that the
6 program has existed, and those incentives are particularly
7 on what's now labeled numbers four and five, the sort of
8 print documents to print collections, and then to number
9 six, the discovery outreach and support, in which the
10 incentives that libraries have had to participate in the
11 program at the institutional level, that there was a
12 particular set of incentives that existed there that are
13 increasingly going to be different, and as -- given the
14 amount of dependencies in the system, as you begin to pull
15 things apart, the incentives change, and I think that that's
16 one of the most important findings from our project.
17   So I'm going to just very quickly run through those six
18 boxes in a little bit more detail. Most of this is not
19 going to be new to very many people in the room today. As
20 you know, there's a significant share of government
21 documents. It's in the 93 to -- I think it's now in the 97
22 percent range that are available digitally, and there's a
0012
1 decreasing share, it has been decreasing the last several
2 years, that are available in print. So the reality is that
3 prospectively the program has become increasingly a digital
4 rather than a -- or I shouldn't say the program, but rather
5 the information has been increasingly available digitally
6 and decreasingly available in print.
7   At the same time there's some -- there are a number of
8 considerations here. One is the issue of authenticity that
9 I know is particularly important to the law library
10 community, but also to some other elements of the community,
11 where the GPO as we've been -- as we've been told by the
12 AALL has been -- has successfully developed mechanisms that
13 will address some of the previous concerns that existed
14 about authenticity, and we heard quite a bit about the sort
15 of, you know, different levels of authenticity that might be
16 needed for different kinds of documents with the -- with the
17 core legal records certainly at the top of that pyramid.
18   But looking forward, the notion of thinking about
19 stand-alone documents with -- sort of in individual
20 containers of their own is one that -- is one that's
21 increasingly being broken down as publications are turning
22 into dynamic sources of digital information as things that
0013

1   were once encapsulated in, you know, PDFs, let's say, are
2   now living on agency websites that have interactions across
3   them. And questions about how those will be preserved and
4   authenticated and other things like that, whether those
5   things are needed is one that we heard a fair amount of
6   discussion about.
7   Now, on the topic of digitization, we heard from
8   virtually everyone we spoke to that digitization
9   dramatically enhances accessibility. Again, probably not a
10 surprise to anyone here in this room. On the one hand, some
11 of the most valuable materials due to the presence of
12 commercial players here are actually not -- although
13 digitized beautifully and in ways that are hugely useful to
14 users, don't actually present the opportunity for permanent
15 public access in the sense that they're not freely
16 available, they're not part of the program, and that's
17 certainly a big concern.
18   There are, as many people mentioned yesterday,
19 library-driven initiatives digitizing significant share or
20 at least significant collections of important content. And
21 the mass digitization projects that I think are going to be
22 increasingly important for this community, in particular the
0014
1   Google/CIC partnership, but also some of the other mass
2   digitization initiatives that either have taken place or are
3   on the table potentially in the future where the -- where
4   for the first time significant volume of the program is --
5   of the collections and the program are being digitized.
6   Now, at the same time, as we all know, the digitized
7   collections vary significantly in quality, and they're not
8   by any means comprehensive; and to the extent that they are,
9   some of the highest-quality programs, as I mentioned, are
10 often provided from the commercial sector, so there's a very
11 sort of fragmented set of digitization initiatives.
12   And as came out a little bit yesterday in the
13 conversation, there is no title level registry that might
14 enable a certain kind of strategic digitization across some
15 of the -- some of these significant areas in the community
16 and some of the libraries in the community.
17   Now, on the digital collections management front,
18 there's actually quite a lot of good news here. GPO access
19 has given way, as you all know, to FDsys, and the plans for
20 FDsys, you know, although it's in data and it's a process to
21 roll it out, seem to be moving in the right direction. The
22 direct ingested materials from agencies is quite well
0015

7

1 established and hopefully will continue to grow in the
 2 future. There are experimental harvesting strategies that
 3 are going on, and hopefully these platforms will eventually
 4 allow GPO to incorporate so much of the digitized content
 5 into the program in a formal kind of way.
 6   Now, as many of you know, there's formal partnerships
 7 between GPO and agencies to help -- to help with management
 8 of information systems, but there's a significant share of
 9 materials that are held neither on FDsys nor in -- under --
10 through those kinds of partnership agreements, like with NLM
11 or some of the other agency partners. And materials that
12 are not held in those ways can't be said to be preserved,
13 and I think that's something that should give us all some
14 cause for concern. And at the same time, at this point
15 neither FDsys nor any of these government partnerships
16 provide audit or third-party preservation custody, which is
17 an important shortcoming that will need to be addressed in
18 the coming years.
19   With respect to print document production, we heard
20 from both users as well as documents librarians the strong
21 preference that users have for accessing materials in
22 digital form. Now, at the same time we are also quite well
0016
 1 aware and it became quite clear that significant kinds of
 2 material types are not necessarily going to be useful as
 3 PDF, so whether those are data tables, for example, or some
 4 of the visual content or maps, that we are -- we are -- the
 5 sort of flat -- a flat PDF format may not be the right way
 6 to engage with those kinds of materials, and, in fact, print
 7 or tangible formats may actually be better until more
 8 dynamic or more appropriate kind of formats are possible.
 9   And at the same time broadband -- you know, you don't
10 need me to tell you, but broadband is not uniformly
11 available even in public libraries in the country, and
12 that -- and that is -- in certain areas of the country, and
13 that constrains what can be done with digital collections
14 and what can't. But at the same time, less than a third of
15 new documents, as I mentioned before, are actually produced
16 in print, which is a significant -- could be for some
17 materials a significant problem given the fact that
18 decision-making about what is produced in print and what is
19 not is not really done with as much of user needs in mind,
20 although the GPO has tried with some of its efforts to
21 develop lists in terms of what, you know, sort of core
22 documents that need to be available in print. These
0017

1   decisions are largely up to the agencies, and so we're not
2   necessarily seeing all of the -- all of the best choices
3   about what should be issued in print and what can be issued
4   just digitally.
5   And then finally with respect -- excuse me, not
6   finally, fifth with respect to print collections management,
7   the demands by users for digital access and online discovery
8   have led historical collections, and we heard this at
9   virtually every single institution we spoke with, to -- the
10 print collections to be decreasingly used and actually
11 dramatically underutilized relative to the richness that is
12 contained in those collections. And I'd submit to you that
13 this is actually an area of significant concern, should be
14 an area of significant concern for the libraries and
15 librarians who participate in this program. As you know,
16 many libraries hope to reassign the space occupied by
17 historical collections to what they see as higher value
18 purposes, such as information commons or materials that they
19 see as higher use materials, and this is an important
20 pressure on the system.
21   As you know, many selectives have left the program in
22 the last 10 or 15 years, and many more have reduced the
0018
1   amount of print that they hold by a significant amount.
2   We've talked to many regional directors who do not have
3   flexibility in print collections management or have
4   relatively circumscribed flexibility and print collections
5   management for whom this is therefore becoming an area of
6   significant concern. And we heard, and this was reflected
7   yesterday in the talk from GPO in the afternoon, an
8   overwhelming call by everyone for a streamline print
9   deaccessioning (ph) practices, and it's good to see that
10 that is something that's really being thought about and
11 addressed now.
12   But in the long run there really are -- as a result of
13 the underutilization of the historical print collections,
14 the incentives that libraries, through their directors, face
15 to participate in this program, both selectives and
16 regionals alike, are declining, and in the long run without
17 structural change, we see this as the most significant
18 threat to the program as it now stands today, so that's one
19 that we're going to be -- that I'll be tracking through over
20 the next few minutes.
21   At the same time on the discovery outreach and support
22 side, I've heard, you know, during the course of the project
0019

9

1 and especially richly over the last 24 hours or so, some
2 really fascinating conversations, and I think John's
3 probably going to talk a little bit more about some things
4 in this kind of direction, but we're -- librarians are
5 deploying their expertise in new kinds of ways, in some
6 cases to reach beyond documents, in some cases beyond the
7 program -- beyond just the FDLP through to other sources of
8 government information, and it's actually -- the vanguard of
9 change here is really moving along quite speedily, and it's
10 actually really heartening to see some of the progress
11 that's been made here.
12   At the same time, we also came across a number of
13 libraries where government information -- and this is both a
14 physical and a digital issue, but where government
15 information is fragmented into discrete service points in
16 certain cases, certainly a discrete bibliographic
17 infrastructure where that bibliographic infrastructure even
18 exists locally, and discrete discovery tools that are --
19 often do an absolutely poor job, I guess is the way I would
20 put it, in meeting user needs. And I think this is a --
21 this is something that so many people are aware of and are
22 working on, but it would be remiss of me not to -- not to
0020
1 point that out.
2   The upshot is that there are too many users out there,
3 some of whom we spoke to during the course of the project,
4 who don't -- don't seem to succeed in obtaining and making
5 good use of the government information that they seek. And
6 this is not to indictment, you know, the government
7 information system exclusively, these are problems that
8 libraries are grappling with across their bibliographic
9 infrastructure and across the services that they provide,
10 but it is something that does live here in the -- in terms
11 of providing for a discovery and outreach and user support
12 with respect to government information.
13   So the system is organized around -- as everybody know,
14 around a series of regional depository libraries.
15 There's -- this will not provide any new information. This
16 is just a graphic so you don't see any more text for a
17 moment or two, but there are, as you know, 50 regional
18 depository libraries. We've lost a number in the few years.
19 And based on -- based on the work that Ithaka's done, the
20 interviews that we've done, it seems quite clear that we
21 stand to lose several more in the next few years, and that
22 that's part of that sort of structural change where the
0021

1 incentives for participation are just moving inexorably in a
2 certain direction.
3   The structural issues, many of you will be aware of
4 this, there's a vast -- there's a wide range of the number
5 of selective libraries that -- that regional needs to serve.
6 So California, David, you'll know that you support more
7 selectives than anyone else, and, you know, it ranges down
8 quite significantly. All of this, of course, is
9 uncompensated work by the -- by the regionals in terms of
10 financial compensation. Population per regional is even --
11 is actually even more -- slightly more dramatic when you
12 calculate it that way.
13   And I'm sorry, I don't know if -- the state names are
14 probably not visible to very many people. It doesn't
15 matter. California is at the top, and North Dakota is at
16 the bottom, and there's 48 in the middle, and, you know,
17 I'll be happy to share my slides, but I really want you to
18 sort of see the -- see the patterns that exist, and the
19 incentives and disincentives that libraries face here.
20   We heard from regional directors, I think every single
21 one of whom -- every single one of -- every single regional
22 director with whom we spoke told us, how's that, about the
0022
1 challenges and the burdens associated with playing this
2 role. This is a real issue for the regional directors, and,
3 you know, they see the services that this program provides,
4 and I think they -- the ones that we've spoken to are
5 committed to -- to government information and committed to,
6 you know, using -- to deploying their resources to provide,
7 you know, expertise around government information, but the
8 incentives that they face is -- is -- is different, and it's
9 unevenly distributed even as it is declining.
10   So here's a -- here's a list of the -- a graph of the
11 number of Federal Depository libraries from the early '90s
12 through the present. And, you know, the graph doesn't look
13 dramatic, but the direction is quite -- the directionality
14 is quite clear.
15   I thought I might try -- at some risk here try a little
16 experiment. Who -- if you are at a selective institution,
17 could you raise your hand, please? Okay.
18   If you have reduced the -- okay, sorry, keep your hands
19 up.
20   Okay. If you have reduced the size of your print
21 collection, your tangible collections by, let's say, 10
22 percent in the last years, could you keep your hand up,
0023

1 please? Okay. And what about, let's say, 20 percent?
2 Okay. And what about 30 percent? Okay, still some hands,
3 not too many. How about 40 percent? They're still up. 50
4 percent? 60 percent? 70 percent? 80 percent? Okay, that
5 got all the hands down, I think.
6   Okay. So what I wanted to -- what I want to illustrate
7 is that there's a lot more reduction of print going on than
8 this graph suggests. I mean, the people in this room
9 largely, if not exclusively, represent selectives that are
10 still in the program, not the selectives that have departed
11 the program, and so this graph actually masks the amount of
12 print that has departed from the program in the last ten
13 years or so. I just think that this is an important part of
14 the dynamics of the program at a structural level that needs
15 to be addressed.
16   So in sum, structural change is needed for three or
17 four key reasons. Users needs are not well served by
18 fragmented and manual discovery and service environment and
19 by the lack of digitization. An insufficient share of
20 born-digital government information is incorporated into the
21 program, and that suggests potential for concerns about
22 preservation and access over the long run.
0024
1   As the assessment of library quality is moved from
2 collections to services, which has happened across
3 libraries, across library sectors and across library types,
4 incentives for participation in a program where the main --
5 where one of the principal incentives was the free
6 availability of tangible collections that featured at least
7 in part into volume count, but also was necessary in terms
8 of serving user needs with the print. Those incentives are
9 declining, both at selectives, as we've seen from the
10 departure of selectives and by the reduction in the amount
11 of print at selectives, as well as at regionals.
12   And so what this -- what this means is that we would
13 project that Federal Depository libraries will continue to
14 leave the program, putting at risk the loss of historical
15 collections that have not been digitized, but also the loss
16 as selectives depart the program, in particular the
17 potential for the loss of the expertise in government
18 information that is represented so richly here in this room.
19 And I think that that is part of the structural issue with
20 this program that, you know, whether -- whether you're at a
21 library whose users are still in a print environment for
22 whatever reason, or whether you're at a library where your
0025

1 users are, you know, gung ho for digital, the structural
 2 issues of the program matter either way.
 3   I'm going to say very quickly a few words about the
 4 future of the program, because I don't have as much time as
 5 I'd like, so I'm going to run through this very quickly.
 6 I'd be delighted to say more either in public questions or
 7 individually, and, you know, certainly will have a long
 8 report out in short time that will engage with some of these
 9 issues at greater length.
10   But at a level of principals, here's what we see for
11 the future of the program. We see three of them:
12 Government information made freely available in digital form
13 and digitally preserved for the long term. This feels like
14 a core -- a core and virtually unarguable element for what
15 the future of the program should look like. At the same
16 time, the historical print collection must be preserved
17 somehow. It shouldn't just be digitized and find ourselves
18 with zero copies left even though it will play a
19 significantly reduced role in providing access for users,
20 and this has already happened in terms of the latter phrase
21 there, and it will continue to take place. And I think
22 that's okay and that's something we should embrace.
0026
 1   And then finally, participating libraries and the
 2 librarians who support the program must really reemphasize
 3 their commitment, and I think this is already happening, so
 4 I don't mean to make this so much prescriptive as much as
 5 sort of reflective in many cases, but we emphasize their
 6 commitment to serving user needs around outreach and
 7 discovery and increasingly advanced forms of access and use.
 8 And I think that as the management of the print collection
 9 becomes a decreasing consideration for many libraries, our
10 hope in the work that we've done here is that that will make
11 available time and capacity that can be redirected forwards,
12 again, outreach and discovery and support of use.
13   So there's -- excuse me. As we see it, there's four
14 elements to that. One is on the historical collections, a
15 real recommitment to digitization and an increasing
16 commitment to digitization which will enable an increasing
17 migration away from print. To remain useful, the historical
18 collections really must be digitized. They are not being
19 used as much as they deserve to be used, and this is just a
20 tragedy in a lot of ways.
21   We have a lot of ideas about how to do that and how to
22 gather materials from all the different richness of
0027

1   digitization efforts that are going on and incorporate them
 2   into the program, but I won't get into those right now.
 3   The fact of the matter is that once digital surrogates
 4   meet preservation thresholds, as many of the digitization
 5   projects underway will provide for, the fact of the matter
 6   is that fewer print copies will be needed, and the number of
 7   print copies will vary by material type. Again, we have a
 8   lot of work on this that I'll be happy to share. We
 9   actually -- Ross and I actually released a paper on this
10   very topic with respect to journal collections just about a
11   month ago so -- but I'd be happy to say more about that
12   later on. But the upshot is fewer print is needed as
13   digital -- digitized versions meet preservation thresholds.
14   Selective libraries of their own volition, I would
15   anticipate, based on the interviews that we conducted, will
16   continue the print drawdown, and in some cases will continue
17   to depart from the program, but more importantly will
18   continue to reduce the amount of print that they hold
19   locally.
20   And at the same time, in the long run, again,
21   substantially fewer regional libraries will be -- I
22   shouldn't say regional libraries but sort of fewer --
0028
 1   substantially fewer collections will be required, which will
 2   allow for a drawdown in the number of regionals. And this
 3   is -- this is -- I want to emphasize, this is inevitable.
 4   This is not something that -- where there's going to be a
 5   lot of choice based on the incentives that exist in the
 6   program. We see three models -- I'm just going to run
 7   through them extremely quickly, but one is an individual
 8   drawdown where a regional just walks away from the program,
 9   and we've seen that happen in a number of states with two
10   regionals. We've seen that happen in one state that had
11   only one regional already, and from interviews with regional
12   directors, this is a real risk that this will continue over
13   the next three to five years.
14   This is the highest risk approach because it leaves
15   selectives not well served in terms of the assistance that
16   selectives have come to look to regionals for, but it's also
17   the easiest to implement, and in the absence of structural
18   change at a system-wide level, that's what's going to
19   happen.
20   A second model would be a coordinated drawdown in which
21   the regionals together provide for -- provide for a
22   coordinated departure that takes into account preservation
0029

1 concerns and in which the regionals work with one another to
2 sort of in what someone called a daisy chain to sort of take
3 on regional responsibilities from one another so that -- so
4 that the selectives continue to be served, the regionals can
5 manage the drawdown. This is feasible. This is legal under
6 today's statute. It's unknown whether this is actually
7 implementable, and I'm not trying to recommend it. That's
8 just another model here.
9   The third one would be legislative change where we
10 would empower the GPO to actually -- to actually take
11 account for what has been digitized at what levels of
12 quality, under what kinds of digital preservation
13 considerations, and what does that mean for the number of
14 copies that are required, and how can we allow libraries to
15 get to that, to get to that point. This is unquestionably
16 the lowest risk from a preservation and collection integrity
17 perspective; but as we know, legislative change brings with
18 it implementation challenges, but this is ideally probably
19 what we would all -- what we would all like to see.
20   On the prospective side, we'd like to see more
21 coordination and -- by the GPO in terms of other
22 born-digital materials, and this is something that we heard
0030
1 from a number of our interviewees where -- where making sure
2 that materials are -- the born-digital materials are being
3 preserved, making sure that they're subject to relevant
4 authentication thresholds is important. And, you know, this
5 is -- this is -- at the same time, we recognized that the
6 notion of the stand-alone documents, as I mentioned before,
7 is beginning to give way, and this suggests a whole
8 additional set of concerns and considerations around the
9 integrity of government information that hasn't really been
10 grappled with to as great an extent as is needed.
11   And finally, I just want to emphasize, there are
12 remaining user needs for print, whether that's for non-text
13 formats, whether that's areas poorly served by broadband,
14 and print on demand is potentially our friend in those
15 cases. Digital infrastructure, FDsys is going to be -- is
16 clearly going to be an important component of that. We're
17 highly recommending both downloads and APIs to enable
18 libraries and others to get access to that content, and we
19 were really gratified to hear the Public Printer yesterday
20 talk about digital deposit and that -- and the opportunity
21 that he would provide to allow libraries to take on digital
22 deposit if that was what they wanted.
0031

15

1   There's a need for outside audits and third-party
2 preservation both of FDsys as well as -- as well as some of
3 the agencies that are partners with the GPO in terms of
4 digital infrastructure, and the kinds of new and revamped
5 discovery environments, law.gov would be an example of such
6 a thing, that are desperately needed to help users get at
7 government information and other kinds of relevant
8 information, whether it's a part of the FDLP, or whether
9 it's part of other kinds of programs or sources.
10   And then finally, but really not least in any kind of
11 way, is outreach and use, where the opportunity to
12 reemphasize the role of the librarian seems imperative here.
13 As I mentioned, some librarians at the vanguard have already
14 successfully redefined their role. We see an opportunity to
15 define the role from government documents librarians to
16 government information librarians. I don't pretend to be an
17 expert in this area, but I really think that this represents
18 some of the most innovative approaches to librarianship that
19 we -- that we came across, but I certainly pose that more as
20 a discussion point than quite as prescriptive as it seems.
21 But the idea is to conserve and re-purpose the existing
22 expertise that exists in the program, raise awareness of
0032
1 government information, train other librarians in its use,
2 develop discovery environments, support users.
3   And I want to emphasize that as the program moves away
4 from collections, moves away from tangible collections
5 towards -- towards digital collections that are in many
6 cases provided from a central point of access, the services
7 rather than the collections may be the principal
8 contribution that many participating libraries make towards
9 permanent public access, and that should be seen as an
10 opportunity. And for the two or three hands of people whose
11 libraries have -- you know, are now 80 percent -- have
12 reduced their print collections by 80 percent or something
13 like that, that is the -- one of the principal contributions
14 that's being made, and I think we should -- we should
15 embrace it, and I think there's a real opportunity to study
16 what that looks like and think about what an environment
17 with a -- with a fully digitized program actually looks
18 like.
19   So in sum, the elements of our model, I don't want to
20 put too much stress on them. I think at a high level there
21 is a coherent model here, a coherent framework that makes
22 some sense, but in some user needs and information
0033

1 dissemination practices have changed dramatically, and the
2 program truly must change structurally to accommodate them,
3 or the incentives that are currently baked into the system
4 will no longer be able to support ongoing participation by
5 many of the libraries. And I think that that's at the core
6 of the recommendations that our report makes.
7   So thank you very much. I apologize for my length, but
8 appreciate the opportunity to present to you.
9   (Applause)
10   MR. SHULER: I want to thank Roger very much. I
11 think that set the stage proPURLy. I also want to give a
12 shout out to the Association of Research Libraries. I think
13 they continue their outstanding traditions of helping our
14 community think about what we're doing and our future
15 implications that we're doing, and I think we probably
16 should give them a bit of a hand about that.
17   (Applause)
18   MR. SHULER: And just as we talked about how our
19 institutions are changing, we now need to move the
20 conversation to how we change ourselves, primarily through
21 how we educate future government information librarians, as
22 the -- Roger's report might highlight, as we call ourselves.
0034
1 And to help us with that thinking and that discussion, I am
2 very pleased to introduce John Bertot (ph), who is a
3 professor at the University of Maryland's School of
4 Information Science. He has many titles after his name,
5 which in the professoriate means he's reached a high level
6 of status, and he's a distinguished professor, a
7 contributor, and is no slouch either in making a difference
8 in our library lives. He's the editor of Government
9 Information Quarterly, as well as Library Quarterly. He
10 works closely with ALA on internet issues involving public
11 libraries. And he has made a long study of our institutions
12 and our practice, and I think he's bringing that to bear in
13 a new project he is directing. John.
14   MR. BERTOT: Thank you. I probably should sit down
15 right now after that introduction. Well, thank you for
16 allowing me to come in here and present to you, and it's
17 actually nice to see so many people that I've presented with
18 before and had some great discussions over the years; and
19 frankly, it's your work and your dedication to the
20 information profession, particularly with government
21 information, that's led to this project that I'll be talking
22 a bit about. But I'd really like to kind of set a broader
0035

17

1 context for it and broaden the discussion a bit. Roger
 2 actually touched on a number of things sort of from the
 3 introduction that I was going to touch on a little bit, so
 4 I'm doing some adjusting on the fly to try and keep us on
 5 time so that we can get to some various discussions.
 6   But basically over the years I think there's been a
 7 fairly substantial shift, and Roger clearly touched on
 8 those, from sort of printed digital, but it resides within
 9 what I would consider to be a much broader service context,
10 it's not just about the collections anymore, and it deals
11 much more broadly with how do you deal with digital
12 government information and digital government services, and
13 how we, as librarians, provide those services to a broad
14 range of users. Over the years my primary focus has
15 obviously been in the public library community, and we've
16 seen what's happened over the years as governments have
17 shifted services to electronic services, and to some extent
18 as academic libraries and others have gotten sort of out of
19 the depository and information business, we've seen a pretty
20 dramatic uptake in service requirements from users in public
21 libraries, right? So there's been this kind of major shift
22 going on, and some of what we need to do is recast our focus
0036
 1 and how do we deal with building an information profession
 2 around these pretty dynamic shifts.
 3   Oh, it does work. Okay. All right. Actually, I
 4 didn't get a chance to play with this beforehand.
 5   So basically the context, you all know this, right?
 6 We're an increasing digital government, but it's a
 7 combination of services, resources and technologies. More
 8 importantly, one of, I think, the key issues that we're
 9 dealing with increasingly is that now our information and
10 our services are embedded with a whole range of
11 technologies, and, of course, the technologies increasing
12 aren't ones that we control, and this is creating a whole
13 range of issues for us as a profession, but also as
14 government service providers. You know, Twitter, Facebook,
15 YouTube, all these range of services -- in fact, GSA has
16 spent a pretty substantial amount of time over the last year
17 trying to deal with how do we, in fact, negotiate
18 arrangements with Facebook and all these other social
19 service -- social service, sorry, social networking type
20 sites and maintain -- have any of you looked at the
21 disclosure statements on Facebook and Twitter? I mean, who
22 owns the contents? Is it you? No. And so this is a big
0037

1 thing for government agencies. If we're going to suddenly
2 start putting out a whole range of services and products and
3 information resources in this kind of context, they want to
4 retain some control over that. And then, of course, there
5 are all the issues that Roger touched on, preservation,
6 authenticity, I mean, there's all kinds of stuff embedded in
7 here.
8   I pointed you to that GSA website because it's actually
9 a fairly interesting website, and they're trying to put up a
10 range of helpful suggestions, and they've been contracting
11 with all these different social networking sites. They've
12 been dealing with cloud computing issues. There's a whole
13 range of things that are sort of embedded under that
14 umbrella site that you may find of interest.
15   And so as Roger mentioned, you know, we're focused on
16 physical (ph) collections housed in a building and
17 increasing -- and also from an agency perspective, we
18 provide services through service outlets. You know, you
19 have regional Social Security Administration offices, you
20 know, this is the model that we've traditionally dealt with
21 for decades, but we've seen this shift towards distributed
22 access to digital collections and a major shift towards
0038
1 online services, which, you know, we call the E-government
2 for shorthand, which integrate and kind of create a whole
3 new way of service -- information service products and ways
4 to deliver those services and resources.
5   Now, one of the things that I want to kind of move the
6 discussion from is just to focus on digital information --
7 digital government information, because although I know that
8 this is a key focus of this conference, but we have to
9 realize that in this E-government environment, there are a
10 range of constituencies with a range of objectives, goals
11 and needs, frankly, and service demands, you have academic,
12 law libraries, public libraries in this, and you also have
13 agencies. And one of the things that we have to realize is
14 that each one of these constituencies has different goals
15 that they want to have. I mean, for example, agencies want
16 their services to be used. They're putting up a range of
17 government information services and resources, and in the
18 public library setting one of the biggest -- we had two
19 really big wake-up calls in the last several years dealing
20 with this kind of continuum and trying to deal with digital
21 government information and the integration with
22 government -- in government kinds of services. One was
0039

1   Katrina, all right, and for those of you who lived in the
2   gulf states -- I actually was in Florida for the last eight
3   years, so we went through a series of five hurricanes in the
4   eight years I was there. That was really interesting, you
5   know, and fortunately Katrina -- I lived in Tallahassee
6   because I was at Florida State University. Fortunately for
7   us, Katrina went west of us so we didn't get all the damage,
8   but one of the things that we saw from that event was a
9   number of people ended up in the public library looking for
10 help, filling out FEMA forms, finding out what services were
11 available to them, getting electronic benefits cards, you
12 know, the electronic credit cards that government -- you
13 know, all this kind of things, how do rebuild a house, how
14 to find their families, you know, all this kind of stuff
15 that created a whole series of pressure points.
16   The second event that happened to public libraries was
17 Medicare part D, because what happened there was a whole
18 bunch of seniors flooded the public libraries for help with
19 technology, access to broadband, access to public computers,
20 but also they ended up coming in and saying, hey, which
21 program's right for us. And if you ever watched, you know,
22 public librarians freeze up, you know, try and, you know,
0040
1   work with seniors who are basically saying, hey, you know,
2   we have a choice of 20 different prescription drug benefit
3   plans, which one works for me, and they bring in a list of
4   their medications. You know, and it was really -- talking
5   to the public librarians, they're a great, great community,
6   good senses of humor, but, man, they did get their attention
7   because all of a sudden they weren't just being asked to be
8   providers of public access to a range of services and
9   resources, they were actually asked to engage in the service
10 provision.
11   And the reason I bring that up is because right now on
12 a different project we're trying to work on an E-government
13 collaborative with libraries and agencies, agencies have a
14 range of what they will partner with you on, all right? For
15 example, I've been talking to folks at the Social Security
16 Administration about this, and they will be happy to help
17 disseminate information through public libraries and other
18 library institutions, they're happy to work with those
19 entities when things change in the program and send out
20 information, but they absolutely do not want non-Social
21 Security Administration personnel dispensing Social Security
22 Administration information and acting as social service
0041

1 providers, all right? They stop -- you know, they draw a
2 line right there, okay? Whereas in other forms of
3 partnerships in Florida, we had the Department of Children
4 and Family and Services, and they were very happy to partner
5 with public libraries and have them do all the work for them
6 filling out their online applications, because DCF had
7 basically eliminated over 3,000 positions that were all
8 social service providers, they were all the case workers,
9 and so they were happy to shift, you know, over and say,
10 hey, you do all this stuff, all right?
11   So we have a range of different things that we need to
12 do and consider in this environment, and then public
13 libraries and academics and others take on a range of those
14 services from just being a provider of public access and a
15 venue and a point of information, all the way to actually
16 trying to integrate with agency services and provisions. So
17 you have a really broad spectrum that you can deal with
18 these things, and you can see that through some of those
19 examples.
20   All right. So here's some key questions and issues
21 that we've been trying to deal with over time as we deal
22 with government information, digital government information
0042
1 and E-government. You know, should E-government
2 librarianships serve as a tradition -- as an extension of
3 the traditional government information documents approach,
4 right? Should it be subsumed into the older tradition? Are
5 they coequal? Is E-government -- government information,
6 are they coequal partners, or is E-government librarianship
7 really something completely different that embeds, you know,
8 services, resources and a whole range of new different kinds
9 of services and the ability to provide those resources in a
10 very different kind of service context?
11   I don't have answers for you on all of these and -- but
12 I do raise them because I think we're looking at a very
13 different kind of service context that's been coming for the
14 better part of 10, 15 years. I mean, this isn't anything
15 that should be catching us by surprise. Maybe the speed
16 with which some of the technologies are moving and the
17 interactivity of those services and technologies is probably
18 catching us a bit off guard, but the reality, this march
19 towards digital has been going on for quite some time.
20   I can remember working on a report for OTA, anybody
21 remember OTA, office technology assessment? Oh, thank you,
22 I feel like I'm -- you know, at least a few people still
0043

21

1   remember that, you know? We worked on a study for them back
 2   in 1993 when I was in a -- still in a doctoral program at
 3   Syracuse University trying to deal with federal electronic
 4   services, and that's what we looked at. And, you know,
 5   actually the Department of Agriculture, you know the reason
 6   why we have, you know, debit cards at the grocery store?
 7   Anybody know the history behind all that? The Department of
 8   Agriculture is in the electronic benefits program, right,
 9   because basically they shifted over from paper coupons for
10   food stamps over to the cards, and they needed a way to
11   actually have those inside service outlets like grocery
12   stores. I mean, so there's been a long history with
13   government agencies trying to deal with these government
14   services, and it's just now it's just become so pervasive
15   that I think we're trying to sort of rethink some of what we
16   do.
17   So the scope, you know this, right? This is just the
18   federal government, all right, from a study that was done
19   back in 2007 that we actually published in GIQ, but
20   basically we had, you know, 30,000 websites and over a
21   hundred million pages at that time, and this doesn't even
22   include state or local government websites and information
0044
 1   resources. So the scope is massive, all right?
 2   And there are huge issues, Roger touched on all of
 3   those, the authenticity issues, the preservation issues, the
 4   embedding of content within proprietary technology, that's a
 5   really big one, and we have different delivery models out
 6   there, building collections versus distributive
 7   partnerships, and Roger went through a lot of those, and
 8   we're all looking forward to seeing that report and its
 9   contents and looking at those.
10   So enter our program, and like I said, we don't have
11   all the answers, but we do know that these are issues. And,
12   in fact, there's a flyer out in the back that looks
13   something like this. If you want to take some with you and
14   pass it on to people, we were funded by the Institute of
15   Museum and Library Services, and by "we," I mean, yes, it's
16   University of Maryland, University of Chicago, Illinois, and
17   it's the government information online folks that we're
18   partnering with in this program. We were -- INLS gave us
19   enough funding for 20 scholarships. This is a full ride for
20   20 Master's students to get their degree program through our
21   Master's in library science through our program at the
22   University of Maryland, and it's online, all right, so we're
0045

1   working on trying to create a national program that partners
2   with all these key agencies, and has really four
3   cornerstones to it.
4   The first one is course work. It's really interesting.
5   John sent me this morning a note that his home institution
6   at the University of Illinois at Chicago has started an
7   E-government certificate program through public
8   administration, and I went and checked it out, and it was
9   fascinating to me because you couldn't get a more directly
10 opposite approach to E-government than what we're taking,
11 you know, because it was databases. It was GIS, it was
12 technology management, it was technology delivery, and so
13 basically it's all the operational stuff, right? It's nuts
14 and bolts, which is fine. You know, someone's got to build
15 the apps, okay?
16   We're very much on the other side of it, which is,
17 okay, how do you use the stuff. You know, how do you get
18 people involved and engaged and access to this content so
19 our course work focus is on policy environment. We're
20 dealing with information policy, legal issues, electronic
21 librarianship and dealing with what it means to be a
22 librarian really primarily in the electronic environment,
0046
1   digital government information resources. So we're trying
2   to pull together a whole range of intellectual content that
3   is all about the new existing environment, with an emphasis
4   on public service. And I think you saw that thread through
5   some of Roger's comments earlier. So it's how to actually
6   engage all these services and resources serving the public,
7   which is very different in many cases than sort of managing
8   a collection that you hope people come to, all right?
9   Practice. Through the GAO partnership, we are actually
10 assigning all the students to mentors, and so they will be
11 assigned with all those individuals across the country,
12 depending on which host institution they're nearest to,
13 hopefully, and we'll see how that works out.
14   Professionals. They're going to come to your meeting
15 in D.C. every year for the next two years. So next year and
16 the year after that they will be here, they will attend your
17 sessions, they'll get a chance to talk to you. We're
18 actually going to set up special presentations for them so
19 that they learn what it means to be part of this very
20 wonderful community of practice, and hopefully you'll
21 welcome them and not scare them. You know, you're supposed
22 to encourage them that this is a really great place to be.
0047

1   And the last part, of course, is the scholarship part.
 2 These students will be working with us in Government
 3 Information Quarterly. They'll be writing reviews of
 4 websites, government information resources, and we hope to
 5 pull them into the publication process, because we expect a
 6 fair number of these folks to go out into academic
 7 institutions where they have to join sort of your scholarly
 8 community and be able to continue that on for tenure and
 9 other kinds of things.
10   So these really are what we consider to be the four
11 pillars of the program, so it's the course work, it's
12 practice, it's professional development, and ultimately the
13 scholarship piece, as well.
14   There's a URL there for -- there's more information
15 about the program and applications and all that that -- and
16 it's also on the handout in the back. Please, you know,
17 pass along the word to colleagues of yours. I mean,
18 obviously I think all of you are -- have your degrees
19 already, but it would be really wonderful if you could pass
20 this out and at least make other people aware of this
21 program. Applications are due February 1 because we'd like
22 to start the program in the fall of 2010.
0048
 1   All right. So in conclusion, to sort of move forward
 2 and get us to the discussion point, we are building a new
 3 profession here, and it's the E-government librarian, and
 4 it's built on what I consider to be very strong traditions
 5 of documents librarianship. It's your professionalism, it's
 6 your expertise, and key to all this, I think, is your
 7 ability to collaborate. What's going to be required moving
 8 forward, and this program sets it up through the
 9 relationship and partnerships between GPO, the regionals,
10 you know, the selectives and all of you, is it's going to
11 require increased kinds of partnerships with government
12 agencies and a range of partnership types between government
13 agencies, libraries and the information community and the
14 scholarly community, as well. So it's a much broader kind
15 of thing. You're used to this, that's a great strength to
16 build on, and it's also something that we need to address as
17 we continue down this new path of E-government librarian.
18   But it's also designed to work in an evolving
19 E-government context, and it does require new skills, new
20 approaches, new ways of thinking and new ways of interacting
21 with the public. You know, when -- I've been in a public
22 library conducting interviews when I've actually seen people
0049

                                24

1 walk in and have a breakdown in of the librarian. I mean,
 2 these people are at like wits' end. You know, every agency
 3 has shunned them, you know, and there they are. In fact,
 4 it's really fascinating to me, it's kind of an ironic
 5 fascination, that the very constituencies that some of the
 6 social services are designed to serve are the least able to
 7 actually engage in E-government services. They don't have
 8 the technology, they don't have the access, and they don't
 9 have the skills, and this program is designed to really help
10 with that kind of service context and move the discussion
11 forward and create a new generation of librarians that also,
12 you know, frankly builds on very good strengths of the
13 existing program that we have before us.
14   So with that I'm going to stop, because I know that we
15 want to have some discussion and be able to continue on
16 later this afternoon. So thank you very much.
17   MR. SHULER: Following the new traditions we've
18 established yesterday, the council will talk about what they
19 just heard and invite the community to join in that
20 conversation shortly.
21   I'll begin by throwing out a comment and then asking
22 council to pitch in, and I think what I find interesting in
0050
 1 listening to both presenters is this essential connection
 2 among some that require that a collection exist for a
 3 government documents librarian to exist. The idea that you
 4 can draw down your participation in a depository program
 5 just because your collection is disappearing, and I'd kind
 6 of like to challenge that. I think the purpose, as we'll
 7 probably hear from George Barnum in his talk about the
 8 history of GPO, the over hundred-year tradition of the
 9 Depository Library program was primarily about the service.
10 The collections, the technology, the procedures, they were
11 all there to support the service, and regardless of how they
12 are deployed in the future, the service is what is
13 dominating our practice.
14   So I'll leave it at -- I'll leave my comment at that
15 time. Council, over to you.
16   MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski (ph),
17 California State Library. I have -- I have a question for
18 Roger, and it has to do with the number of individuals and
19 the number of different libraries that were surveyed. I
20 believe that you said that there were 80 individuals from 30
21 libraries, and of those 30 libraries, there were academic,
22 law, public and state libraries. Can you give us either a
0051

25

1 numerical breakdown or a percentage breakdown of the
2 different library types that gave input for this study?
3   MR. SCHONFELD: Absolutely, and I'd be happy to do
4 that. I actually anticipated that question.
5   At the -- at the regional level we spoke with seven
6 academic directors and six academic documents librarians,
7 five state directors and five state documents librarians,
8 and I should say for things like an ARL kind of person,
9 I've, you know, put them into the director category, so when
10 you see the full interview list, it's not perfect, but just
11 to give you a sense.
12   And then on the public side, two directors and one
13 documents librarian. Wait, that can't be right. No, that's
14 not right. That was one director and one documents
15 librarian. And those are all among the regionals.
16   And then among selectives we spoke with eight academic
17 directors and eight documents librarians, four law directors
18 and one law document librarian, one state director and one
19 state documents librarian, and two public directors and four
20 public documents librarians.
21   And that was just a quick count that I did last night,
22 so it may not be perfect, but just to give you a sense that
0052
1 we have -- you know, it's not perfectly representative. It
2 wasn't designed to be a survey so much as a set of
3 interviews to talk to key stakeholder communities, and, you
4 know, certainly -- you know, but I do think that our
5 findings were broadly representative of what GPO and others
6 have found through survey exercises that they've -- that
7 they've conducted.
8   MR. CISMOWSKI: Also, of the academic libraries
9 that you surveyed, how many were not ARL members?
10   MR. SCHONFELD: I don't have those numbers with
11 me, but I can circulate the interview list without any
12 trouble. It certainly is weighted towards the ARL directors
13 among the academic libraries, there's no question about
14 that. We spoke with -- but we did speak with a significant
15 number of non-ARLs, and even going down to small college
16 libraries, smaller college libraries like Brooklyn College
17 Library was an example of one that we actually visited and
18 spent several hours with the staff and directors there.
19   MR. CISMOWSKI: And one last question, did you
20 survey any members of the public who were not members of the
21 academic community, or did you survey any -- any
22 nonlibrarian?
0053

26

1   MR. SCHONFELD: Oh, we did. We spoke with a
 2 number of users. Most of the users that we spoke with
 3 were -- were academics. The nature of the project was that
 4 we had -- you know, we had a very constrained period of time
 5 in which to do the -- in which to do the project. We
 6 received help from one or two of the -- more than two, I
 7 think three of the academic libraries that we visited, and
 8 one or two of the state -- one of the state libraries in
 9 reaching members of their communities. So in the case of
10 the state library, you know, we were trying to talk to
11 members of the general public, so to speak. We -- we had
12 one or two interviews with people that they recommended. I
13 think in that case it was probably state employees, frankly,
14 and not members of the general public, but, you know, we
15 worked very hard in the interviews that we conducted,
16 especially with the documents coordinators and other
17 librarians in trying to understand the needs of the
18 communities that they served. It's imperfect to be sure,
19 but I hope we've done at least a reasonable job of bringing
20 in a diversity of perspectives in that respect. But if
21 there are perspectives that you see missing, I'd certainly
22 welcome the opportunity to learn about them, because we
0054
 1 haven't -- you know, we haven't finalized the report, and
 2 there's an opportunity for more voices yet to be heard if
 3 that was appropriate.
 4   MR. CISMOWSKI: And one last question. Is the
 5 breakdown of the data collection process, including
 6 identifying the percentages of different library types and
 7 the people interviewed, going to be in the final report?
 8   MR. SCHONFELD: Oh, the list of interviewees will
 9 be in the final report. We could provide some charts or
10 graphs if that were helpful.
11   MR. CISMOWSKI: Absolutely. Thank you, Roger.
12   MR. SCHONFELD: Okay.
13   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan.
14 Roger, don't sit down.
15   I would be interested to know if in talking with -- in
16 the various interviews you conducted, it's -- your
17 conclusion that documents collections are underutilized is I
18 think -- I think we can all agree with that. That's not
19 really a surprise, I don't think, to this community. My
20 question is how many of those collections are cataloged?
21 Because in my experience -- well, the literature tells us
22 for over the last 20 years that when you catalog a
0055

27

1 collection, your circulation both in and out of the library
2 increases by 500 percent, and that's -- we've known that for
3 a number of years. And I guess I'm not as surprised as --
4 I'm not very surprised by your exercise of, you know, how
5 many people are drawing down the size of their print
6 collections because most of them are probably drawing down
7 the size of their non-depository collections in a similar
8 fashion, but we're all re-purposing space with the increased
9 availability of digital documents.
10   So I guess I don't -- I'm not really sure if I -- if
11 you're going to have an answer for me, but I would be really
12 intrigued to know if you had factored the availability of
13 metadata or bibliographic data for these collections into
14 any of -- any part of your study.
15   MR. SCHONFELD: We -- sorry. Thank you for the
16 question. We absolutely asked those questions of many of
17 the libraries that we visited and other interviews that we
18 conducted, and you're absolutely right, there's very --
19 there's an under cataloging of these collections, I guess
20 it's -- I guess it's fair to say, and I'm sure that if they
21 were to be cataloged, the usage would increase to some
22 degree. I haven't seen the 500 percent figure, but it
0056
1 doesn't surprise me to hear it.
2   I think that when we thought about where to
3 recommend -- and because of the speed with which I was
4 running through the recommendations at the end, it wasn't
5 possible to get into this at the length that I might
6 otherwise have done, but because of the -- one of the
7 questions that we faced in thinking about recommendations
8 was whether limited resources should be devoted towards the
9 kind of discovery-level cataloging that might be -- might
10 help in the way that you're suggesting, or whether resources
11 instead should be devoted towards -- towards digitization
12 but that, of course, enables, you know, full text
13 search ability and, as we know, discovery that's, if
14 anything, even more powerful for many purposes anyway than
15 traditional cataloging. And so the nature of the
16 recommendation is therefore in the direction of
17 digitization.
18   Now, that's not to say that for those libraries where
19 cataloging is possible -- and I just heard yesterday about a
20 large, selective library that has, at least for collection
21 management purposes for moving things off-site, just
22 cataloged something like 550,000 titles in the last -- over
0057

28

1 the summer or something like that. And so it's not to say
2 that cataloging isn't possible and isn't feasible and isn't
3 doable, with an outside contractor I should have mentioned,
4 and -- but, you know -- but -- so it's not to say that
5 cataloging isn't possible or feasible or necessarily even
6 desirable, but in terms of -- it seems to -- I mean, from
7 the purposes -- for the purposes of structural change in the
8 system, it seems as though digitization takes us to the
9 future we want to get to, whereas cataloging, although
10 valuable, would only provide an interim step, and I think
11 that's the -- but I agree with you that cataloging would
12 certainly make a difference.
13   MS. SANDERS: Okay. And if I can ask a second --
14 this is an unrelated question. Of your three models that
15 you offer, the one that suggests a coordinated drawdown
16 among the regionals, you have the conclusion in your -- at
17 least in your interim report that that is legal under the
18 current statute, and that's not the message that we've
19 gotten at least in the Kansas/Nebraska proposal --
20   MR. SCHONFELD: Well, we weren't -- let me
21 clarify.
22   MS. SANDERS: -- following that --
0058
1   MR. SCHONFELD: We were not suggesting cross state
2 regionals, which is my understanding of what the
3 Kansas/Nebraska -- cross state -- two libraries serving
4 across a state boundary as a single regional, that was not
5 what the recommendation calls for. We were calling -- that
6 model that we had targeted was one in which -- to take
7 Kansas and Nebraska, not to focus on them but just as an
8 example, in which let's say Kansas -- the University of
9 Kansas would cease being a regional, and the University of
10 Nebraska would become the regional for both states, and that
11 is legal under the current statute.
12   MS. SANDERS: Is it?
13   MS. ETKIN: Where's Lance to lower this? Cindy
14 Etkin, Government Printing Office. Yeah, Roger and Ross
15 talked with us before making that particular model available
16 in their report, and they are, as they described it, looking
17 at a model very similar to a regional that serves multiple
18 states, which is a model that has been in the program for
19 decades, like Maine serving Vermont and New Hampshire and
20 Florida serving Florida and Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico.
21   MS. SANDERS: But correct me if I'm wrong, I
22 understood that those were more or less grandfathered in but
0059

29

1 were not found to be particularly legal from the perspective
 2 of general counsel. Am I misunderstanding that?
 3   UNIDENTIFIED: Can I interject for just a sec?
 4 Under the guise of a contract relationship, that's what
 5 Rhode Island does with Connecticut State Library.
 6   MS. SANDERS: That's right.
 7   UNIDENTIFIED: So it's a consortium or a group of
 8 libraries entering into a contract with another library that
 9 happens to be a neighboring state's regional --
10   UNIDENTIFIED: And may --
11   UNIDENTIFIED: -- since 1884.
12   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
13 at Chicago. I don't think it was -- we necessarily don't
14 need to look at this report as giving us the answers. I
15 think what they have unearthed are the questions that will
16 remain with us about how we organize ourselves and what
17 we're legally obligated to do, and I think their coordinated
18 drawdown is probably edging closer to the grandfather clause
19 than what was asked for in the Kansas/Nebraska, however, not
20 to let Cindy off the hook -- excuse me, Cindy, I'll
21 personalize your GPO in a moment here. I think one could
22 very easily say, well, if it's grandfathered in, why doesn't
0060
 1 it have grandchildren, and then what is -- if the legality
 2 extends into the future, why doesn't that act as a
 3 precedent, and I think that's a very important question as a
 4 community we need to ask. Because, indeed, if the objection
 5 to the Kansas/Nebraska arrangement was that a state could
 6 not serve multiple libraries, then since 1963 or thereabouts
 7 we have been existing in an illegal state that must stop
 8 now.
 9   So that is the conundrum I raise as a council member.
10 That is a question we need to wrestle with, not whether a
11 particular report, a particular project either stalled or
12 whatever. That is a question I think we need to wrestle
13 with as council.
14   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing
15 Office. It wasn't our general counsel that indicated that
16 Kansas/Nebraska was not legal. That was a memorandum from
17 the Congressional Research Service to the committee, to the
18 oversight committee. And at that time there was no -- no
19 effort, no indication, no request made of GPO to discontinue
20 the arrangements that have already been in place, and they
21 knew that those arrangements were in place when they were
22 doing their research.
0061

```
 1          MS. MORIEARTY:  Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.
 2  I know I'm injecting at this point, but I did not want John
 3  to get away free and clear, because I have no doubt I'm
 4  going to welcome your students here.  I mean, they -- it
 5  sounds like a fascinating program, and I won't scare them,
 6  all they may well scare me.  Yet the last several years I've
 7  been on a good number of search committees, meeting many of
 8  the best that our library schools are producing, and the one
 9  thing they are leaving library schools without is what John
10  indicated, service.  The bells and whistles are there, they
11  can flip technology in ways that I need explained to me
12  sometimes, but it comes down that we are a service industry.
13  It comes down to what tangible service can these bells and
14  whistles produce?  How do you relate ultimately to people?
15  And I think that's -- that's what I hope you will expand
16  your -- your program.  I think that "E" depository
17  librarians are a reality.  You know, we've been seeing it.
18  Whether we want to admit it or not, it's there, and a lot of
19  them had a grounding in good service, and so once they help
20  people with the electronic, they can all -- they can teach.
21  They can educate.  They can follow up and make sure that
22  they've gotten what they wanted.  Maybe that's not what they
0062
 1  knew they wanted, but they had their needs met.  But what
 2  I'm really concerned about is I've been seeing these newer
 3  librarians come out and the bells and whistles are there,
 4  but nothing for service.  Ultimately, how do you talk to the
 5  people?  What are you going to do about it, John?
 6          MR. BERTOT:  You know, actually I couldn't agree
 7  more with you.  In fact, it's a complaint that I completely
 8  agree with.  So you're not going to get a counter argument
 9  or, you know, a contradictory perspective from me.  And, in
10  fact, it's why we built the program the way we did.  If you
11  look at -- besides the course work, and I want to talk about
12  that just momentarily, we are intentionally partnering these
13  individuals with people who are, in fact, in this room in
14  some cases, and trying to teach them about what it means to
15  serve the public.  And increasingly you have to understand
16  it's all -- well, frankly, we're all in public service.  I
17  mean, that's the reality of what we do.  Some people may not
18  agree with that or maybe that's not what they thought they
19  were getting into, but at the end of the day, you're a
20  public service provider, and our program is designed through
21  working with the government information online people and
22  partnering with them, bringing them to these meetings, and
0063
```

1   also the last part of it is in the course work, all the
2   course work that we have that is particular to certainly the
3   certificate -- or the specialization is all about the con --
4   the service context and how you deal with the public in a
5   range of ways.
6   In fact, Paul Yager is also on our faculty, and some of
7   you may know his work. Paul also does a tremendous amount
8   of work, and, in fact, we have a meeting this afternoon on
9   dealing with underserved populations and persons with
10 disabilities, and so we have a whole mechanism in place to
11 try and bring that public service element into the program.
12   Now, the challenge we will have, I mean, and let's be
13 candid about this, is that we're initially creating a
14 national program, and it's going to be online. So the
15 public service element initially is going to be sort of how
16 to deal with the public service from an online context,
17 right, government information online and those kinds of
18 things, so the one piece that we're still working on is how
19 do we integrate that face-to-face public service aspect of
20 what we do, as well. So we're still working on that, but it
21 is not something that's lost on us, and we really do hope to
22 build through a range of these activities I think through a
0064
1   range of these activities I think a fairly strong public
2   service ethic and understanding of electronic service
3   delivery within a public service context. I hope that
4   helps.
5   MR. SHULER: We have time for one more question
6   perhaps from the audience. Yes.
7   MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, San Bernardino County
8   Law Library, otherwise known as law library for San
9   Bernardino County. First, just a real quick announcement.
10 Law librarians, if we could also meet at the registration
11 table for lunch today, we're going to take a little walk to
12 our lunch site.
13   And then just two real more comments than questions.
14 Having read the synopsis as well as having been one of the
15 participants, in general terms I think it really doesn't
16 represent all types of libraries and I think -- that are
17 part of the program, and I think Roger kind of hinted at
18 that. It's really ARL focused. It's not really focused --
19 I think it meets the crisis that a lot of ARL libraries are
20 facing, but not necessarily all types of libraries.
21   And I'm still concerned about access. As I was sitting
22 back there thinking, I've got broadband in my three
0065

1 locations; however, two of those three locations are in
2 poverty areas, for lack of a better term. I'm limited to
3 how much broadband access I have. If everything comes PDF
4 broadband, if I've got more than two or three users at one
5 time, nobody's getting it, and that's a concern of mine.
6   MR. SHULER: Thank you. We've nearly come to the
7 end of our time here today, and I want to thank our
8 speakers. Let's give a big hand.
9   (Applause)
10   MR. SHULER: I think they've given us a lot to
11 think about. They've unearthed other ancient questions
12 amongst us, and I think they've given us some possible
13 directions to go to.
14   We will not be seeing you as a group, as a council,
15 until tomorrow morning when you will hear us discuss what we
16 think about what we heard here today and what we're going to
17 do about it, you'll hear about the wonderful things we're
18 going to use and devise in order to attract you to Buffalo,
19 and I hope to also be able to continue some of the points
20 that have been raised these last two days tomorrow morning.
21   The next session that will be taking place at 10:30
22 will be the small session. Help me somebody. I'm having a
0066
1 senior moment.
2   UNIDENTIFIED: Item numbers.
3   MR. SHULER: Item numbers, thank you. Yes, a
4 small break-out discussion about item numbers. Not all the
5 council members will be here. They may surprise you in
6 solidarity and they will, but I suspect what we've given
7 ourselves is the freedom to go to the other meetings to hear
8 what's going on and a chance to mingle among you.
9   There will be a second smaller council session with
10 much the same constraints in the afternoon, smaller, not
11 everybody here, and then, council, I ask you to be back here
12 at 4:00 to start our working session. But I ask you to stay
13 for a couple minutes because I want to say a couple things.
14   Other than that, have a great break. And thanks, it
15 was a good session this morning.
16   (End of first session, beginning of second session:)
17   MR. SHULER: If we could kind of get together for
18 the tremendous topic of revision to item selection. And
19 because we -- we envision this as a true discussion with all
20 of you out there, those of you way in the back who are truly
21 committed to this passionate topic might want to come
22 forward so you can share your passion a little bit more
0067

1 equally with all of us.
2   My council partners on this are Justin Otto and Ann
3 Marie Sanders, and we're also going to hear from Laurie Hall
4 of GPO.
5   This session results from the Fifth Council
6 recommendation that came out of the Tampa meeting. This is
7 the longest recommendation, but I'm going to read it anyway
8 because I think there are aspects of this that are very
9 important that we want to try to bring out here and get your
10 input on this.
11   The council recommends that GPO retool the current
12 depository library item selection system. This retooling
13 should allow for the following: Number one, greater
14 granularity of item numbers assigned to different formats of
15 the same titles or series, that is, every format available
16 for distribution would have its own unique item number so
17 depositories could select only desired formats.
18   Number two, the ability to select EL only item numbers
19 without risking receiving unwarranted tangible publications.
20   Number three, a thorough revision of list of classes,
21 removing all item numbers for titles and formats no longer
22 distributed.
0068
1   Number four, the ability to receive only specified
2 formats of general publications. At present, an electronic
3 only depository must deselect general publication item
4 numbers in order not to receive unwanted tangible
5 publications, even though many general publication
6 monographs are issued both in print and electronically.
7   For purposes of this retooling, the two proposals dated
8 September 8, 2005, that were formally presented to council
9 at the spring 2006 council meeting for new models of
10 selection of tangible and electronic item numbers should be
11 revisited.
12   Now, that last point may be somewhat foreign to people
13 who were not involved in this -- in this process in
14 2005/2006, so for the purposes of sort of revisiting those
15 models, which were a rather substantial revision of the
16 current structure of item selection, which I think we heard
17 in Tampa loud and clear, is very frustrating and inexact.
18 Justin Otto is going to give a brief overview of those item
19 selection models that were presented by GPO back then but
20 were never implemented.
21   So, Justin, do you want to...
22   MR. OTTO: Good morning, everyone. Can you hear
0069

1 me okay?
2   So just very briefly, I'd like to give a quick review
3 of what the 2005 model was, and that doesn't mean that what
4 we're looking for today is just a discussion of the merits
5 of that model. We're just kind of using it as a review and
6 a starting point for our discussion today.
7   There were two parts to the model. There was a -- the
8 first part being the tangible items model, and GPO proposed
9 a tiered selection mechanism with four categories, first
10 category being high-profile items which would be distributed
11 to all libraries, things like the 9/11 report. Second type
12 would be selected items, much like our current model. Also,
13 it sort of -- you can think of it as akin to a standing
14 order with a book dealer. And it would have had greater
15 granularity than the current system can accommodate.
16   Other tier would be review items, and this is -- this
17 is new, and this is a new concept. Item numbers contain
18 titles a library may or may not want, so if people mark
19 things as review, the library would be notified when the
20 item is available, excuse me, and they could be sent an
21 electronic copy for review and then make a decision of
22 whether they do or don't want to receive the tangible item,
0070
1 and they'd have a specified time period in which to make
2 that decision, and extra copies could be distributed on
3 request to libraries that didn't request -- decide it in
4 advance.
5   And the fourth tier was non-selected items, it's
6 similar to the current model when an item number is not
7 selected, and libraries that mark an item as non-selected
8 could request a copy if any are remaining from that review
9 inventory. So libraries would be able to change their
10 status from non-selected to review or selected twice a year
11 as opposed to the once a year that we can add items under
12 the current system.
13   So the electronic items models, as I said before, it
14 was kind of considered to be two separate models, and
15 there's two selection mechanisms within this model, the
16 first being an electronic notification service that would
17 replace new electronic titles. All online titles listed on
18 the notification service, they would be listed on the
19 notification service after cataloging them, they would be
20 listed in SuDoc order. And the alert in this new
21 notification service would contain a brief bib record and a
22 PURL for, you know, review of the item.
0071

35

1   The second was subject bibliographies in the GPO ILS.
2 For new publications, they would be ordered by state and
3 major region to facilitate selection by geography, like, for
4 example, where I am in Washington, we can select things, you
5 know, from our region. Also, they can be ordered by topic
6 areas such as, you know, as you can see here, terrorism,
7 healthcare, things like that. And, again, these would
8 contain the brief bib record and a PURL.
9   Now, one thing about this new proposed electronic
10 selection system would be if you're using agency-based item
11 numbers, you would have to select all publications for an
12 agency or sub agency. What that means is if you selected the
13 item number for the Forest Service, you'd have to select all
14 electronic titles from the Forest Service, and this would
15 actually reduce the granularity of item selection.
16   And, again, for electronic libraries would be able to
17 add online numbers to their selection profile twice a year,
18 just like with the new book model, as opposed to under our
19 current system where it's once a year.
20   So that's the quick brief overview, and with that, I'd
21 like to turn it over to Laurie, who is going to discuss
22 where GPO is on this currently.
0072
1   MS. HALL: Where we are and what -- I'm sorry --
2   MR. OTTO: And what your -- you know, what you
3 guys have been doing, are doing...
4   MS. HALL: Are doing. This is Laurie Hall with
5 GPO. I was going to put together some presentation slides,
6 but that just didn't happen since we rolled that web tech
7 notes on Friday late, so we were busy with that.
8   I wanted to give a few statistics though, because I
9 think that there is some misconception or just people don't
10 know. Joe Paskoski took a poll from the list of
11 classes file I think October 14. There's a total number of
12 multiple formats that -- I think there's a big perception
13 that there are a lot of item numbers that have multiple
14 formats, and currently there's only 492 out of a total
15 number of item numbers from the list of classes, 8,548, will
16 then give a little bit of background about why we have those
17 multiple formats on specific classification numbers and
18 titles.
19   Originally when we started in the electronic
20 transition, when we would go to a website or find out from
21 an agency if they had electronic items, in some cases in
22 some series and some categories and some titles, they didn't
0073

1 have a very good run on their website. They may have had
2 one or two issues, they may have replaced, you know, an
3 issue, they would put one up and they would take one down.
4 So we did not create a separate item number and a separate
5 classification number for those that we did not feel were
6 very stable websites, because we weren't sure. They didn't
7 have a full run, they -- most agencies were just starting to
8 load their documents to a website. So that's one of the
9 reasons we started out adding multiple formats to a series,
10 say open file report, for instance. Not all of the
11 publishing entities that produce open file reports two or
12 three years ago, 2005, whatever, did not put their stuff on
13 the web, so we were still getting a CD, a paper, or some of
14 them may be electronic, so we really couldn't break them
15 out, because if we did break them out, you would only get
16 pieces of the series. So we wanted to make sure that you
17 would get every single issue, and it could come out in
18 various formats.
19   Now, granted, that has transpired over the last couple
20 of years as agencies become publishing more and more to the
21 web, they're putting more comprehensive holdings on the web,
22 so we've started to break a lot of the -- those things out,
0074
1 creating separate item numbers for different formats.
2   There are some down sides to that. We just recently
3 did the congressionals. I think people are under the
4 assumption that there are -- if you select the microfiche or
5 select the paper or select the electronic, you're going to
6 get the exact same thing. That's not always the case. We
7 had some agent -- some committees only want their
8 publication online. They're not giving us a print version.
9 So people need to recognize that when we do break out those
10 item numbers by format, you may not always get the --
11 everything that's been published by that format, so just be
12 aware of that. We had a committee that we called a couple
13 of weeks ago, one of our acquisition specialists, and the
14 committee -- we were saying is there a paper version coming
15 out of this because we found the electronic version, and the
16 committee said no, there will be no paper version, and we do
17 not authorize you to make a paper copy. Now, we all know
18 that we can go to the website and make a paper copy, but
19 they basically told us that we could not make a paper copy
20 without their permission, and they did not give us
21 permission to do that. So if you selected the fiche or the
22 paper, you would not have a representation of that document
0075

1   in your collection. It was only available electronically.
2   So there are some good and bad points about breaking things
3   out.
4   The series problems are a problem. That's the way the
5   SuDoc class is. So if we broke out open file report, there
6   may be one division that still puts out something in a CD
7   format. You may not get that item. They're not always
8   doing them online. Now, as things go on, more and more
9   agencies are doing online, so I just want to make sure that
10 people understand that there are some downsize to -- down
11 sides to breaking out item numbers.
12   Anything else -- anything else that we had talked about
13 that you wanted me to think about? Oh, brainstorming at
14 GPO. Since 2005 when Lisa and Suzanne worked on this
15 report, we constantly undergo brainstorming at GPO about
16 what to do with the item selection. I think maybe you think
17 we aren't doing that. We are doing that on a constant
18 basis. We have this old system that Bob talked about, one
19 of many. It's called DDIS, the Depository Distribution
20 Information System. It was built in 1982. That is our
21 basic infrastructure for most of the depository program. We
22 all know that it is needed to be replaced, but we're always
0076
1   not sure what to replace it with. Lisa Russell here has
2   been writing requirements for a new system based on a lot of
3   the information that's in the 2005/2006, we're moving
4   forward with funding with a team to do that development, to
5   hire a contractor to build the system for us, so we are
6   moving forward.
7   But there are also some things that have changed since
8   2005/2006 that we're concerned about. One of the things
9   that comes to mind, knowing how much we spent and how much
10 development time it took for us to get an integrated library
11 system, we know that since this is a major system, it's
12 going to take some time for us to develop.
13   There's also some questions in -- at least in my mind,
14 and this is my own opinion, is that building another system
15 for item selection, is that the best way to go, using item
16 numbers. I know there's some little bits of law in there
17 that say something about selection and number, but the last
18 count -- when I was a little surprised, we only distributed
19 in the -- since 2005 we distributed -- total titles
20 distributed was 12,000, in 2008 we're down to 7,000 titles,
21 and for some reason we're back up to 9,700 titles, tangible
22 titles, were distributed in the program in fiscal year 2009.
0077

1 Now, I would say that's probably a transition from one
2 administration to the next.
3   But we're concerned -- at least our discussions have
4 been should we keep up with this item number scheme for such
5 a small number of tangible publications. That's another
6 option that we've talked about, should we possibly just use
7 item numbers for the distribution of tangible documents. Is
8 there some other way we can, you know, let you know about
9 electronic documents without using the item number scheme.
10 So we've talked about -- Cindy has done some investigation
11 about the Canadian library system, looking at some of their
12 systems and how they notify the libraries, how libraries
13 participate in their program, and what kind of services they
14 provide.
15   So we do a lot of discussions, a lot of out-of the-box
16 discussions, talking about no SuDoc, no -- no item number,
17 we do have those discussions over lunch sometimes, so we are
18 looking at a lot of these things. I think we just need some
19 additional input since the 2005 is too -- you know, what
20 would be the best way to go forward. Or a suggestion was to
21 Justin and Ann and to David is to maybe a couple of models
22 that we could vet through our systems requirements that
0078
1 we're -- that Lisa is preparing now. So that's just to give
2 you a little bit of idea where we are.
3   We are also going back the whole list of classes,
4 cleanup is happening. It always happens. It's always going
5 on as part of our regular routine day-to-day operations. We
6 add new items every day, but we've also retooled our whole
7 cleanup process, going back and looking at items and getting
8 rid of microfiche formats, calling the agency to find out if
9 it truly is dead, if it -- what's been replaced. So we've
10 retooled that entire work flow with the help of library
11 planning and acquisitions, so you'll be seeing more and more
12 changes to the list of classes.
13   What else have we been doing? We've retooled -- redone
14 web tech notes, more about that in the operational forum.
15   Like I said, we have broken out some of those big
16 chunks of things where people have asked us to, so we're
17 always willing to take suggestions and work through some of
18 that cleanup in the list of classes and contact the
19 agencies.
20   MR. SHULER: Thank you, Laurie. Before you
21 leave, I think I understand the dilemma that you face with
22 certain series that, you know, some of those are available
0079

1   online, some are not. Is there any -- because I get
2   complaints from some of my selectives who have chosen to
3   be -- to trend toward electronic-only publications, and they
4   don't want to receive any real new publications that they
5   have to keep for five years before they can discard them, is
6   there any way that you could tag certain libraries as -- you
7   know, they can select these hybrid item numbers, but if a
8   title in that series does appear only in tangible format, it
9   would not be distributed to them?
10   MS. HALL: I'm not -- that's sort of a Robin
11 question, as well. I'm not really sure -- sorry, Robin. I
12 can't give an answer to that. We really have to think about
13 that because the lighted bin system, remember, does go on
14 item numbers. I think there has been a suggestion about
15 creating general pub, some of these general category classes
16 in various formats. That might be something that we can
17 investigate a little further. We've talked about that a
18 lot.
19   What we also are doing as part of the list of classes
20 cleanup, that was contacting a lot of these agencies, and
21 when we do, if we can get to the right people, not only to
22 find out things that are dead, but we do talk to them on a
0080
1   regular basis about websites. There -- you know, there are
2   big databases full of publications, and what's their
3   publication policy. We're finding more and more are moving
4   to most everything online.
5   So I think -- at least in my opinion I think a lot of
6   that's going to be -- is continuing to change, where we
7   won't -- we'll have some of those big series, majority of
8   those big series all available online.
9   Did that answer -- Robin and I will have to talk about
10 that. Sorry.
11   MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Robin Haun Mohamed (ph), GPO. And
12 I'm going to bring up something that may shock lots of you,
13 but can we consider making an all or nothing tangible
14 program? Yeah, I know, Jill, it's pretty radical, but that
15 would allow just the kind of library that you're talking
16 about, David. And also, as Laurie said, we are all
17 receiving much, much less material in a tangible format, but
18 I threw it out there for conversation knowing it won't go
19 down the successful road, but it's at least a place to talk,
20 because we keep -- we keep talking about it.
21   MR. SHULER: How seriously? Do you talk about it
22 seriously?
0081

```
 1        MS. HAUN MOHAMED:  Robin Haun Mohamed.  Since 1996,
 2   it's my dream.
 3        MR. SHULER:  That's pretty serious Robin.
 4        MS. HAUN MOHAMED:  My dream.
 5        MS. MORIEARTY:  Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.
 6   Robin wouldn't say it in public if it hadn't gotten serious,
 7   but I'd like to know from practitioners, what do you think
 8   about this?  Ah, we're getting -- Steve Hayes, you can't
 9   hide.  I know you've got an opinion.  He's gone.
10        MS. CHILDERS:  Martha Childers, Johnson County
11   Library.  I'm just going to -- I have some other things I
12   want to say about this, but I'll -- I won't address it now
13   in hopes that it will come up later.  Did I say my name in
14   place?  Okay.
15      As far as web only, I do believe that the National
16   Library of, what is it, Transportation and maybe Education,
17   some of them are only web-based, so it might make it
18   interesting for them to join.  Just throwing that out.
19        MS. SMITH:  Just to expand on my thumbs down, this
20   is Laurie Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.  I don't
21   want to go any direction that decreases selectivity.  I will
22   take print, I'll take electronic, but I only want those
0082
 1   things that are going to be useful for my population,
 2   because every record that goes into my online catalog is
 3   something I have to maintain, whether that is electronic or
 4   print, and database maintenance is becoming a huge part of
 5   my life.  So the cataloging is onerous no matter which
 6   format you get, so either way I want to be able to select
 7   and just get the things that will be useful for my
 8   population.
 9        MR. OTTO:  Justin Otto, Eastern Washington
10   University.
11      Correct me if I'm wrong, GPO, but if the DDIS system is
12   replaced, then basically it's a clean slate, right?  You
13   could -- you could have a subject-based selection system?
14   Yes?  No?  You could -- I'm just brainstorming here.
15        MS. RUSSELL:  Lisa Russell, GPO.  One of the
16   problems we've run into both with the whole item number
17   model and DDIS is that we've sort of gotten into the chicken
18   and egg thing.  We go, oh, we need to replace the system,
19   but we need a new model, and we don't know what the new
20   model is so we can't build a system; and then we go back the
21   other way and say, okay, we need a new system, but we don't
22   know what the system will do.  So --
0083
```

1   MR. OTTO: Sure.
          2   MS. RUSSELL: -- everybody's trying to get around
          3   that. The approach we're taking with the DDIS requirements
          4   is to try to build something that will handle item numbers
          5   for now and possibly be flexible enough to get away from it
          6   in the future. Does that answer your question?
          7   MR. OTTO: Yes, it does. I also, you know, since
          8   we're brainstorming here -- oh, please, go ahead.
          9   MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. I just wanted to
         10   make certain that everybody understood, it's just not a
         11   system replacement. There's staffing training, I mean,
         12   depending on what you're asking for, we're talking -- you
         13   know, if we're asking for staff to make your selections for
         14   you because -- you know, we don't know what you need all the
         15   time. I mean, you are the experts on what you really need
         16   and want for your collection. So we're not only talking
         17   about a system replacement, we would be talking about
         18   staffing replacement. There is -- DDIS is just one system.
         19   There's a lighted bin replacement, so, you know, it's a
         20   multiple tiered kind of thing. I just want to make sure
         21   everybody -- you know, based on the model, it's a pretty big
         22   change to our organization as a whole, at least from the
         0084
          1   operation perspective.
          2   MR. OTTO: Well -- Justin Otto, Eastern Washington
          3   University. Just since we're brainstorming here, like what
          4   I would love to see in the future for a selection system is
          5   one that at least would have the option for me to do like
          6   subject-based selection, say I don't care what agency this
          7   comes from, I would really like to see things about
          8   substance abuse, you know, since my university would have a
          9   big program in social work; and then also have the ability,
         10   you know, to either check a box, I only want things that are
         11   electronic or, you know, send it to me regardless of format
         12   or -- you know, because, I mean, if -- when you look at
         13   things I -- I guess what I see in my head is like one of the
         14   commercial, you know, book vendors and their online ordering
         15   systems, and they have, you know, plenty of options. I
         16   mean, you can -- you can -- even those -- a lot of those
         17   things can even be like format neutral. And, you know, I
         18   know that, you know, the processes are different for you
         19   guys, but you can say I just want to know if this vendor has
         20   this book, and then, I don't know, something like The Da
         21   Vinci Code, so then it shows you, yes, you can get it, and
         22   then it says would you like it in paperback, would you like
         0085

1 an E-book, would you like a hard back, and you pick that,
2 too.
3   So there's, you know, there are -- people have figured
4 out, you know, how to do these kind of flexible systems, you
5 know, so in the future I don't see any -- you know,
6 depending upon what we come up with, I don't think there's
7 any reason why something like that couldn't be -- couldn't
8 be a model for the future.
9   MR. SHULER: Peggy.
10   MS. JOBE: Hi, Peggy Jobe, University of Colorado at
11 Boulder, and we're the regional for Colorado, and so I may
12 be making mistakes since I never have to select or deselect,
13 but one of my -- one of my selectives has really expressed
14 some frustration with the process for selecting electronic
15 materials after the item numbers are separated. So, for
16 instance, the Congressional members items were separated
17 after the annual item selection period, and so this person
18 would like to get the electronic, but she won't be able to
19 add that to her selection profile until the next selection
20 period, if I'm right so far. Okay, I see heads nodding so
21 I'm not dead wrong.
22   So I contacted GPO, and I got the response that, no,
0086
1 that couldn't happen until the next item selection period,
2 and so with the legacy system, I understand that there's
3 some real issues to managing the print runs and all those
4 issues with those kinds of things, but could we build in
5 some flexibility that allows people to select electronic
6 items at any time because it only affects how they get their
7 records from Marcive or another vendor? So -- and I didn't
8 understand the answer I got, and I understand that you're
9 working with a very old legacy system, but, you know, what
10 are the possibilities for that?
11   MR. SHULER: I see Cindy hesitating here.
12   UNIDENTIFIED: I'm going to address the
13 requirements in the new system. We actually do have a
14 requirement for the new system that you would be able to add
15 online titles at any time, so that will take care of it in
16 the future. I think Cindy's going to talk about the current
17 state.
18   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing
19 Office. If they only want to select EL but can't actually
20 add the item number till the profile update, there's still a
21 way in which they can get those titles by using the new
22 electronic titles, because if they know the item number that
0087

43

1 they would have added, could they have added, they can
2 search that way. And I can anticipate the next question is
3 the cataloging and the profiling for different record
4 services. That doesn't necessarily have to be dependent on
5 the item number being in our system. You could let the
6 service know that you want this item number added to your
7 profile. Did I anticipate that incorrectly?
8   MS. JOBE: You know, my -- the library that raised
9 the question, I think that basically except for the annual
10 intervals, whenever you change, you ask them to add
11 something to your profile, it incurs some charges, am I
12 correct? Okay. So that's one of their issues.
13   And then the other option that's been, you know,
14 mentioned is to search the CGP and get the records that we
15 already use under the electronic titles, all of which
16 require a little more staff time in terms of getting the
17 records into your catalog. And basically, you know, in
18 these selectives that -- there are some other ones that are
19 kind of hanging on by their teeth, and so anything that
20 creates more staff time for them becomes problematic. And I
21 know from my own experience, we somehow lost about 3,000 bib
22 records from our Triple A system, no idea how it happened,
0088
1 but we know that it was in the Y1.1/8s. So we're getting
2 those item numbers and we're overlaying it, but using the
3 Z39.50 client, we have to rely on really high-end staff in
4 our cataloging and metadata services to do that for us,
5 because my staff who loads the Marcive records just -- you
6 know, they're a little intimidated by that whole process
7 so -- and we have to do it all. So the smaller ones,
8 they're still pretty -- it's a barrier, and if we would make
9 it just easier for them, I think it would be better.
10   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin. Thanks for the
11 clarification, and we'll look into it. Can't make promises,
12 but we'll look into that.
13   MR. SHULER: John.
14   MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson, University of
15 Delaware. I wanted to follow up on what Justin was talking
16 about with commercial services and the model that they offer
17 for selection. Our library recently evaluated competitively
18 two major vendors who offer profiling, and recently there
19 was training on the system that we chose. Not only did you
20 have a subject selection, which was very nice, but what I
21 liked and what I thought might be applicable to this
22 situation, even if you stay with item number based
0089

1 selectivity, is the ability to either say no handbooks, no
2 CDs or all CDs, you know, to be able to say we can't use
3 Braille. We don't have the people who are reading it. They
4 have other assistive technology available to them which they
5 prefer. And so that someone at GPO who is helping to
6 disseminate the information would be able to see by
7 switches, you know, this library, although they're
8 interested in this topic, this is not the format they can
9 use, effectively, and they'll be dumping it within five
10 years, which is a waste of everybody's time.
11   I know that Braille in particular is a very expensive
12 format to produce and disseminate, and it's very bulky, but
13 there are other formats, as well, where if a library chooses
14 to select mostly electronic, I think that if you were to
15 double the number of item numbers, essentially, and say, you
16 know, given the caveats that you've explained to us, you may
17 select the electronic version of anything within these
18 areas, I think that a lot of people would bite. I think
19 that a lot of us would choose electronic, evaluate its use,
20 figure out does it meet our needs, and if the electronic
21 meets the needs, many of us would drop the more expensive to
22 disseminate formats as needed to serve our clientele. But
0090
1 it's just a thought.
2   MR. SHULER: And a very important one. Arlene?
3   MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible (ph) from the Oregon
4 State Library. I think, you know, this is one of these
5 situations where you're never going to please everybody,
6 because everybody wants to do it their own way, and I -- you
7 know, the key is flexibility.
8   I think the thing of it is somebody else earlier
9 expressed the notion of, you know, format is not primary
10 interest. I'm interested in content, and if it's about
11 Oregon, I want it no matter what it is, CD, Braille,
12 whatever. So I think that you have to understand that while
13 format is vitally important for certain types of libraries,
14 content is really an important selection factor for others,
15 and anything that we can do to increase selectivity by
16 subject, by geography is really important for most -- most
17 libraries. Anything that you can do to let us know what the
18 titles are before we get them as opposed to in a series I
19 think would be very much appreciated by a lot of libraries.
20   So, you know, I know that format is really important,
21 but I really don't want to lose sight of those other
22 selection criteria, because they're important to, you know,
0091

45

1 different types of libraries.
 2   So -- and I also want to echo the fact that, you know,
 3 vendors have been doing approval plans for a long time, this
 4 is not a model that needs to be created from scratch, and I
 5 really hope that GPO considers looking at some of those
 6 systems as they're looking at requirements and what systems
 7 can really do.
 8   MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders from the Library
 9 of Michigan. I want to dovetail on one of John's comments
10 that I -- one of John Stevenson's comments that I do hear
11 from my selectives, and that's language, materials in
12 foreign languages, and I'm talking about things that you
13 get, you know, the Portuguese version and the Spanish
14 version and so on. That is an area in which libraries would
15 appreciate a filter.
16   But basically speaking from my -- just my general
17 experience, I think what we mostly want to get away with is
18 anything to do provenance, because we're librarians, we
19 think this way, but we're really not normal, and nobody else
20 does, and why we're working this hard is -- I mean, it was a
21 wonderful 19th Century solution when Adelaide Hasse came up
22 with SuDocs, and item numbers kind of grew out of that, but
0092
 1 it's really time we all moved on. And anything to do with
 2 provenance is just something that I don't -- I don't want to
 3 see us go down that path in a new system.
 4   MR. SHULER: I'll call on you in just a second.
 5 I want to ask a followup of GPO.
 6   Given the fact that item number selection, at least the
 7 way I understand it, is -- was developed primarily as a way
 8 of budgeting in the sense that you need to know how many
 9 publications from a certain series are people going to want
10 in the coming fiscal year so that you can either produce
11 that number if GPO is producing it in-house, or you can ride
12 that number of publications if an agency is having it
13 printed outside of GPO.
14   And, number two, given the fact that we have discussed
15 and seemingly rejected the whole concept of print on demand,
16 what are the -- what are the obstacles to developing some
17 kind of an approval program from GPO's prospective? That
18 is, how could that even be done given the fact that you need
19 to know so far ahead of time how many copies of a particular
20 publication to print or ride?
21   MS. HALL: Laurie Hall from GPO. Do you remember
22 that we did do approval kind of, we sent out surveys back in
0093

1 the mid '80s. Just when I came, we were still doing
 2 surveys. You're right. Remember, we order things before
 3 they're even printed so -- and we do send general counts to
 4 the Congressional Publishing Office two times a year so that
 5 they can -- when anything comes -- any hearing comes off the
 6 line, we already know that there is 500 libraries that get
 7 it. I think it really is a cost issue. We could order
 8 1,250 copies and send them out to everybody, and everybody
 9 selects them. Then there's also that waste issue. So those
10 are things that over the years, and probably way even before
11 my time at GPO, and I've been there long enough now, that
12 those things evolved where we did get massive amounts, but a
13 lot of things were thrown out, so we were trying to stay
14 close as possible to the total number of documents that
15 really were going to go out so we didn't have a lot of
16 waste. Did that answer the question?
17   MR. SHULER: So would it be fair to say that
18 given those constraints that you face, that you don't want
19 to print 1,200 copies on the off chance that some -- that
20 all depositories are going to want a tangible copy of this?
21 It sort of seems to me, and correct me if I'm wrong, that if
22 we went to an approval process, we would be faced oftentimes
0094
 1 with a situation where we get more demand from the field for
 2 a certain publication than can be filled --
 3   MS. HALL: Right.
 4   MR. SHULER: -- from available copies?
 5   MS. HALL: We would have to -- we would have to
 6 estimate by either the format or the content how many we
 7 think may be interested in the document, and then if we do
 8 get more than we have, we would incur reprint or, you know,
 9 reproduction costs to make up the additional amount. So
10 those are things that are always on our mind, especially
11 for --
12   MR. SHULER: And is that additional cost
13 something that GPO could absorb?
14   MS. HALL: We do do some of that now, Joe. I
15 don't know what percentage we go back to press on. Not very
16 many.
17   UNIDENTIFIED: Not very many, and it's an
18 expensive proposition.
19   MS. HALL: Right, because sometimes we have to go
20 back to, you know, set-up charges. We can -- sometimes we
21 can duplicate it, but we try not to go back to press on --
22 you know, sometimes if it's a ten-page pamphlet or whatever,
0095

47

1 the costs are not as great, but if it's some kind of bound
 2 volume or whatever, then you -- you know, we don't get that
 3 as many as we -- I mean as much as we have in the past.
 4   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan.
 5 You have done that though historically with -- I'm thinking
 6 of the 556C and 1004D, the -- you know, the 9/11 report --
 7   MS. HALL: Right.
 8   MS. SANDERS: -- things like that where you have
 9 made a decision based on its content that all --
10   MS. HALL: Yeah.
11   MS. SANDERS: -- of us needed it. And, actually,
12 I have occasionally heard from libraries why do I get this.
13 I don't want it.
14   MS. HALL: Correct.
15   MS. SANDERS: But that's just sort of an executive
16 decision made at your level --
17   MS. HALL: Well, yeah, see -- and back to that
18 other discussion we just had -- once again it's Laurie Hall,
19 GPO -- how much do you really want us to filter? I heard
20 that word. You know, how much do you want GPO to make some
21 of those decisions for you based on our best judgment? 9/11
22 report is exactly the thing. In our judgment we thought
0096
 1 that was a really -- we live in Washington, what can I say?
 2 That was really an important document that we felt everybody
 3 should have, and then hearing from you, then another library
 4 saying, no, we don't really want it so, you know, there are
 5 some -- if you -- how much you really want to rely on us to
 6 make some of those decisions. We do our best to try to make
 7 a decision we think is unilateral for the entire program,
 8 but that may not be the case. So I'm a little cautious on
 9 saying that we can help you best make your selections for
10 you.
11   I do trust my staff. I have every confidence in my
12 staff, but that's a lot to understand, what 1,250 libraries
13 need and want.
14   MR. SHULER: My purpose in asking this is to sort
15 of get some thought processes going on out there, because I
16 think we all would agree that a true approval process where
17 we could see a document online and say, yeah, I want a
18 physical copy of that for my collection is the way to go,
19 but what kind of tradeoffs might happen budget wise if we
20 were to go to that? I don't know.
21   I think you were next, the lady sitting down.
22   MS. CHILDERS: Martha Childers, Johnson County
0097

48

1 Library. I don't have time to deal with an approval
 2 process, to look at every item. It's not going to happen.
 3   I wanted to comment on a couple of things. I am in a
 4 large public library. If the rationale that you all use
 5 when you decide about the item selection, to put an item
 6 with paper and electronic or web together as you addressed
 7 earlier, if there would be some way for us to know what that
 8 rationale is, that might help us when I have to address a
 9 question from the collection development department or the
 10 people who shelve are going like why am I shelving this
 11 again, or having to shift it for five years because nobody's
 12 checking it out or -- you know, it's just I am constantly
 13 working on building -- I just want everybody in the library
 14 to love the FDLP as much as I do, and it is a big struggle.
 15 So the more information I have on that level, the best --
 16 the better it is.
 17   Also, I wanted -- as a public library, the DVDs and the
 18 CDs are very desirable for us, also foreign language
 19 materials, so if there's some way that we could select that
 20 way, that would be great.
 21   MR. SHULER: Steve.
 22   MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame.
0098
 1 I'm a business librarian. I did government information for
 2 20 years. I gave you a no answer when you asked me flippant
 3 because one of the basic things -- and I've been in this
 4 business 35 years -- is the depository librarians want it
 5 their way. I mean, I only want what I want when I want it.
 6 The rest of the time don't send it to me. You should have
 7 read my mind. We're like faculty at the University of Notre
 8 Dame.
 9   How many in this room have gone through an approval
 10 process with a real approval process? I mean, this is
 11 quasi, and it's not a criticism, so we know what that's
 12 like. And having done it, and you're absolutely correct, it
 13 takes a huge amount of time. It builds in certain things.
 14 I mean, if we have a return rate of over ten percent, guess
 15 what? My AD says go back and retune that again because
 16 we're -- we're sending too much back, and the publisher
 17 tells us that.
 18   I mention it because often I think our field looks to
 19 itself as totally different. You are doing an approval
 20 process. Provenance that we're using in terms of their --
 21 when I'm teaching my juniors finally to do research and
 22 they're assessing something, provenance is an important
0099

1 process to take into consideration. Is it important that,
2 okay, I get everything for the Department of Labor, well,
3 big provenance.
4   So I'm mentioning that we may have to look to that
5 model with all the overhead that we have to do once. And
6 yes, indeed, you know, I don't refuse books simply because
7 it's not worth my time. I'll put it on the shelf. You
8 know, that 9/11 report, we have a culture here that says,
9 oh, don't send it to me. You know, it's important that you
10 have it. If you don't have it now, you're not going to keep
11 it -- you're going to keep it for five years and then dump
12 it. Well, are you best serving your population ten years
13 from now or some such like that, depending on the population
14 that you do.
15   So while I think we think of ourselves, we have unique
16 problems, we don't. It is a matter of how do we construct,
17 yes, you're going to have some overhead that, okay, we
18 ordered X number and guess what, somebody doesn't want it,
19 you know, heresy, you're going to recycle that.
20   That balancing act between the Burger King approach of
21 have it your way and the heresy of the business approach
22 that I have to live with all the time that says the cost is
0100
1 no -- you know, you've got it, it's going on your shelf for
2 five years because it costs us more to save one or two
3 libraries from getting that.
4   So, you know, the main point of this wandering is
5 maybe -- and GPO probably has done this already, look to the
6 private sector modeling in terms of approval plans and see
7 how it is, and in some cases it's going to be -- the program
8 is going to eat the overhead. We'll have to do it because
9 in the long run we will get down to the type of granularity
10 that we have wanted since they were shipping documents to
11 Indiana by Pony Express. I don't want this one. Why did
12 you send it to me? You know, 1890 something. Okay.
13   MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University.
14 I have to echo what Steve says. We have an approval plan
15 now. It's just that some people don't like, and I'm
16 probably one of them, the item number basis. One of the
17 things I think probably gets in the way of moving to the
18 granularity we would like to see, the subject content, the
19 language content, the format content, is you either have to
20 take your item numbers and create all new item numbers for
21 all those possibilities, or we don't have the structure in
22 place. When we look at our approval books, we know what's
0101

50

1 in press but hasn't been shipped yet. I don't know that you
 2 guys have that capability, so that's a real problem for
 3 them.
 4   So just two cents on that, but I really have a quick
 5 transition period question to whatever we get. How long
 6 would it take GPO to go through the remaining 480 some
 7 odd -- I'm sorry, I didn't quite catch the number --
 8 multiple format item numbers and split those out?
 9   MS. HALL: It's Laurie Hall, GPO. 492. Here's
10 the list here. It's interesting. A lot of them are
11 category classes, so like posters, so if we could come up
12 with a decision to, you know, break out category classes,
13 general pubs, whatever, by format, that probably wouldn't
14 take us too long.
15   Some of the other ones are -- a lot of them are series
16 so -- and a lot of them probably would require contacting
17 the agency, looking at a website again to see, you know,
18 through the list of classes cleanup project probably would
19 eliminate probably two or three hundred of them, because
20 chances are they're probably dead by now.
21   So, I don't know, I can't give you an estimate how long
22 it would take. How many have we done so far in this list of
0102
 1 classes cleanup? We've just done recently 200, but that's
 2 because we just totally retooled the whole process going
 3 through acquisitions to cataloging to web tech notes,
 4 whatever. So sometimes we get information from the
 5 agencies, sometimes we don't, and sometimes we just say,
 6 okay, we're going to -- if we don't get anything from the
 7 agency, we'll discontinue it.
 8   So a couple of months, but we're coming up against the
 9 holidays, so spring. Spring, is that okay?
10   UNIDENTIFIED: Within this fiscal year?
11   MS. HALL: Oh, yeah, yeah.
12   MR. SHULER: Gwen.
13   MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of
14 Hawaii, a couple of points. Item selection is one of the
15 issues that my selectives ask me for help with the most,
16 because they just don't understand it when there -- there's
17 a lot of turnover in some of my selectives, so there's
18 constantly a new person who's faced with this system that
19 they don't understand. They're not accustomed to dealing
20 with an approval plan, so they're not inculcated in that
21 system.
22   So one difficulty that they have is that a lot of them
0103

1 are nine-month employees, they don't work during the summer,
 2 and that's when item selection takes place. So if it could
 3 be arranged so that item -- the adds can be done at two
 4 times per year rather than once a year, that would really
 5 help a lot of the people I work with.
 6   The second thing is that currently the item selection
 7 system, you log into it and you type in the item numbers
 8 that you want to add, and you type in the item numbers that
 9 you want to drop, and I think it would really help a lot of
10 people if it could be a more intuitive system that's more
11 like a guided system rather than a -- you know, just a blank
12 slate sort of interface, because I cannot go and sit down
13 with a lot of my selectives and go through the process with
14 them. And I've even tried using Skype with my selectives to
15 sit down with them and do this. Skype just doesn't work
16 with some of the bandwidth that we're dealing with, so that
17 would be another improvement that we would really help
18 things.
19   MS. OVERLAND: Hello. This is Melanie Overland
20 from the Ohio State University Law Library, and I have two
21 comments looking forward to the future, and I think one is
22 that, you know, all of our libraries are under great
0104
 1 constraints about our print resources, how much space we
 2 have, how much staff time we have for maintaining them and
 3 processing them, so as the number of print items decreases
 4 at GPO, I hope we can select almost on a title-by-title
 5 basis in the future, because otherwise the pressure coming
 6 down from our directors and the head of our technical
 7 services department is to scrap the program and buy only
 8 those few titles that we want in print from a commercial
 9 vendor. And for those of us who like being part of the
10 program, it would help us a lot if we could, you know,
11 really be sure that what we're selecting in print or other
12 tangible format is what want at our library. I think a lot
13 of people are saying that.
14   And the second thing is for libraries like mine that
15 don't get the Marcive records, what would be great in the
16 future with a future system is if somehow our item numbers
17 were always correlated to SuDoc or title, because it's very
18 difficult to manage the collection each year and assess what
19 we want to add or drop to go through, you know, 1,300 item
20 numbers and use the list of classes to see what each one of
21 those is. It takes a lot of time. So in the future some
22 kind of system where we could list both our items and what
0105

1 that item is would help collection managers a lot. Thanks.
 2   MR. SHULER: One of the issues that -- I believe
 3 it was Laurie who brought up was this whole concept of using
 4 item numbers to select publications from the electronic
 5 library. And I know that I, myself, have a great deal of
 6 difficulty rapping my mind around that when I first heard
 7 about this, because how can you select something that you
 8 never receive, and what does that really mean, and I get a
 9 lot of questions from my selectives about that, as well.
10   And I eventually -- it became clear to me a few
11 conferences ago when Judy Russell kind of explained that
12 when you select that item number for an electronic-only
13 publication, what you're really doing is committing to
14 servicing that title or series or serial meaning that if
15 someone asks a reference question about that, you're
16 committing to helping people with that resource.
17   But still, even though that helped a little bit for me
18 to wrap my mind around this concept of selecting something
19 you never get, sort of like asking Santa for a present you
20 know you're never going to receive, I still wonder whether
21 it's really necessary to have item numbers connected to
22 electronic-only publications, and I would be very -- I'd be
0106
 1 interested in GPO's perspective on that, and certainly your
 2 perspective.
 3   I know that item number selection is important when you
 4 contract with a vendor like Marcive to get cataloging
 5 records that are attached to those item numbers, but is that
 6 really necessary to get those records, or is there another
 7 mechanism that we could use to get those records into our
 8 catalogs?
 9   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. You took my
10 thunder. I was going to say that we were looking ahead to
11 the point where we would be able to push cataloging records
12 based on item numbers, the selections, and looking towards
13 the day where -- the possibility of digital deposit. I
14 mean, that's looking way ahead, so maintaining the system
15 that we had and looking forward, but maybe that's not the
16 best way. Maybe that was the thinking then, maybe it's not
17 the best way now.
18   MR. SHULER: Well, along those lines, Cindy,
19 before you sit down, and I don't know how much you can talk
20 about this, but this brand new partnership with Marcive to
21 explore pushing records from the CGP to depositories is
22 somewhat related, I think, to what we're talking about here.
0107

1 Could you talk a little bit about that, that pilot project?
 2   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. No, but Laurie Hall
 3 can.
 4   MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. We put out that
 5 announcement a couple of weeks ago, and just from 8:30 to
 6 10:30 this morning, we had our kickoff meeting with the
 7 Marcive folks and our pilot project team. There will be a
 8 lot more information coming out, I said that in the
 9 announcement, because there's a lot of little details that a
10 lot of people have questions about, and we're trying to
11 develop an FAQ and some literature and stuff with Jim and
12 John Jappa.
13   It is a pilot test. We expect that we can -- that we
14 will be able to service or use 30 to 35 libraries to
15 participate in the pilot to get records from the CGP based
16 on some very simple parameters, your item profile, if you
17 want the historic shufflets. We were just developing some
18 of those this morning, so there's going to be a little bit
19 more detail coming out.
20   What else did you want -- what else is the question?
21   MR. SHULER: What is the ultimate goal of this
22 pilot if it's successful?
0108
 1   MS. HALL: The ultimate goal is -- we heard from
 2 the libraries, we've constantly heard from you guys that you
 3 really want us to disseminate records. We don't want to --
 4 you know, you don't want to pay Marcive for it, whatever.
 5 We looked at trying to develop that kind of application
 6 ourselves and said, well, maybe we should really try it with
 7 Marcive. They have a long history of doing that. They know
 8 all the ins and outs of the system, of what they have to do,
 9 so we thought a partnership with them would be really good
10 for us to learn what it takes to do something like that.
11 How the libraries -- also to try to pick up some of those
12 libraries that don't get the service now and see if we
13 can -- we can deliver the records to them.
14   We're also wanting to test records coming out of the
15 CGP. The current records that go to Marcive come through an
16 OCLC route, so we want to test the capability of our system
17 to batch load-out records to Marcive and have them
18 distribute it to those test libraries. So that's kind of
19 our goal, to get a real sense of just what it takes.
20   I also -- Laurie Hall again for GPO. I also had
21 something that I think Ann and I talked about in our little
22 phone conversation. One of -- I think whoever said it, I
0109

1 think Jill said it, the SuDoc system also causes a lot of
 2 these problems. Ann said it, whoever said it, people have
 3 said it. One of the other suggestions is to maybe move from
 4 SuDoc to something else. We do classify hearings now in
 5 LC -- you have to think outside the box. Come on, think
 6 outside the box.
 7   UNIDENTIFIED: We can move from Dewey to LC.
 8   MS. HALL: So, you know, we do now classify
 9 hearings in LC classification. Jennifer Davis and I have
 10 talked many times about moving to another group of
 11 classification, so that might be something as a transition
 12 to start, because a lot of the problems between -- in the
 13 system are based on the SuDoc number and then the item
 14 number on top of that.
 15   So, of course, classifying in LC takes kind of a staff
 16 retooling for me, but maybe it is something that we really
 17 need to take a look at. It would probably be after I
 18 retire, but, I mean, it's something we really should be
 19 looking at if we're really looking outside the box.
 20   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan, as
 21 the person who opened this particular can of worms, anybody
 22 who knows me very well knows that I've had a thing about
0110
 1 SuDoc for a number of years now, but it isn't just LC, it's
 2 Dewey for the smaller libraries and the publics. In my
 3 experience, the libraries that have been most successful in
 4 my state in delivering really, really good service are the
 5 ones who integrate their documents as much as possible into
 6 everything else, and so that has been sort of my mantra for
 7 a number of years to try to make it easier for them to do
 8 that, because it makes them so very much more successful.
 9   And I know, I mean, I've got a staff member in Michigan
 10 right now who has all the hair standing up on the back of
 11 her neck, and she's getting ready to push pins into a voodoo
 12 doll because she doesn't like the thought of giving up
 13 SuDocs, but, honestly, it doesn't matter if you put it in
 14 raganafin (ph) as long as you can find, and you've got a --
 15 a lot of the problems were made very clear to us when we
 16 worked with Detroit Public, because Detroit Public became a
 17 depository in 1891 and didn't go to that new-fangled SuDoc
 18 system until 1982, and so I've been working with them
 19 processing out a collection that isn't even in SuDoc. So
 20 you really kind of do have to think about some of those --
 21   MS. HALL: Well, Laurie Hall --
 22   MS. SANDERS: -- and go forward.
0111

1   MS. HALL: Laurie Hall again, GPO. What has it
 2 been, about five years now since we -- we -- when we first
 3 started classifying electronic publications, remember we
 4 were using the SuDoc stem and a made-up number? Well,
 5 people in the community complained about that because they
 6 were making tangible copies, and they still wanted a cutter,
 7 or we were sending out more tangibles, so maybe now's the
 8 time to take a look at that again. Some of my staff have
 9 asked that question, why are we continuing to classify
10 electronic documents, especially when there is no tangible
11 version that's going out or tangible document available.
12 So, you know, we did that a couple of years ago, we went
13 back to classifying and cuttering everything, so maybe now's
14 the time to take a look at that as well again, not
15 classifying electronic versions.
16   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty -- oh, I'm sorry. Do
17 we have time to talk?
18   MR. SHULER: Since we have about 20 minutes left,
19 what I'd like to suggest is that since SuDoc classification
20 serves maybe two functions, it serves the function of
21 allowing you to organize things on your shelves, and it
22 serves the function of working with item numbers to select
0112
 1 items in the first place, that we confine our argument about
 2 the usefulness of SuDoc to the selection process and not to
 3 the classification process for putting things on the
 4 shelves, because we could have an entire program arguing
 5 about that, whether to go to LC, whether to go to Dewey.
 6 Let's just talk about selection and how SuDoc relates --
 7   MS. HALL: I know, but I just want to --
 8   MR. SHULER: -- to selection. Is there a better
 9 way, such as subject-based selection instead of
10 provenance-based selection.
11   MS. HALL: Excuse me. I just wanted to say we do
12 have a program about that, about classification, SuDoc,
13 integrating your collections or keeping them in SuDoc, and
14 it's tomorrow morning at 8:30.
15   MR. SHULER: Did you want to say something, Jill?
16   MS. MORIEARTY: No.
17   MR. SHULER: Okay.
18   MS. HOFFMAN: Well, I'm glad to hear that. Elaine
19 Hoffman, Stony Brook University. And I was very glad to
20 hear you talk about that, as well. Our documents collection
21 when I came there 18 years ago was maybe one third that had
22 been classified by LC, and the rest was in SuDoc. And even
0113

1 though we have had access to the SuDoc collection through
 2 another vendor, GDCS, people had to look in a separate
 3 catalog, and they never found the material.
 4   Maybe a couple of months ago I decided -- I asked the
 5 catalogers if we could just try a project where we would
 6 start cataloging some of our hearings, because we have this
 7 great hearings collection that doesn't get used that much
 8 anymore. So we started do it, and she started putting them
 9 into LC numbers, and then we started thinking about it, you
10 know, we have rows and rows and rows, and they're all going
11 to have to be redistributed. So I said, well, I just read
12 somewhere about class -- you know, put them in your catalog,
13 but use the SuDoc number. The system we use is capable of
14 that. And so far everybody's been happy with that. The
15 SuDocs stay where they are on the shelf, and people can find
16 them in the regular catalog, and so they have to go and find
17 out where the Y4s are, but -- you know, because I just got
18 fed up with the stuff not being able to be found.
19   Oh, and, yes, one other thing I wanted to say. I got
20 an email last week from one of our librarians, one of our
21 subject librarians who said why are all these government
22 documents coming up all of a sudden. I've done this class
0114
 1 before, and I never had to deal with them. And I said I
 2 don't know. I mean, the only thing I can think of is that
 3 we started classifying hearings, and he said okay but -- I
 4 said I don't understand what the problem is. He said,
 5 well -- I said send me an example of what you're searching.
 6 So he said he's searching a key word "terrorism." Okay.
 7 Well, that combined with the fact that we cannot afford to
 8 buy any new books at all most of last year, this year and
 9 probably the next two years, the most recent things that we
10 have are government publications, so, you know, it was sort
11 of like get used to it because they're going to be coming
12 up.
13   MR. SHULER: Carol.
14   MS. SPECTOR: Hi, I'm Carol Spector from USF, and
15 I'm going to just kind of move back to a slightly different
16 topic.
17   MR. SHULER: Carol, could you get closer to the
18 mike?
19   MS. SPECTOR: Oh, yeah, hello. I think I'm
20 concerned about clarity in the selection process no matter
21 what process we're using, about whether -- whether I know
22 I'm going to get the item. Not so much what format it's
0115

57

1 going to come in, but based on what I've selected, what I'm
 2 going to get. So where I'm going with this is when we're
 3 talking about breaking out by format, like this is the first
 4 I ever heard that there are some committees, I think if I
 5 heard correctly, that aren't distributing and printing
 6 anymore. So, for example, and this is just one example, our
 7 library likes to get hearings from all the committees, so to
 8 be sure that we're getting it all, we thought we would
 9 select all the print. We already have the PURLs in our
10 records, so we dropped the electronic because we didn't want
11 to have duplicate records coming in through our Marcive
12 service.
13   So now -- and I get it that you guys don't know in
14 advance and you can't anticipate what these agencies and
15 committees are going to do, but there's something that is
16 fundamentally disconcerting that -- as the selection person
17 for my library that I don't know what I'm going to be
18 getting. And, I mean, clearly this happens with agencies
19 all the time but -- and I know that you guys are in a real
20 bind, but there's something that makes it really hard for us
21 and for talking to our deans and our fellow librarians
22 saying, well, oh, my gosh, we're now not getting it because
0116
 1 this year they've decided to do it differently, and I don't
 2 know what to do about that. I've been sitting here trying
 3 to think about it, but it's a real problem for me.
 4   MR. SHULER: Carol talked about this at our lunch
 5 yesterday, and I think that what she's ultimately asking is
 6 is it safe to deselect particular formats when you don't
 7 really know what's going to be occurring in the coming
 8 fiscal year to those formats, what will stop being
 9 published, what will not come out that I'm expecting to come
10 out, and there's probably no easy answer, but it is a deep
11 concern.
12   MS. SMITH: Laurie Smith, Southeastern Louisiana
13 University. Another concern is being able to tell after the
14 fact whether you were supposed to get it. For the Louisiana
15 State documents selection system, we select based on agency,
16 and then there's a long list of exclusions. You can say no
17 staff newsletters, no bills, and whenever we get something,
18 we have to look at it and go, all right, what is this, were
19 we supposed to get this. And you have to look, okay, we
20 select that agency, but is it a news letter, is it one of
21 these other categories of things that we have excluded, and
22 I think we're approaching perhaps that level of confusion if
0117

1 we add too many all of this, none of that kind of things
2 that aren't based on something concrete. So that's one
3 thing of the items numbers is, you know, I can look at that
4 and go this was assigned this item number, I select that
5 item number, yes, I was supposed to get this.
6   MR. SHULER: I'd like to go back to the question
7 I posed earlier about the connection of item numbers to
8 electronic-only publications. If a system could be
9 developed -- and I'm asking this as a question for you to
10 respond to. If a system could be developed where you could
11 choose to have catalog records pushed to you if this pilot
12 project with Marcive succeeds, if you could choose a system
13 where you could have those records pushed to you based on
14 the selection of subject categories or geographical
15 categories connected with subjects, for instance, rivers in
16 South Carolina, I only want electronic publications that
17 deal with rivers or harbors in South Carolina, no other
18 state, would that be preferable to you than selecting
19 electronic-only publications via item numbers?
20   MS. SOLOMON: Thank you for that question. Judy
21 Solomon, Seattle Public Library. I am going through a
22 process right now where I'm looking at each item number, and
0118
1 then using Marcive I'm looking for general titles and
2 checking them in my library catalog, and I'm like to
3 0025.BO1 or something like that. And thus far I'm
4 discovering that I have hundreds of titles that make no
5 sense being in my public library, and I'm having them
6 deleted. So I'd say yes, you know, if I had a better choice
7 for that, because I'm just not quite sure what the item
8 numbers electronic, it's true we don't put them on the
9 shelves, but they're in our catalog, and they really do
10 require a lot of maintenance.
11   MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate, yes and no.
12 There are some things we want to be able to select by
13 provenance, I want everything from a certain Congressional
14 committee, and then there are other agency publications that
15 we would prefer to be able to profile by subject and
16 geography and have pushed.
17   MS. SMITH: Laurie Smith, Southeastern Louisiana
18 University. I think selecting by subject would be great,
19 but then what do we do, go through the LC subject headings
20 and mark the ones we want? I mean, how much selectivity
21 would you have selecting by subject? It seems to me like
22 that could get almost as confusing, and why can't you assign
0119

59

```
 1  an item number to the subject and still select item numbers?
 2        MR. STEVENSON:  John Stevenson, University of
 3  Delaware.  I think that selecting things that have been
 4  cataloged by subject is fine, you know, that you can --
 5  basically when you discover that you have a new discipline
 6  or something that you've got to support, you might back up
 7  the truck to CGP and see what kinds of records that are
 8  available that would meet that need, but I think that
 9  there's a lot of issues that, you know, we're discussing
10  here; and, for example, the idea that we -- we want to have
11  something, and we want to make sure that we've got a back
12  stop or a user copy for a hearing, say, you know, trying to
13  determine, you know, is there something else.  I think that
14  GPO is good bibliographic work, you know, putting in the
15  linking fields makes it possible to say, oh, this is
16  available in another format.  But while my library does not
17  use SuDoc numbers for electronic publications, we call them
18  all electronic resource or electronic journal as a call
19  number to our public display.  When you browse CGP by call
20  number, you see the pairs of electronic print and possibly
21  fiche, and that's a very useful thing.
22       So I guess what I would have to say is that I think
0120
 1  that a subjects-based selection is good because that way at
 2  least in some cases you can get people to the types of
 3  things that they're probably interested in without having to
 4  drown them.  If we were to, for instance, start loading
 5  records for all the bills, individual records for bills, I
 6  don't think that the public would be able to pick and choose
 7  to say, oh, and this is the one that's going to the
 8  President's desk.  I think that they would have a lot of
 9  difficulty determining, you know, which one they really want
10  to read and which one was the one that was rejected earlier
11  on.
12       And so -- I'm sorry, I'm all over the place, but I
13  think that working with our colleagues at GPO and having
14  this kind of dialogue are very useful, and I think that this
15  is the way toward a solution that we can all live with.
16        MR. SHULER:  Thank you, John.  One question for
17  Laurie tending toward wrapping this up.  When we spoke on
18  the phone, you talked about the real desire of GPO to
19  receive models from the community.  If such a solicitation
20  of models is to occur, can you tell us what the community
21  should tell you, how specific should they be with these
22  models?
0121
```

1   MS. HALL: Laurie --
     2   MR. SHULER: Because we've received a number of
     3 different ideas here, but how can we -- how can we put them
     4 together and deliver them to you so that you can take action
     5 on them?
     6   MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. My suggestion was is
     7 that because Lisa and her staff are developing requirements
     8 for the daughter of DDIS or whatever, the DDIS-type
     9 replacement, we know that she has covered a lot of the
    10 requirements from the 2005/2006, correct? We just want to
    11 make sure that there are no other requirements out there,
    12 and if we had specific models that we could gain a little
    13 bit better consensus on -- you know, that we can vet them
    14 through our requirements process to see if what we are
    15 proposing would work. So that was my suggestion. You know,
    16 oh, can it do this, can it do that. Well, we've got a lot
    17 of those, but we obviously have heard, you know, yes, some
    18 people it works, some people it doesn't. So as Lisa said,
    19 we're trying to be flexible, but if we had a couple more
    20 specific models from -- of the entire process, it would
    21 probably help Lisa a lot to make sure that the requirements
    22 are written to cover various scenarios.
    0122
     1   MR. SHULER: Well, I guess what I'm getting at is
     2 if I were sitting out in the audience, and even standing up
     3 here, I'm going to come away from this session wondering
     4 what is going to occur, what was the purpose of this
     5 session, and how can we -- how can we contribute to going
     6 forward here. And the development of models is a very
     7 committee-driven thing. I mean, one individual probably
     8 cannot develop a usable model --
     9   MS. HALL: Right.
    10   MR. SHULER: -- but a number of people getting
    11 together can --
    12   MS. HALL: Right. So we've talked about the whole
    13 subject, you know, selection by subject. As Laurie said,
    14 what was at the LCSH, what's the taxonomy, what's the -- is
    15 it like the subject bibliographies, is it the Barnes and
    16 Noble broad categories. So if that could be one model, and
    17 what does that mean, what implications does that have, I
    18 would agree, a committee would be good. Because once you
    19 get together and start thinking about that, somebody is
    20 going to say, oh, well, what is that -- you know, what
    21 taxonomy are we going to use, how is that going to -- how is
    22 that going to be implemented, and I think that would be
    0123

1 helpful to Lisa.
 2   So a little bit more of an analysis of just what that
 3 means from the library's perspective, from their processing,
 4 and then we can also take a look at that because a
 5 subject-based model means to me a staff -- I have staffing
 6 resource issues, I have training needs, I would have system
 7 development from my side. So not only are we retooling the
 8 program and the libraries that participate, but we also
 9 would need some major retooling at GPO.
10   So if I knew that that was a model that everybody
11 was -- a lot of people were interested in and we thought a
12 little bit more about, then we can decide how well -- you
13 know, if that could go forward. Does that -- did that make
14 sense? Because I need to know a little bit more about it,
15 we need -- a little bit more of the implications of that
16 kind of model if we went that way, from the libraries'
17 perspective joining with our perspective, and then we can
18 figure out if we -- if we could do it.
19   MR. SHULER: Just for the purposes of developing
20 mechanics of doing this -- I'll wait. Go ahead.
21   MS. KLAIR: Arlene Klair, University of Maryland.
22 You know, as I'm thinking about these mechanics, I mean,
0124
 1 University of Maryland is the regional, but we're also in a
 2 state consortium which supports a number of our
 3 depositories. I'm not the depository librarian. Please, do
 4 not confusion me with Cindy Todd. But my group does the
 5 processing of the bibliographic records and the physical
 6 items for College Park and much of the cataloging records
 7 for the University System of Maryland consortium, and what
 8 I'm beginning to think is would GPO offer one model or
 9 flexible models. And for those of us who are in consortium,
10 if multiple models were offered, does that mean a consortia
11 would have all its members choose the same model? Because
12 otherwise, how in the world do we load those records with
13 multiple choices? How do we present ourself to a vendor
14 like Marcive or even a CLC, you know, as we try and obtain
15 records and make sense of how to massage them.
16   You know, these are the concerns that I have, which
17 aren't necessarily GPO's concerns, but this is -- you know,
18 once these choices are made, you know, the scenario that we
19 have right now from managing the records is as
20 straightforward as it can get. The flexibility that we
21 might have in a new system might make my world unmanageable
22 in -- in interesting ways, but I can -- I can see the need
0125

62

1 for it, but, gosh, can I retire fast enough?
 2   MR. SHULER: Go ahead, Steve.
 3   MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. I'm
 4 extremely confused because -- you know, and I have a
 5 colleague back that begins any project he has is what is the
 6 problem we're trying to solve. I have heard everything from
 7 the few tangibles that we're still trying to distribute, to
 8 records being distributed, to the librarians who you put all
 9 those pesky government document records in the catalog, and,
10 you know, I don't want to use that stuff, how do I get down
11 to the stuff I really want to use in a book type of a thing.
12 So, you know, and we're solving problems that have been
13 solved before. I mean, we migrated from Dewey to LC, and
14 how many libraries are still stuck between two? Mine is --
15 we got rid of Dewey -- between LC and SuDoc.
16   So to save GPO more headaches than they already have on
17 their plate, I still am back to what are the issues and what
18 are the problems we're trying to solve? What would success
19 look like? You know, we can get down to the title-by-title
20 in a tangible form where I only get what I want, and I don't
21 get anything I don't want a hundred percent of the time.
22 Well, okay, you've at least put something on the table that
0126
 1 someone can start to design a system to get I only want the
 2 records for the records that I want. You know, we've
 3 substituted all those paper documents that, you know, we
 4 fought to get into the system, now we're fighting to get
 5 them out of the system. You know, I'm having too much stuff
 6 coming in.
 7   So I'm back to can someone frame the basic questions in
 8 nice bullet points that says we need to solve this problem,
 9 this problem, this problem, this problem, because then GPO
10 can magically put out that request for proposal, and it will
11 just come back solved, you know. And I'm being a little
12 facetious, but I'm trying to make things easier for them.
13 You know, what are we trying to accomplish here, and, you
14 know, can we really put things -- I'm thinking some of the
15 things that are Laurie's plate. I don't want them on
16 Laurie's plate. You know, you're already doing SuDocs.
17 Don't think of a new thing. I mean, you know, we've coped
18 with it, move on, you know, type of a thing.
19   MR. SHULER: Jill.
20   MS. MORIEARTY: I just want to add one thing to
21 that. Thank you, Steve. I called on you a long time ago.
22 I'm glad you put forward that, because the other thing that
0127

63

1 I think is very important for GPO is if we add something,
 2 what are we willing to have them stop?
 3   MR. HAYES: We have to protect them.
 4   MS. MORIEARTY: I heard something.
 5   UNIDENTIFIED: We have to protect them he said.
 6   MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. We have to
 7 protect them. We keep --
 8   MS. MORIEARTY: Yeah.
 9   MR. HAYES: -- piling more and more and more --
10   MS. MORIEARTY: Exactly.
11   MR. HAYES: -- onto them, where do they start?
12 Instead of going, no, this is what we really want to do --
13   MS. MORIEARTY: But I'm also saying when we tell
14 them what we want, part of that also has to be -- because
15 we're all in this situation at our home institutions. When
16 you take something on, what do you give up in order to
17 complete this new item or this new project.
18   MR. SHULER: Well, in summary, I don't know if I
19 can -- if I can encapsulate what anybody wants here because
20 I'm hearing many contradictory things, but I think that -- I
21 think that we could say one of the things that we want is
22 that if you are an all electronic depository, I do not want
0128
 1 to get tangible publications because I have to keep them for
 2 five years. Is there a mechanism that could be developed to
 3 prevent that from happening.
 4   Number two, can we establish some kind of a selection
 5 process that would allow a depository to choose by
 6 provenance if they want to, or by subject if they want to do
 7 it that way, or flip-flop even, is such a mechanism possible
 8 in this new system.
 9   Those are two things that I am getting out of this that
10 I think that -- we want flexibility, some people don't want
11 flexible. Some people are going to drop out of the program
12 unless they have flexibility. So how can we accommodate
13 both of those? I don't know.
14   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to
15 throw a thought -- well, actually, as people were talking, I
16 thought of some other things but -- and maybe looking at the
17 University of Maryland and the consortium idea might be one
18 model to come up with. If I'm in a consortium, what is best
19 for us might be one of those models.
20   The problem, to answer Steve's question, I think is how
21 do we get this flexibility to everybody. That's the problem
22 we're trying to solve. So in thinking about all of that and
0129

1 thinking about provenance and thinking about subject and
     2 thinking about geography and how few -- comparatively few
     3 titles we're sending out in tangible format now -- anybody
     4 have tomatoes, because I'm just going to throw this -- I
     5 shouldn't have worn a light color today. I'm just going to
     6 throw this out. What if we did a whole switch in the
     7 processes of GPO and our work flow, and you all could select
     8 after cataloging. At this point you all are selecting prior
     9 to what we even know what the printed product's going to
    10 look like, and the cataloging is the last thing. With the
    11 lesser amount of tangibles, what's the tradeoff in getting
    12 them quickly versus getting what you really want after
    13 cataloging? Now, this is looking at like the Canadian
    14 model.
    15   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan.
    16 Why would you think that would be a tomato concept?
    17   UNIDENTIFIED: Because that answers --
    18   MS. SANDERS: It sounds to me like what we've been
    19 asking you for.
    20   UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, that answers -- would seem to
    21 answer a lot of the topics -- a lot of the items that have
    22 been mentioned today, and that is being able to select by
0130
     1 title, knowing what you're getting, and I think with the
     2 number of tangibles decreasing -- and I don't know this for
     3 sure, but it would seem to me that the cataloging would be
     4 done a lot faster than it used to be because there's a whole
     5 lot less.
     6   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the reasons
     7 I thought I might get tomatoes is because of the time lag in
     8 getting the materials into your library. What is the
     9 tradeoff from having them as soon as they come off the print
    10 or in from the printing contractor and out to the libraries
    11 versus holding them for a while until they're cataloged, and
    12 then you can choose.
    13   One of the possible down sides of this is that there's
    14 the question of if we do it this way, we're not -- we
    15 wouldn't be able to ride the print orders from the agencies,
    16 so we're looking at some kind of mechanism to get the print
    17 products. For those of you not familiar with the Canadian
    18 depository program, they automatically get enough for what
    19 they call their full depositories, and then they order X
    20 number for what they think will be available for choice by
    21 their partial depositories. Sometimes they guess correctly,
    22 sometimes they don't. Sometimes there are enough to go
0131

1 around, sometimes there aren't. And then when there aren't,
 2 it's up to the library then to find that copy by going to
 3 the agency or some other mechanism. So there are some down
 4 sides to that. We'd have to look at how we would actually
 5 get the print copies, or what is an X number that we might
 6 want to order.
 7   MR. SHULER: I'm sorry, folks, but we're going to
 8 have to wrap this up. I know that there are people who want
 9 to comment on this, and I also know that GPO is very, very
10 open to your comments, so if you could summarize those
11 comments and send them in an email to Laurie Hall, I'm sure
12 that she would love to get all of those emails. Thank you
13 all for your great input.
14   (End of second session, beginning of third session:)
15   MS. MORIEARTY: My name is Jill Moriearty,
16 University of Utah, and it's my privilege and pleasure to be
17 the council member who is going to be leading us in this
18 discussion, our 2:00 discussion of outreach and assessments.
19   We are going to be starting today with Kathy
20 Brazee (ph), outreach librarian from GPO, who is going to
21 talk to us about PAA, and I hope you all know that this is
22 PAA and not "I can actually participate." Everyone's in the
0132
 1 right place, right? Oh, even in the back, don't -- don't do
 2 that.
 3   All right. Kathy, could we have a bit of your time?
 4   MS. BRAZEE: Good afternoon. It's just me talking,
 5 there are no PowerPoints, so I feel like I should do an
 6 interpretive dance or something about outreach and public
 7 access assessments, but it's just me. I'm Kathy Brazee with
 8 GPO, and I'm going -- the council recommendation addresses
 9 public access assessments specifically -- and I will try not
10 to step on the power cords here. The council
11 recommendations addresses public access assessments, but I'd
12 like to talk about that within context of outreach currently
13 within the library unit at GPO, and give you a little bit
14 more background about assessments, as well.
15   For those of you who remember the older desktop page
16 two iterations ago when we had inspections, inspections fell
17 under the depository administration tab. Currently if you
18 go to the FDLP desktop, you'll find information about public
19 access assessments and our other outreach activities under,
20 surprisingly enough, the outreach tab, and I wanted to give
21 you an overview of outreach as we see it now.
22   One, it provides depository libraries with a variety of
0133

66

1 tools and resources that can be used to promote the free use
 2 of federal government information products by the American
 3 public, and this is our traditional information under that
 4 desktop tab of information about events, online learning,
 5 partnerships and promotional resources. But in the broader
 6 context, our outreach also encompasses interaction,
 7 communication and consultation with federal depository
 8 libraries about depository management activities. This
 9 includes daily depository consultation by phone, email, the
10 ask GPO messages. It also includes, really cool, future
11 articles about very cool depository libraries and the public
12 access assessments program, whereby GPO evaluates each
13 library's compliance with FDLP legal and program
14 requirements.
15   The library services and content management unit
16 provides several services to assist you, including this
17 daily depository consultation. In some cases we will
18 proactively contact your library when we hear of something
19 especially interesting or of concern or wish to learn more.
20 When you have a question about your library's individual
21 depository operation or services, we encourage you to
22 contact us and your regional librarian so that we may
0134
 1 discuss all the options available to your library.
 2 Considering that each depository is unique, in that you may
 3 determine locally how to apply the requirements and
 4 guidelines of the FDLP, this is important to make sure that
 5 you're aware of all options and any potential effect on
 6 public access to depository resources.
 7   And the library services and content management unit is
 8 also committed to sharing information through a whole bunch
 9 of avenues, such as announcements, news articles, new
10 educational resources, presentations at conferences and
11 meetings, GPO conferences, online training and visits to
12 libraries, which may be part of public access assessments,
13 so they may also be what we call courtesy visits, you may
14 hear us slip that phrase out, but basically consultation
15 visits to libraries.
16   A recent note relating to some of our outreach
17 activities not specific to public access assessments, we've
18 unveiled this really cool thing called the depository
19 library spotlight, shedding light on different depository
20 libraries, the unique services and offerings of our
21 depository so we can share in the strengths and innovations
22 of our partners and help promote this essential service to
0135

1 the program. What we are trying to do is feature different
 2 types of libraries at this point, and we're also trying to
 3 hit different parts of the country, so we've got another
 4 different type of library coming up for November.
 5   We also have FDLP on the go. This is a web page under
 6 outreach on the FDLP desktop. It shows where the library
 7 services and content management personnel are visiting
 8 libraries for all types of purposes, including
 9 participations in meetings and conferences, library visits
10 for general consultation, on-site public access assessments,
11 presentations at library special events, such as
12 anniversaries and more.
13   We also have some new OPAL programs, OPAL, O-P-A-L,
14 online programming for all libraries. It's a service we've
15 had for a while, and Robin Haun Mohamed set up a really
16 interesting collaboration with some University of Washington
17 Master of Library and Information Science students, and
18 their students were in contact with us and chose some topics
19 for some canned OPAL presentations, and there are two really
20 good ones up there right now on GIS and geology resources,
21 and we've got two more coming out, one on Austi (ph) and one
22 about full text online publications.
0136
 1   And we're hoping that this encourages you to submit
 2 OPAL presentations for the type of educational instruction
 3 programs that you're already presenting, so just taking the
 4 content that you have and putting it into an OPAL
 5 presentation would be great. So we take advantage of your
 6 expertise and share that widely so that people can learn
 7 about different topics.
 8   So getting specifically to public access assessments,
 9 again putting this in the context of outreach, public access
10 assessment is a review by GPO staff of an individual
11 library's federal depository operations and services. This
12 review is organized around the categories of access,
13 collection, service and cooperative efforts. GPO has the
14 responsibility to ensure that the resources that distributes
15 to federal depository libraries remain accessible to the
16 general public.
17   So the purpose -- the primary goal of GPO's assessment
18 program remains to ensure that federal depository libraries
19 comply with their legal requirements as outlined in Section
20 19 of Title 44 of the U.S. Code, and the program
21 requirements which are outlined in the federal depository
22 library handbook and also in the FDLP desktop, and this
0137

1 responsibility touches on almost every aspect of library
2 operations and services. And has always been the case, as I
3 mentioned before, individual depository libraries have the
4 flexibility to determine locally how to apply the
5 requirements.
6   And a second purpose of the assessment program, as many
7 of you know who have been through assessments in the past,
8 is to -- for GPO to help advise libraries how to reach
9 greater compliance with the requirements. This review is
10 intended to be supportive of each individual depository
11 library, and involve sharing of best practices and
12 recognition of notable achievements. That's a new section
13 now in the report, and it will help -- we hope it will help
14 libraries continue to enhance depository operations and
15 services.
16   So for the framework -- and what I'm summarizing now is
17 actually in a new project summary that's been recently
18 posted on the FDLP desktop public access assessment web
19 pages, and this is just a very brief summary of that.
20   On the public access assessment, also known as PAA, web
21 page, you'll find current information about PAA and its
22 related resources. There's a paper entitled, "Focus on
0138
1 Access, Collection, Service and Cooperative Efforts," and
2 has broad program goals and provides the focus and
3 organization of PAA. The PAA's designed to make a direct
4 connection between the activities that depository libraries
5 perform and the outcomes of those activities, with the
6 ultimate objective being support of desirable conditions for
7 depository libraries that provide for free public access to
8 federal depository resources. So if you haven't read what I
9 shorthand as the focus document, focus on access,
10 collection, service and cooperative efforts, I encourage you
11 to do so.
12   So we use that as the framework for a public access
13 assessment, and the process involves up to three phases in a
14 typical assessment. It's comprised of the -- there is an
15 initial review, a follow-up review and an on-site review.
16 There's a little bit -- there's more about this in the
17 project summary.
18   We also have something we're calling an expedited
19 public access assessment. If the timing works out for a GPO
20 staff person to actually visit a library on-site right away
21 rather than go through a process of the initial review,
22 follow-up review and then determine whether or not an
0139

1 on-site review may be needed, we can do an expedited public
2 access assessment. This bypasses a few of the preliminary
3 steps. It speeds up the opportunity to consult on-site with
4 a GPO representative, and it gives you a report more quickly
5 that way.
6   In a typical PAA, starting with the initial review,
7 outreach librarians will be in contact with the library
8 staff at each juncture of the review process. We start
9 during the initial review by calling to schedule a phone
10 call, conference call, with the depository coordinator, and
11 if you're the coordinator, you're welcome to invite other
12 depository staff who are involved and may be interested in
13 the conference call. And the GPO staff person outreach
14 librarian will talk to you about what we found in our review
15 of by-mail survey submissions, what's on your library web
16 pages, any other information we may have in our official
17 file, and ask you some clarification questions, if needed,
18 and also ask you for updates, because things are changing so
19 fast at libraries these days, we know that. And the 2007
20 by-mail survey was a ways away, of course in the middle of
21 the 2009 survey at this point.
22   So that's part of the initial review. If we ask for
0140
1 some kind of follow-up review, we'll give you a preliminary
2 report and a time period in which we'd like a report back
3 from the library, and that report back is about specific
4 issues that we noted, and we're hoping that changes can be
5 made at the library that then supports the -- greater
6 compliance with the requirements of the program.
7   And the process is complete after any of the phases
8 when a library's found to be fully compliant, has only one
9 minor compliance issue, or has compliance issues that will
10 be resolved according to the action plan report submitted to
11 the library services and content management unit. And an
12 official report is provided at the end of the PAA that
13 summarizes the findings.
14   So I'd like to give you a summary of recent activities.
15 As I mentioned, there's a project plan now up on the FDLP
16 desktop, PAA web page. We sure are looking forward to
17 hiring or selecting two new personnel to join us in the
18 outreach -- education and outreach unit and participate in
19 public access assessments and work with us on other outreach
20 activities.
21   And we are conducting PAA now in response to the
22 following: Upon request. There is a request for a GPO
0141

1 participation form on the FDLP desktop. You can get to it
 2 through several different avenues. One is through the PAA
 3 web page. You can go to forms down at the bottom of the
 4 desktop and find all the forms available. You can also get
 5 it through some of the outreach links on the desktop.
 6   To date we have received two requests for public access
 7 assessments. This has been since the form was available in
 8 early 2007. And just incidentally, in both of those cases
 9 when we talked to the depository staff, we decided that an
10 official assessment was actually not in the best interest at
11 that time, so we set up on-site visits. It took us awhile
12 to get the on-site visits, but one of them has happened, and
13 another is going to happen shortly.
14   So we're conducting the assessments upon request by
15 depository staff or others who make that request. We're
16 also conducting them in coordination with travel to events
17 such as ALA conferences and regional meetings. Also,
18 according to the chronology of the last inspection or
19 self-study evaluation, if you don't know when your library
20 was last inspected or you got a self-study evaluation, I
21 encourage you to look that up. We're looking right now at
22 libraries who were last inspected in the mid '90s in this
0142
 1 chronology.
 2   And we're also conducting assessments in response to
 3 any unresolved public access complaints. I'm sure this
 4 won't happen with anybody here, but if a library is unable
 5 or unwilling to resolve a public access complaint, we do
 6 feel obligated to follow up on that. Or if free public
 7 access is denied, and there have been no arrangements to
 8 accommodate library users requiring access, GPO
 9 occasionally -- it seems to be increasing a little bit
10 lately, but maybe five or six times a year we'll get
11 contacted by someone from the general public saying that
12 that individual has attempted to use depository resources at
13 a library, and of course the first thing we do is look at
14 your library web page to see what your access policies are
15 on the web page, but we'll also call you if you're the
16 coordinator, or call your colleague as the coordinator, and
17 ask you your knowledge of the situation. In a lot of cases
18 if you didn't have the direct contact with the individual,
19 you'll need to go ask someone who may have had that contact.
20   And in all the cases recently, there has been a
21 non-depository-related use of the library that is really --
22 where the situation has really been covered under the
0143

1 behavior policy or user contact policy of the library and
2 not depository access, but we, of course, must follow up on
3 any complaints about a depository library.
4   This applies to four libraries. We'll also conduct PAA
5 in response to a non-submission of by-mail survey. There
6 were four libraries that did not submit the 2007 by-mail
7 survey, and also just a head's up for the 2009 by-mail
8 survey.
9   So also in our recent activities, this is going to make
10 some of you a little nervous, I know, so follow up with me
11 afterwards. We have been to do public access assessments in
12 Illinois and Texas. More are coming soon in Arizona,
13 Oklahoma and Mississippi. No gasp from the audience, okay.
14 Called the regional librarian in Mississippi and warned her
15 since she isn't here at the conference that this was going
16 to come up.
17   The 2009 by-mail survey of depository libraries of
18 course will provide us additional information for the future
19 public access assessments once we have that data back once
20 the survey is closed.
21   So you're probably sitting there wondering if you need
22 to do anything to prepare. In the past GPO asked you to
0144
1 complete a self-study. You don't have to do anything to
2 prepare if you don't want to at this point. We're not
3 asking you to complete any type of self-study. The
4 education and outreach unit is working on an updated version
5 of the self-study of a federal depository library. That is
6 a completely voluntary resource. We hope you do use it, and
7 you can do it as time permits each module by module, but
8 we're not asking you to submit that study prior to public
9 access assessment. We think the self-study will be helpful
10 to you to do a self-assessment of your depository operation,
11 and we hope to get all of the modules up there as soon as
12 possible in the next few months.
13   So on a regular basis, too, even if you didn't hear
14 your state named, we encourage you to review your library's
15 depository and library-wide policies, as well content on
16 your library and institution web pages for compliance with
17 the FDLP and consistency as this is content that is reviewed
18 in a public access assessment. So it's just a good best
19 practice that we're suggesting that any library do.
20   It is really common for someone -- I was a former
21 inspector, for someone looking at the depository library web
22 pages to see a conflict between something that the library
0145

1 put out, especially if you've got a lot of web pages, and
2 what may be a depository policy. That is not uncommon at
3 all -- or not common -- that is common, I should say. So I
4 just encourage you to look at those policies, read the
5 content, make sure that they are -- they do match with the
6 requirements of the program. I just looked probably at 20
7 web pages, and I wasn't able to say that any of those
8 actually were fully compliant. So I do encourage you to
9 look at the text on your web pages, look at your access
10 policies. If you don't have any access policies on your web
11 page, we're going to ask you if you have one when we call at
12 the beginning of the public access assessment. So we're not
13 necessarily saying you have to put policies on your web
14 pages if that is not your library's routine, and a lot of
15 libraries don't do that. But certainly if you have hours
16 information on your web page, you probably have something in
17 there about visitor access policy. So we look at that, and
18 it basically provides us with information about what you
19 consider to be an access policy.
20   So if you are notified or when you are notified that a
21 public access assessment is taking place, we will ask you to
22 gather materials that may be requested or discussed during
0146
1 the initial review, the phone call, if these aren't posted
2 on the library web pages or if the current one isn't posted
3 on the library web pages. These include things like your
4 depository or library policies that cover the depository
5 operation and services, official selective housing site
6 agreements, procedures or processing manuals, and your
7 reports, strategic plans, examples of promotional materials,
8 possibly not a state plan if you've got a copy of that and
9 you know it's not current up on the web, that would be help.
10 We're just going to be asking you questions about those, and
11 it's helpful to have those available on hand rather than
12 have to tell us you'll look it up and call us back or email
13 us back with information, we just recommend that you know
14 where those are and that you've reviewed them and know that
15 they're in compliance with the program.
16   And this is probably a given, that federal depository
17 library staff have the responsibility to know and remain
18 knowledgeable of the FDLP legal and program requirements, so
19 you want to be up to date with your review of the federal
20 depository library handbook, anything new that would come
21 out through the FDLP desktop that is likely -- that will be
22 announced through FDLP or any successor mechanism to that
0147

73

1 announcement service. And if you're a new federal
 2 depository library coordinator, we do encourage you to look
 3 at the new depository coordinator tutorial. I think that
 4 will -- that will give you a head start.
 5   And, also, if you've been notified that a public access
 6 assessment will be conducted at your library, and you know
 7 that there are going to be reviews at neighboring libraries,
 8 we encourage you to contact the neighboring libraries so
 9 that you can network. It gives you an opportunity to make
10 this networking and to share information. And remember that
11 I mentioned that cooperative efforts is one of the four
12 categories in public access assessment, so you could
13 brainstorm with your colleagues at the neighboring
14 depositories about the type of cooperative activities that
15 your library participants in in your local area or region.
16   And you also might be sitting there wondering what in
17 the world can this public access assessment do for my
18 library if you've never participated in an inspection or a
19 self-study. I know Suzanne is going to talk a little bit
20 more about an experience with public access assessments, but
21 in case it's new to you, this is our perspective. It's an
22 outside review that documents the current status of your
0148
 1 library's depository operations and services. This review
 2 helps you identify your depository strengths and any areas
 3 needing improvement. GPO outreach librarians performing the
 4 PAA are experienced former depository coordinators who are
 5 able to consult on a range of topics. And if we don't know
 6 it, we'll look it up and get back to you.
 7   And the regional librarian participating in the PAA
 8 process will also give you additional feedback and ideally
 9 continuing support, and an on-site review provides an
10 opportunity for all library personnel at your depository to
11 interact with a representative from GPO. It's fantastic
12 that you all are here. Obviously most federal depository
13 libraries are not able to attend the GPO conferences, so it
14 gives us an opportunity to go out and meet with the
15 depository coordinators and all of the colleagues at the
16 depository who contribute to the operations.
17   It also -- the public access assessment also offers an
18 opportunity for the coordinator and staff to remind library
19 administration and colleagues of unique value, service and
20 challenges that the depository operation and services bring
21 to the library. When my library was being inspected -- I
22 was a coordinator at a library prior to coming to GPO -- I
0149

74

1   sent out a message the day before saying just a reminder,
2   there's going to be a GPO inspector in the building, and I
3   sent out lots of quotes, every quote I could think of that
4   might be funny and humorous relating to government documents
5   librarianship, and I brought in bagels, of course, for the
6   staff because nothing wins them over like food, or at least
7   not at my institution anyway. But it reminded my colleagues
8   that we're part of this -- this national program called the
9   FDLP. Most people, of course, in the library were not
10 involved in the inspection, but it just reminded them that
11 this is an important thing that you all are doing. And I'm
12 not suggesting at all that you provide food for us, by the
13 way, just mentioning that that was something that I chose to
14 do at my library.
15   So if you find that this type of review would be
16 helpful to your library at this point in time, you may
17 choose to request a public access assessment now before GPO
18 schedules one of your library's depository operation, and to
19 do that, go to the request for GPO participation form that I
20 mentioned earlier, and the place you can easily remember, I
21 guess, from this session, it's linked to directly from the
22 public access assessment web page. And there's more
0150
1   information in the project summary and on the public access
2   assessment web page, too, and we'll be constantly looking at
3   updating that content to make it most useful to you.
4   So I just wanted to conclude with a reminder about
5   public access assessments, that depository libraries do have
6   the flexibility to determine locally how to apply their
7   requirements. The library services and content management,
8   outreach librarians assess the current conditions at an
9   individual depository library on the day of review, but also
10 give the library credit work -- credit for work in progress
11 or plans being developed that will enhance or improve
12 depository operations or services.
13   We are certainly aware, as you are, of all the changes
14 in the library environment, and this is undoubtedly
15 impacting all services at your library, including the
16 depository services. This is all taken into account in a
17 public access assessment which demonstrates the flexibility
18 of this program.
19   And GPO and the FDLP benefit from the assessment
20 program, as you have another opportunity to share
21 information with the GPO representative. This exchange of
22 information may help address ongoing areas of concern, which
0151

1   can lead to savings and resources and also lead to the
2   identification of best practices, which then we may share
3   more widely within the FDLP.
4   And this has been said in information previously about
5   inspections, but I really think it makes the point very
6   well, so as has been said about the inspection and
7   self-study program, through this process which is designed
8   to strengthen individual libraries in the FDLP, our mutual
9   commitment to provide library users with easy access to its
10 government information is reinforced.
11   So stepping back to general outreach just for a moment,
12 I talked a little bit about our outreach activities and
13 public access assessments is part of that. And you're
14 probably thinking, oh, my library's going through all of
15 these changes, how in the world can you do an assessment at
16 this point in time. In cooperation with John here on
17 council, we disseminated an article recently that hopefully
18 reminded everyone that libraries and GPO are partners in
19 these challenging times, and please take advantage of the
20 network of the FDLP to help you remain as knowledgeable as
21 possible so that you can explore all your options in the
22 program, and that we're available -- library services and
0152
1   content management personnel and your regional librarians
2   are available to discuss options and best practices with
3   you. Please don't hesitate to contact us. That's what
4   we're there for.
5   Great. Thanks so much, end of interpretive dance.
6   (Applause)
7   MS. MORIEARTY: Kathy will, of course, remain for
8   questions later in our -- in our presentation.
9   And I think you just took my notes. Kathy, I think you
10 took some of my notes.
11   MS. BRAZEE: They're underneath. I'm sorry, I
12 stuck them underneath the --
13   MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you. Next point. I would
14 like to read a recommendation that council had made and
15 forwarded to GPO concerning assessments. The council
16 further recommends that GPO continue implementation of the
17 new model of public access assessments, including site
18 visits when appropriate. Action. GPO has worked
19 consistently with the council -- with council members to
20 reestablish an assessment program that meets 44 USC 1909
21 requirements for first-hand investigation of conditions for
22 which need is indicated in depository libraries. And as
0153

1 became obvious in Kathy's wonderful presentation, they are
 2 moving forward on this council recommendation and stepping
 3 up implementation, and thank you.
 4   I would next like to introduce Suzanne Sears, head of
 5 the government documents department, University of North
 6 Texas, who as recently as last week underwent an assessment.
 7   MS. SEARS: Okay. Are you guys awake out there?
 8 Because I know we just had lunch, and it should be cool
 9 enough that it's keeping you -- you know, your blood
10 circulating. It's freezing up here, if it's not out there.
11   So my job was to just kind of explain what happened and
12 how we got involved in having an assessment, and what it was
13 like to try and ease anybody's fears out there. The
14 recommendation came forth in April because we heard from the
15 community what about inspections, inspections don't exist
16 anymore, what's going on.
17   Well, in doing some research, I found the actual
18 recommendation that caused inspections to go away, and that
19 was from the fall meeting in 2001, and GPO and the council,
20 recommendation six, inspections, it says it is the sense of
21 council that a change in the use of the word "inspection" to
22 a more positive term such as "site visit" may facilitate the
0154
 1 sharing of expertise, best practices and other positive
 2 outcomes. And so GPO did exactly what we asked them to do,
 3 and they changed that room "inspection," so now it's public
 4 access assessments and site visits. So they are doing them,
 5 and I do want to take just a moment to applaud both Kathy
 6 Brazee and Ashley Dowling for what they do -- I'm probably
 7 pronouncing her last name wrong -- for what they do. That's
 8 two people, and like she said, they are hiring two more, and
 9 they do these public access assessments, and I think that
10 they are doing a fabulous job. The new depository
11 coordinators' toolbox is wonder, and I just want to take a
12 second and thank them for what they're doing.
13   (Applause)
14   MS. SEARS: Okay. So on to my --
15   UNIDENTIFIED: Robin, as well.
16   MS. SEARS: Well, yeah, Robin is over that area,
17 and she's the one who came and did my access assessment, so
18 Robin Mohammed, as well, Haun Mohamed, as well.
19   So Robin calls me I think October 1st, maybe it was the
20 end of September, and said, hey, Suzanne, I'm going to be in
21 the area, so that's where we fell in coordination with other
22 events, so no -- yes, we did fill out our biannual survey.
0155

1 No, they did not find problems on our web page, at least I
2 hope they didn't. We were -- we were just in the area, is
3 it okay if we come by and do a public access assessment, and
4 I thought about it for a minute, and I'm like what day,
5 okay, well, I should be there that day, sure, come on.
6   For me it was a great opportunity to showcase my
7 department to my dean. My dean -- my old dean retired at
8 the end of June, and we had a brand new dean who started
9 October 1st. So she was going to come on October 13th, I
10 believe is when she came, and that was going to be
11 wonderful. I mean, he was going to be there two weeks, and
12 I was going to be able to showcase to him the depository
13 collection. It also gave me an opportunity to meet with him
14 twice before she came when every department head in the
15 building was trying to get his attention and get meetings,
16 and he's having to meet with the provost and everything
17 else. I was able to get on his schedule because we had a
18 VIP coming, so this was important, it had to be pushed up.
19 And I was able to say, okay, here's what we're doing and get
20 him abreast of the situation.
21   I will say I am old enough to have been through an
22 inspection both as a depository coordinator and as a support
0156
1 staff in a depository that was being inspected, and so I
2 kind of knew what to expect. I also had kept abreast during
3 council of the changes from what used to be the inspections
4 to what are now the public access assessments, so I had a
5 little bit of knowledge of what to expect, what I
6 immediately, after I hung up the phone with her, went to the
7 desktop and pulled up the initial review checklist for
8 public access assessments and the guidelines for completing
9 the initial review, and that's what I took to my staff
10 during a staff meeting and I said, okay, here are the things
11 that they're going to be asking us, these are the things
12 they're going to be looking at, and we need to make sure
13 that we are in compliance with these issues.
14   And so we went through and we looked at each one, and
15 we answered what we thought, you know, our situation was and
16 tried to do a self-assessment of what our situation was, and
17 when Robin came, it was very easy, it was very simple. Like
18 Kathy, she used three words in her presentation,
19 interaction, communication, consultation, and that's very
20 much what it was. It was very much a give and take with
21 Robin and myself. Not only was she assessing my library,
22 but she was giving my staff the chance to ask her questions,
0157

1 to ask her, you know, why is this this way or why is this
2 done this way, and so it was very much a give and take, and
3 my staff was very happy after she was gone, they were a
4 little terrified before she came, but they -- it made them
5 feel important that they were asked, you know, what do you
6 think.
7   And so not only, you know, did it impress my dean and
8 put the depository foremost in his mind, but it also
9 impressed my staff. And I have a wonderful at UNT, but it
10 even reenergized them into what they do and how what they
11 did is important, and even their little piece of what they
12 do is important in getting that collection out and getting
13 it served -- serviced to the general public.
14   So I do want to tell those of you in the states that
15 Kathy mentioned, it's not something to freak out about. It
16 is a kinder, gentler inspection, and it is very much an
17 interaction.
18   And I do think that as far as what council asked for in
19 the recommendation in April, was that they continue with
20 implementation and the main concern was that they weren't
21 doing the on-site inspections, they are, and they're just
22 doing them a little differently, and they're not necessarily
0158
1 doing every library in the state like they did before at the
2 same time.
3   So Kathy outlined all of that for you, and I'm going to
4 turn this over to Jill and open it up for questions to see
5 if we can figure out if there's something else you want us
6 to go further on with this recommendation, or are we done
7 with this one now, are we good. Everybody knows these are
8 happening, we're good. Do you have questions about the
9 access assessments, or do you have questions about the
10 federal depository library handbook, because that is
11 something you do need to be reading before your PAA to make
12 sure that you're familiar with the laws as Kathy said.
13   So we're going to open that up, Jill has some
14 parameters that she's going to give you, and then we'll
15 allow you questions from the floor.
16   (Applause)
17   MS. MORIEARTY: I want to outline a few parameters
18 if you don't mind. First off, if you have a specific
19 question about your individual department, division, please,
20 please, get information to GPO in the form of a business
21 card, or please contact them at their website. We'd like to
22 keep these general questions. Anything specific to your own
0159

1 department I think is best handled by talking one on one
 2 with GPO, who can assess your individual requirements or
 3 needs.
 4   So let's open up to questions, and do we have anyone
 5 who would like to ask some questions? Well, no one leaps
 6 up, and so toward that -- well, okay, I will save the
 7 questions that have been sent to me.
 8   And would you please say your name and institution?
 9 Which I did not do, Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.
10   MS. PALMER: I'm Colleen Palmer, Bowling Green
11 State University. I probably should know the answer to
12 this, but I don't. As the assessment is done, will we get a
13 report back from GPO on it?
14   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Yes, definitely.
15 The -- there's a little bit more detail in the project
16 summary, but we'll provide a narrative under the four
17 categories of access, collection, service and cooperative
18 efforts. We've also added kind of a general catchall
19 because there are a lot of issues, of course, that cover or
20 cross all those four categories. We'll include any
21 recommendations, and those are typically large-scale
22 recommendations based on best practices.
0160
 1   We've added a section that was not in the former
 2 inspection report, it's called notable achievements, and
 3 we're hoping that this is something that you can point to
 4 when you discuss these things with your library
 5 administration saying, hey, we're doing really cool things
 6 or unique things, or we're doing exceptionally well in this
 7 area.
 8   And then of course there's a section related to any
 9 compliance issues, if there are any. And if after the
10 initial review we ask for a follow-up, at the end of the
11 follow-up or the end of the on-site visit, there will be an
12 official -- a second official report, the final report.
13   MS. LEVERGOOD: Barbara Levergood, Southern
14 Illinois University Edwardsville. I think I have a question
15 that's of general interest to new depository coordinators,
16 so we have the biannual survey coming up, we have the
17 self-study, which we've been encouraged to do, and the
18 possibility to request a PAA. I'd like to know from your
19 experience, all else being equal, in what order we might do
20 these and in what -- over what time period? Are we talking
21 about over a year, over two years or so? Where do you find
22 the depository coordinators and the depository itself best
0161

1 benefiting from these steps?
 2   MS. SEARS: Well, from my experience -- this is
 3 Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas, the biannual
 4 survey is required by law to be filled out in a certain time
 5 period, so priority number one. The self-study and the PAA
 6 actual site visit, the self-study comes first, and it's from
 7 that that, you know, you would then determine if you think
 8 you need a public access assessment, would be how I would --
 9 I would see it.
10   MS. LEVERGOOD: Okay.
11   MS. SEARS: The self-study really makes you take a
12 look at all of the legal requirements and where your library
13 falls within those requirements.
14   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. I was really
15 interested in what Suzanne was going to say, so I appreciate
16 that. You also asked about the new depository coordinators
17 tutorial, correct?
18   MS. LEVERGOOD: I should have.
19   MS. BRAZEE: Oh, that comes immediately to mind.
20 When someone updates the federal depository library
21 directory and indicates they're a new coordinator in a
22 depository library, we send out a note and copy the regional
0162
 1 saying, hey, great, you know, we've got your directory
 2 change, and we recommend that the new depository
 3 coordinator, or the person may have been there for a while
 4 but just got around to updating the directory, look at the
 5 new depository coordinator's tutorial. That's just a start.
 6   The self-study, four of the eight modules are up there.
 7 The four biggest ones are probably up there. Ashley's
 8 saying yes because she did a lot of the web work on that
 9 recently. So it's actually not complete. You can take a
10 look now and in the next month or two when we get everything
11 up there. Just do the modules that you think you need to
12 review. There's collection development, public services,
13 there's upcoming or regional services for regionals, for
14 example, so you can -- if you know your collection
15 development policy hasn't been updated in a while, it may
16 behoove you to take a look at that collection development
17 module. You know, and in this self-study we recommend some
18 resources to review in conjunction with that. Obviously,
19 there's the collection development chapter of the federal
20 depository library handbook, and then we suggest you gather
21 resources.
22   So you can do the self-study in any order at any time.
0163

1 If it would help you to do the self-study first and then
 2 decide whether or not an on-site visit is a good idea for
 3 you, if you'd like to make a request for one before a PAA is
 4 scheduled -- because the PAA may or may not -- GPO may or
 5 may not decide to do an on-site visit.
 6   Actually, after the new depository coordinators'
 7 tutorial, it's up to you.
 8   MS. LEVERGOOD: Okay. Well, thank you both for
 9 your advice.
10   MS. MORIEARTY: Any more questions from the floor?
11 I knew there would be.
12   MS. CANEY: Peggy Caney (ph), Northeastern State
13 University in Oklahoma, one of the states listed. We're one
14 of the sites that may be visited. We've been talking about
15 it with the regionals. And one of the questions I have,
16 we've talked a lot about the prep. What actually happens if
17 we have a site visit, like timeframe, you know, kind of how
18 long, what types of activities might happen on that specific
19 day?
20   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. I know that I'm not
21 the one coming to Oklahoma, so obviously I'm one of two
22 people, so the other person is actually Darlene.
0164
 1   The amount of time is typically dependent upon the
 2 initial review that's going to be done based on the 2007
 3 biannual survey submission at this point in time and the
 4 information on the web pages. It may depend upon the size
 5 of your library, too. But we've done some assessments that
 6 were just half a day, so morning or afternoon.
 7   If you have requests for more meetings with your
 8 colleagues, we could certainly set up a longer timeframe,
 9 and we may determine that a longer timeframe is actually
10 beneficial to both GPO and your library, so at this point we
11 can't really say, other than it's likely to be half a day
12 and a full day -- up to a full day. I know that doesn't pin
13 it down whatsoever, but the idea is that each library is
14 individual, unique and, you know, apply the requirements in
15 a way that, you know, fits your entire library so...
16   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
17 Texas. We have a 70 percent depository in very good shape,
18 but we also have off-site storage, and Robin stayed five
19 hours. I would have -- you know, we probably could have
20 filled another day and a half, but she was rushed because it
21 was because she was in the area. So, again, it's going to
22 depend on your library and size and type and shape and what
0165

1 issues are going to be brought up.
 2   MS. GIBSON: Hi. My name is Carrie Gibson. I'm
 3 from Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pennsylvania. I
 4 actually have two -- maybe two comments or questions. The
 5 first question, when you were talking about the various
 6 factors for the public access assessments, access collection
 7 service and cooperative efforts, I think my ears perked up
 8 at the cooperative efforts, and I was wondering, is there a
 9 place for a best practices as to what other libraries are
10 doing so that I may gain some ideas or inspiration, that I
11 can work with other maybe small colleges in my area.
12   And then the second question I had was is the -- is it
13 necessary for the outreach staff from the state library to
14 be present for the public access assessments? Do we have to
15 coordinate that for the same day, or could that be done at a
16 different time? Thank you.
17   MS. MORIEARTY: All right. Let's take best
18 practices first. Who wants to leap up? And there she goes.
19   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. You can look in the
20 photo depository library handbook in the collaborative
21 efforts chapter and also in the public access assessments
22 chapter at this point, and I encourage you to review
0166
 1 articles, too, that have been put out on the FDLP desktop.
 2 There may be some suggestions in there. I'm not thinking of
 3 any off top of my head unfortunately.
 4   I really encourage you when it comes to cooperative
 5 efforts to network with your neighboring depository
 6 libraries and discuss everything you're doing, because
 7 you're probably doing a lot more than you even think of off
 8 the top of your head. That is really common. We start
 9 asking questions and learn that the libraries are doing so
10 many incredible things related to U.S. government
11 information, but they never made that connection before. So
12 there are best practices, you know, that your colleagues can
13 suggest, too.
14   Relating to the second question, is your regional at
15 the state library? Is that why you mentioned state library?
16   MS. GIBSON: Yes.
17   MS. BRAZEE: Okay. So you're asking if the
18 regional will be -- will participate in the public access
19 assessment. GPO will invite the regional librarian or a
20 representative from the regional depository library to the
21 assessment, and we will try our darndest to make sure that
22 there's a mutually convenient time for all of that. If need
0167

1 be, you know, we will work something out. But certainly the
  2 regional librarian has a lot to contribute, and we'll be
  3 very interested in learning what's going on at the
  4 depository just from the conversation that day, because it
  5 is the role of the regional depository library to provide
  6 consultation within the state and sharing the best
  7 practices, you know, within the specified area.
  8   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
  9 Texas. On the best practices, I would just also say if you
 10 go to the depository spotlights, the depositories that
 11 they've put up in the depository spotlights are doing some
 12 fantastic things. Also, the depository library of the year
 13 award, if you go back and look at the -- what those
 14 libraries are doing, those are usually on the desktop, and
 15 then just contacting some of those libraries, too, and
 16 asking for more information about something that you've
 17 read. Gov.go, there's always something going out about
 18 something somebody's doing, and, you know, when you come to
 19 the meetings, there's always the educational sessions that
 20 are talking about the different things, and a lot of those
 21 are collaborative efforts. And you can go on the desktop in
 22 the file repository and look at previous DLC meetings and
0168
  1 the handouts and things like that.
  2   MS. MORIEARTY: Go ahead, Cindy.
  3   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The other thing I
  4 would suggest you do, these are all very good ideas, and you
  5 can get lots of ideas of new things to do, but what you
  6 might also want to do is check your files for previous
  7 reports from GPO about your library to you and see what
  8 kinds of things were included under the cooperate -- excuse
  9 me, under the cooperative effort section in those reports to
 10 give you an idea what you were doing in the past and the
 11 kinds of comments that were received by you from GPO in
 12 those areas.
 13   MS. MORIEARTY: Before anyone else grabs the mike,
 14 I have a question that was handed to me, and I'll get the
 15 answer back to people, and it concerns the handbook. There
 16 have been increasing questions about the status of the
 17 handbooks in terms of it being updated and perhaps the need
 18 for the electronic section to be expanded. Would anyone
 19 from GPO like to fill us in about this? Thank you.
 20   MR. PREVEE: Hi, Ted Prevee (ph), GPO. I'll just
 21 take a first cut on this. So the handbook is an integrated
 22 resource. It's a living document. We've had recently --
0169

1 well, it's been, I guess, several months now, but we had one
 2 of our last updates off the desktop indicated the frequency
 3 of it would be updates as needed. If there were any major
 4 updates that came forward, they could be done, you know,
 5 immediately, but at a minimum it would be updated on an
 6 annual basis.
 7   So what we have done, and what I'd like to encourage
 8 everyone to continue to do, is if you have suggestions,
 9 there's the ability to feed those to us through ask GPO. If
10 you have clarifications, questions, certainly we're here
11 now. We're also here, you know, when you're back at your
12 institution. But I would be very interested in what kind of
13 suggestions might be proposed in terms of expanding any
14 particular section or -- you know, each of the chapters as
15 they were developed initially was done pretty -- in a
16 collaborative sense. Everybody in the community
17 participated. It was pretty extensive in terms of the whole
18 vetting process, is everyone comfortable with this. It went
19 well beyond a normal iterative process, but that doesn't
20 preclude us from revisiting chapters based on changes in
21 technology, based on best practices. That's why we
22 developed the handbook the way we did in terms of
0170
 1 flexibility.
 2   MS. MORIEARTY: I think why -- at least in our area
 3 why people wanted me to ask this question and put it forward
 4 is with the implementation of PAA, people are starting to go
 5 back to the handbook, I feel, more than they have been. And
 6 that was wrong, people should keep an eye on it all the
 7 time, but I do -- I did look at the electronic section, and
 8 I think that there is a priority, a need to flesh out a
 9 little bit more. As you've heard in our sessions, there are
10 a lot of questions about what to do with the electronic,
11 what -- what's the best practice or what are basically
12 people doing with electronic access, and I think that might
13 be a definite need at this point.
14   Would anyone like to comment? All right. I can stand
15 by myself. I'm a big girl.
16   MR. PREVEE: Thank you, Ted Prevee.
17   MS. MORIEARTY: Any other questions?
18   MR. SHULER: I do.
19   MS. MORIEARTY: Of course.
20   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
21 at Chicago. How were these -- has GPO had the experience in
22 accessing a library under these conditions -- under these
0171

1 new ways of doing things? Where there is no collection, the
 2 services are completely integrated into libraries so there's
 3 no distinction between documents and other material, that
 4 there is no collection, per se, and there is no separate
 5 public service desk. Do any of these parameters that were
 6 described in terms of the public assessment change
 7 significantly under those conditions?
 8   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Libraries did merge
 9 reference desks in the past. I believe in the '80s there
10 was a lot in the library literature about that, so that in
11 and of itself isn't a new thing.
12   MR. SHULER: Uh-huh.
13   MS. BRAZEE: What is really new in the past year or
14 so is that a lot of libraries are considering or have
15 dropped a lot of item numbers and basically have really
16 become the first mostly electronic depository libraries.
17 They are providing access to the FDLP electronic collection
18 according to the FDLP internet use policy and the public
19 service guidelines for government information in electronic
20 formats as to GPO -- FDLP policies, I should say. So
21 they're providing access to a lot more than they're
22 selecting by item number, and I know there was a whole
0172
 1 separate session this morning on item numbers, but what
 2 we're looking at in terms of collections in a case of a
 3 mostly electronic depository library would be access to the
 4 electronic collection, the FDLP electronic collection, and
 5 service then becomes really important, making some kind of
 6 way, process, whatever the library chooses to do to make
 7 their status as a depository visible, having the emblem on
 8 the door is still a program requirement, cataloging online
 9 resources, doesn't have to be all online resources that are
10 available, could be selected ones, and that could be
11 whatever way the library wishes to catalog these things,
12 could be review by subject or by item number that they're
13 not selecting. Service can be done in a lot of different
14 ways, that way in terms of providing visibility to the
15 electronic collection and to the library status as a center
16 for U.S. government expert -- government information
17 expertise. Obviously to make sure that that expertise is
18 available, the public services staff need to have some kind
19 of training. Yes, government publications are
20 interdisciplinary, but it does take some in -- or staff
21 training, some kind of regular reminders of how to find U.S.
22 government information, reminder what the core resources
0173

1   are, that CGP exists, that kind of thing just as a basis.
2   A lot of libraries are doing a lot more than they
3   realize, I think, when it comes to service. U.S. government
4   information is a part of a lot of libraries' regular
5   instruction classes. It's just not identified that way when
6   it comes to the depository operation. So if U.S. government
7   publications are included in general critical thinking
8   classes that the library teaches for new researchers or
9   freshmen at an academic institution, that's great. U.S.
10 government publications are authoritative core resources,
11 you know, really good examples, and those are described
12 as -- the nature of the publication is described that way.
13   Obviously, U.S. government publications show up in all
14 kinds of different subjects, so those are integrated, so
15 every single way that a library is utilizing the U.S.
16 government information expertise or government publications,
17 whether they be of the tangibles in the library's reference
18 collection or all of the online resources is taken into
19 account, and we will keep asking probing questions until we
20 get there.
21   Did I address everything?
22   UNIDENTIFIED: I think you did.
0174
1   MS. BRAZEE: Okay, thanks.
2   MS. MORIEARTY: Any further comments or questions?
3   Seeing none, talking very slowly to allow anyone -- well,
4   ladies and gentlemen, I don't believe in dragging out a
5   meeting just to fill a time slot, and it is exactly 3:00.
6   If there are no further comments or questions -- and we have
7   one.
8   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
9   Texas. So not hearing any more questions, comments, I mean,
10 this is your chance. Council's got this recommendation on
11 the table, and from what I can tell, GPO has -- is doing
12 wonderful at responding to our recommendations, so if
13 there's something that you're not seeing in their response
14 that you expected or that you thought we need, we need to
15 hear that. We need to know what it is you are looking for.
16   MS. MORIEARTY: All right, and we have people at
17 the mike. Please identify yourself and your institution.
18   MS. PALMER: Colleen Palmer, Bowling Green State
19 University. I applaud the efforts of GPO. In my
20 institution, we're required to do assessment across the
21 university and across the library, so I think it's a great
22 opportunity for me as a documents librarian to do a very
0175

87

1   formal assessment as part of something to do this year.
 2   I guess I have sort of a -- I don't know if it's a
 3   philosophical question, but you don't have very many people
 4   to do this. I think we would really welcome assessment, I
 5   think it would be good for us, and I imagine there's a
 6   demand out here in the community for it. Can you meet the
 7   needs of all the people that want to go through an
 8   assessment project?
 9   MS. MORIEARTY: Kathy?
10   UNIDENTIFIED: Robin?
11   MS. MORIEARTY: No. Robin's gone, or we would not
12   call on Kathy.
13   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Excellent question,
14   I really appreciate it. Because we have currently two
15   people, and we had one of those two people out on a very,
16   very happy -- for a very, very happy reason, on maternity
17   leave this past year, we kind of did an initial review with
18   the 2007 biannual survey submissions and identified major
19   areas of where there could be potential compliance issues,
20   and we drafted some articles and did that kind of thing. So
21   our hope is through our educational resources and our
22   continued outreach, programs at conferences and all that, we
0176
 1   can share information to remind everyone of compliance
 2   issues, especially related to public access, although almost
 3   everything that happens at a depository relates to public
 4   access in some way. So hopefully through continued
 5   education, our goal is to keep libraries above par related
 6   to compliance.
 7   We are -- we just did -- did a job announcement, I'm
 8   not saying that correctly, put out an announcement to
 9   hire -- or to select two more outreach librarians. We're
10   hoping that's going to really help. We have a schedule
11   whereby we can do a certain -- we plan to do a certain
12   number of assessments in a year, but obviously it does not
13   touch all libraries in one calendar year. So there is going
14   to be a delay. Those who were inspected farthest in time,
15   back in time, are going to have the public access assessment
16   first because it's been so long since they had an
17   inspection. There are a lot of libraries that were at the
18   very tail end of the inspection process. Unless they
19   request an assessment or unless we determine that there is a
20   need, we will not be scheduling a public access assessment
21   right away.
22   It's definitely a concern, and we definitely will keep
0177

1 on track of it. It is part of our internal implementation
2 plan to do a quarterly review of how many public -- I keep
3 saying inspections, it's just natural, how many public
4 access assessments we've done, keeping in mind that the
5 public access assessments start with a review at GPO, so
6 we're not necessarily visiting all libraries on-site. And
7 there have only been two libraries since early 2007 that
8 have asked for an on-site inspection or public access
9 assessment. Please, whenever I say inspection, please think
10 public access assessment.
11   So hopefully this discussion will generate a lot more
12 discussion about a review of a library's policies and all
13 that to make sure that they're following the requirements of
14 the handbook.
15   But your point is very well taken and it is understood,
16 and we certainly are monitoring it.
17   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
18 Texas. I just want to remind what Kathy said. You can ask
19 for a PAA. So if you think that it would really help your
20 library, you can request one.
21   MS. MORIEARTY: This is your time. Any further
22 questions or comments? Please, sir.
0178
1   MR. CORELICK: Okay. I will keep this really
2 quick. John Corelick (ph), University of Alaska at
3 Fairbanks. Okay. I'm supportive of the PAA process, but
4 there is one concern that I have which has not been spoken
5 about at any of these meetings so far, and it's something
6 that GPO seems reluctantly to discuss, and I don't know why,
7 and that is the importance of private sector indexing. As
8 far as I'm concerned, the private sector does a better job
9 of providing indexing and access, and one of the best things
10 that I can do for my -- for my clientele is to provide as
11 much private sector reference sources and indexing that I
12 can possibly afford, and then to put notification of that on
13 the web page where I'm discussing this. So I just want to
14 make sure that you people realize that in a lot of these
15 libraries we -- we construe the private sector to be an
16 extremely important part of providing information and
17 services to our clientele, and I want this to be recognized
18 in the PAA process, because you have not seemed to have
19 addressed that -- that -- the degree to which that we
20 actually do rely on this.
21   And my other concern related to this is that you're
22 overly concerned on idealistic things like, you know, some
0179

1 collection development things which may or may not ever be
 2 realized and some of the practical implications. Again,
 3 coming back to the private sector, I feel if I load my place
 4 with as much private sector source material that I can, that
 5 complements, it does not replace but it complements what GPO
 6 provides, and it complements what other subject things
 7 provide, like from the legal and the political and the
 8 social aspects, and therefore I have a better rounded
 9 service, and I have a better rounded collection. And I'm
10 really worried that your PAA process is focused somewhat on
11 the wrong things, and you're not looking at the full
12 spectrum of services, and you're not looking at the full
13 spectrum of what we do as librarians. And one of the things
14 that I do repeatedly, I go back and I fill in the cracks
15 that GPO can or will not do by maximizing the private
16 sector.
17   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. I appreciate the
18 comment. Obviously access -- whatever access the library is
19 able to afford is great, and we give you credit. In the
20 description of the different categories under access, one of
21 the selections is the library selects appropriate secondary
22 resources, for example, databases and indexes, that support
0180
 1 bibliographic access to and use of the federal government
 2 information products.
 3   We know that -- we've always known that secondary
 4 resources are absolutely necessary to make sense of the
 5 depository resources, because the government typically does
 6 not do a lot of that type of indexing. GPO catalogs the
 7 resources and makes those available through the CGP. And
 8 the agencies themselves will have some indexing of some of
 9 their resources or place their resources in databases, but
10 without doubt, we anticipate that each library is going to
11 have some selection of reference resources, databases and
12 indexes. Obviously, larger, more affluent libraries can
13 purchase more and subscribe to licenses more readily than
14 other libraries, but it is definitely part of the access
15 component related to bibliographic access and providing --
16 identification of the resources and providing access and
17 making use of them. Did that help?
18   MR. CORELICK: Yeah, sort of just, as long as you
19 recognize --
20   MS. MORIEARTY: Well, it -- yes.
21   MR. CORELICK: -- that's really a -- not just a --
22   MS. MORIEARTY: I'm sorry, we can't hear what
0181

1 you're saying, sir. If you'd come --
 2   MR. CORELICK: Just as long as you make sure --
 3   MS. MORIEARTY: Come to the mike, please. I can't
 4 even hear you.
 5   MR. CORELICK: Okay.
 6   MS. MORIEARTY: We do want you to be involved in
 7 the conversation.
 8   MR. CORELICK: It's not a minor component, it's a
 9 major component, and that's what I want recognized. It's
10 not just to fill in the cracks. It's really part of our
11 major operations.
12   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Yeah, the item
13 that's in the focus on access collection service and
14 cooperative efforts stems from the entry in the federal
15 depository library handbook basically making this a program
16 requirement for depository libraries, so it's important
17 enough that it is a program requirement.
18   The resources that you select are certainly up to your
19 library and what you determine to be the U.S. government
20 information needs of your users in relationship to all the
21 other information needs of your users. Obviously, you
22 select -- you purchase and subscribe to licensed databases
0182
 1 based on a priority for the entire library, but we ask that
 2 depository users are included in that review process, so the
 3 depository service should be equal to or exceed -- I always
 4 love that exceed, equal to or exceed the service provided to
 5 other library users. I understand your comment, and it is
 6 in the handbook, and it is in the public access assessment,
 7 so I think it is elevated to the level that you're asking
 8 for.
 9   MS. MORIEARTY: Any further questions or comments?
10 And there does not appear to be any additional comments or
11 questions. It is 11 after 3:00, and I am going to adjourn
12 this session. A gift for our transcriber.
13   (End of third session, beginning of final session:)
14   MR. SHULER: All right, thank you. It helps to
15 have somebody in the audience.
16   John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. The
17 question was typically we don't have a court reporter at our
18 working sessions, but because we're bleeding over into a
19 plenary session, the court reporter is here, so I'm asking
20 the council what their wishes are. No problem? No problem
21 on this side?
22   This is a working session. Normally we have our own
0183

1 recording, and that's why I'm asking the questions. So I
 2 think if the recorder is not needed by council, she would
 3 probably appreciate the time away -- it doesn't matter to --
 4 we like to think of her welfare, too. So by most traditions
 5 during council working sessions, a recorder has not been
 6 here.
 7   UNIDENTIFIED: We can manage without.
 8   MR. SHULER: Okay.
 9   MS. MORIEARTY: John?
10   MR. SHULER: Yes.
11   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.
12   MR. SHULER: Thank you, Jill.
13   MS. MORIEARTY: What is the advantage of having the
14   recorder here?
15   MR. SHULER: We will capture our remarks a lot
16   better than we usually do, okay, that would be one thing.
17   John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Since we
18   are changing the idea of writing full-fledged
19   recommendations to topic sentences, it would help in our
20   memory to go back and see what we said versus what we might
21   remember based on our own recording, if you will. Those
22   will be the advantages. The disadvantages would be
0184
 1 everything we say here in all its rawness would be available
 2 to the public.
 3   MS. MORIEARTY: John, Jill Moriearty, University of
 4 Utah.
 5   MR. SHULER: Yes, Jill.
 6   MS. MORIEARTY: I don't want to hear you raw. Put
 7 that in the transcript, I dare you.
 8   MR. SHULER: So John uncut is not desired, okay,
 9 I heard that. What do you think?
10   MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco.
11   Somebody has to take minutes though.
12   MR. SHULER: Yes.
13   MS. LAWHUN: That's what happened last time, and I
14   think we had some problems with people being either too
15   short or too long.
16   MR. SHULER: Yeah.
17   MS. LAWHUN: So we didn't capture everything, not
18   that I want every single thing recorded, but it just saves
19   us -- someone being distracted by taking minutes.
20   MR. SHULER: Okay.
21   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
22   Texas. I echo that, but then that also brings up that
0185

92

1 perhaps I'm putting forward a recommendation that we vote
 2 for a secretary or elect a secretary, because we did not do
 3 that last night.
 4   MR. SHULER: Okay. Then the sense I get the
 5 council is -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
 6 Chicago. The council is comfortable with the idea of the
 7 recorder being present during this discussion? Okay, then
 8 let us begin.
 9   Since GPO has available to us for consultation during
10 our discussion of their recommendations about technological
11 improvement and council operations, I suggest that we begin
12 with that resolution so that we maximize the GPO's time
13 here, and it allows Karen to go back home and rest proPURLy,
14 considering she's -- she needs as much --
15   UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).
16   MR. SHULER: Sure, or I think we all have pieces
17 of paper in front of us, so why don't we work with that?
18   UNIDENTIFIED: The audience doesn't.
19   MR. SHULER: Oh, I forgot about the audience.
20 See, this is what happens when nobody ever watches you
21 during a working session. Yes, go ahead. Let's evoke the
22 technology. Sorry, audience.
0186
 1   So while we're getting the technology in order, go
 2 ahead and review --
 3
 4   MR. SHULER: Recommendations for technological
 5 improvements and technical operations. We're almost there.
 6 We've got the Gutenberg in front of us, the Farnsworth is
 7 about to be coming available.
 8
 9   MR. SHULER: So while that is -- I would like
10 then to discuss the recommendation that begins after this
11 called over the last 15 years after review of the council's
12 historic record, the recommendation that begins with that
13 sentence, and followed by the draft council recommendation
14 that begins background attendance at council
15 meetings/depository conferences.
16   Some of this may be available to the audience, some may
17 not, depending on our technological capabilities, so bear
18 with us.
19   UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).
20   MR. SHULER: That's the one everybody --
21 everybody has in front of them.
22   UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).
0187

```
 1          MR. SHULER:  Sure.  Okay, so --
 2          UNIDENTIFIED:  (Inaudible).
 3          MR. SHULER:  Thank you, James.
 4          UNIDENTIFIED:  (Inaudible).
 5          MR. SHULER:  So John Shuler, University of
 6  Illinois at Chicago.  I encourage the council members to
 7  remember their naming obligations when they speak.  Who.
 8      Would like to open the discussion on this
 9  recommendation?  Suzanne.
10          MS. SEARS:  Suzanne Sears, University of North
11  Texas.  John asked Chris Greer and James Jacobs and -- Jacobs
12  and myself to work on a sub task force on improvements to
13  FDLP.gov and community.FDLP.gov, so in that vein we drew up
14  a very simple possible recommendation for us to work on to
15  be coming out of this meeting with our recommendations,
16  which is that council further recommends that GPO work to
17  enhance the functionality of FDLP.gov and
18  community.FDLP.gov, the rationale being that the internet is
19  ubiquitous and collaborative.  The GPO sites available to
20  the depository library council and the FDLP community,
21  FDLP.gov and community.FDLP.gov, do offer some tools for
22  leveraging the web's power.  These tools need to be more
0188
 1  fully develop, as they currently limit the work and
 2  collaboration opportunities of the community and require
 3  enhancements to take full advantage of the web.  It is
 4  recommended that GPO make these enhancements a top priority
 5  in order to move the work of depository library council and
 6  the depository community forward.
 7      In that vein, James and Chris and I prepared the
 8  two-page document that you have, recommendations for
 9  technological improvements and council operations.  We've
10  had preliminary discussions with Karen over the phone, and
11  appreciate her being here to talk to us further on these.
12  And there were some recommendations that we had that they
13  already actually implemented, which we're very thankful for
14  and appreciate the prompt response on that.
15       So I open up the floor, unless you want me to read
16  through these.  I think you can read yourself, or do you
17  want me to read through them?
18          MR. SHULER:  Can people read for themselves?
19  Okay.
20          MS. MORIEARTY:  Jill Moriearty -- I'm so used to
21  people just hearing me a football field away.  Jill
22  Moriearty, University of Utah.  On problem one -- problem
0189
```

1 statement number one, when you said findable, do you mean
  2 accessible or collated and findable?
  3   MR. SHULER: And what was your suggestion or --
  4   MS. MORIEARTY: No, no, a definition for exactly
  5 "findable."
  6   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
  7 Texas. Basically we are concerned -- we were very concerned
  8 with the navigation to be able for the community to find
  9 where the depository library council page was. Previous to
 10 last week there was nothing on the front page that said
 11 depository library council anywhere. You had to know that
 12 you had to go into the about FDLP and find depository
 13 library council. So Karen has added a link to the very
 14 bottom, if you scroll to the bottom of the FDLP desktop,
 15 there are now under about the FDLP, there's a listing that
 16 includes depository library council to help with that.
 17   MS. MORIEARTY: So you mean what -- Jill Moriearty,
 18 University of Utah. So you're talking in terms of
 19 transparency of --
 20   MR. SHULER: Yes.
 21   MS. MORIEARTY: Okay.
 22   MR. SHULER: Searchability of the site, as well.
 0190
  1   MS. MORIEARTY: See, that's what I thought. It's
  2 not just -- for me findability was fuzzy, I wasn't sure what
  3 that meant.
  4   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
  5 There's, I guess, two different kinds of findable. There's
  6 the navigation of the site, which is what we're talking
  7 about, but we're also talking about the search of the site.
  8   MS. MORIEARTY: Well, see, that gets back to do we
  9 want to say that -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Do
 10 we want to say that, because if I read -- were reading this
 11 and I saw findable, I wouldn't know what that meant, but if
 12 we are specific and we want navigation or transparency or
 13 easily searchable, then let's -- let's say it. Let's tell
 14 them exactly and define what it is that we're looking at.
 15   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I
 16 think if you look below to the recommendations, that you'll
 17 see that although findable in the problem statement is maybe
 18 a little vague, that there are recommendations for both
 19 navigation and making a search engine better, and so I mean
 20 I --
 21   MR. SHULER: I hope at this pint that what we're
 22 trying to do with this discussion is not work smith, because
 0191

1 either agree that these recommendations are in the direction
 2 we want to go, and if we want to make suggestions, it could
 3 come in another point. So I think it's good discussing
 4 findability versus not, but I think if we make the point
 5 that we want a better definition of what we mean by
 6 findability, just to say that, and the group can take it
 7 under consideration.
 8   MS. MORIEARTY: But how much -- Jill Moriearty,
 9 University of Utah. I understand that you want to cut
10 through this and get to the chase --
11   MR. SHULER: Yeah.
12   MS. MORIEARTY: -- but if these are due tomorrow,
13 we don't have much chase.
14   MR. SHULER: No, what is due tomorrow --
15   MS. MORIEARTY: Yeah.
16   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
17 at Chicago. Let's revisit a bit what we have discussed,
18 that is, actually what is due tomorrow is going to be topic
19 sentences of what we're focusing on for the council business
20 about what we heard of discussions and everything going on
21 at the meeting this week. We are not presenting full-blown
22 recommendations of this kind of detail, okay? This
0192
 1 particular recommendation is a council recommendation that
 2 is fulfilling a particular council function. That's why it
 3 has so much detail at this time. We've actually been
 4 working on this for several weeks, okay, and that's why it
 5 comes to us more full-blown, okay?
 6   So we can note -- and perhaps we can ask Karen, maybe
 7 she can address the findability issue in terms of the
 8 capacities or the capabilities of GPO that might address
 9 Jill's concern. Does that seem reasonable? Okay.
10   MS. SIEGER: Can you hear me? Okay. Karen
11 Sieger, U.S. Government Printing Office. I would interpret
12 "findable" as in both in terms of navigation, searchability
13 and accessibility of all content, whether it be via a web
14 page point click, or either searching both on the FDLP
15 desktop or through third-party search engines. Does that
16 clarify at least my opinion of findable?
17   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
18 Texas. So I just want to ask council, do they think we're
19 on the right step here? I mean, the first one, basically
20 we're trying to make sure that the depository library
21 council section of the FDLP desktop has information about
22 our current work, what we're doing, that it's up, that the
0193

1   content that -- like for meeting minutes or whatever we
2   decide, draft documents that we want community input on, are
3   put onto the page.
4   And with that if you go back to the one sheet that has
5   your recommendation rationale at the bottom, there's a
6   bylaw. We're probably going to have to put something into
7   the bylaws, either adding to the secretary duties, that they
8   are the person who reports that web content to the web
9   content manager for GPO, or that we have a new position on
10 council of a web content person who's responsible for
11 distributing that to GPO.
12   The second one then is that we have a separate file
13 repository for the council recommendations. James and I
14 were envisioning an interactive database of sorts so that
15 the recommendations could be put up with the GPO responses,
16 and what actions had been taken and if those recommendations
17 had been closed out. For instance, today at the public
18 access assessments, I feel we closed that recommendation,
19 and it would be nice that on the page it was said it was
20 closed, it was done, we've discussed this.
21   And then the next payment is related to
22 community.FDLP.gov, which sort of goes into the page behind
0194
1   that. We feel that it is not in council's best interest to
2   have a list serve that goes from institution to institution
3   based on who the chair is, and therefore has no continuity,
4   no institutional memory, no archive to be searched for
5   emails and discussions on the recommendations. So we would
6   like for community.FDLP.gov to be that spot, and it needs a
7   lot of enhancements to do that for us. And so after we're
8   through with this discussion, the next one on your agenda is
9   what can we do in the meantime until it is up to par.
10   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
11 at Chicago. And one of the reasons we invited Karen to join
12 us in discussion is to give the council an ideas of how much
13 time it will take, how much time will we be in that
14 interregnum between a fully capable desktop environment and
15 how long we'll have to rely on third-party apps. So this
16 might be a chance for Karen when she's ready to give us some
17 feedback about that.
18   MS. SIEGER: I'm sorry, Karen Sieger, U.S.
19 Government Printing Office. You asked me to give some
20 information about?
21   MR. SHULER: Okay, thanks.
22   MS. SIEGER: I'm sorry, can you repeat what you
0195

97

1 wanted me to --
 2   MR. SHULER: Yes. The question, if you can speak
 3 to what is possible, what is easily done and -- in terms of
 4 accomplishing this, and what's going to take a little bit
 5 longer, I think that would help the council understand, you
 6 know, this sort of intermediate strategy that is being
 7 suggested. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.
 8   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Is there a
 9 particular topic you want to start on, or do you want me to
10 run through --
11   MR. SHULER: I want you to start with the --
12 start with the first recommendation.
13   MS. SIEGER: Okay. Karen Sieger, GPO. I have a
14 list of recommendations which -- do you all have this copy
15 of the recommendations with the GPO response?
16   MR. SHULER: I don't -- you guys should have
17 that. We handed it out yesterday.
18   MS. SIEGER: Okay. Karen Sieger, GPO. Would you
19 like me to read these out for those in attendance? And then
20 we could talk about --
21   MS. MORIEARTY: Just give us a moment.
22   MR. SHULER: Since we have it in front of us, why
0196
 1 don't you just give us -- let's do it this way since we're
 2 all not reading from the piece of paper. What would you
 3 suggest would be the easiest thing to do from all this?
 4 What would you do as the web person responsible for FDLP
 5 desktop?
 6   MS. SIEGER: At present the web content section
 7 within library services consists of a staff of five plus
 8 myself, and at this time we have a number of priorities that
 9 we are going to go ahead and put in rank order after this
10 conference to say, you know, what is our main focus going to
11 be. So we're going to be taking our budget information for
12 this year, our staffing for this year, as well the part of
13 this that we get from the director of LSCM and GPO, and
14 determine what we're going to be doing.
15   With regard to this list, when I was talking to Suzanne
16 and James about it, there are a lot of things in here that I
17 see that are very doable in the near future. Some of them,
18 as Suzanne mentioned earlier, have been completed already.
19 We went ahead and added the link to the depository library
20 council pages from the bottom navigation, which is available
21 on every page of the desktop. We also went ahead and --
22 there are two sections where materials from council can be
0197

1 found in the file repository. We noticed that one of the
2 links was not included on the council page, so we went ahead
3 and we added that, so there's now a link to the section
4 specifically about council in the file repository that is
5 underneath the "about" section, and that contains right now
6 the council recommendations, for example.
7   In the past couple of months what we've been doing is
8 going through the legacy desktop, and we've been looking
9 through all the content that was on there, and we found a
10 mix of materials found across several directories. We found
11 duplicate files. We try to make sure that the version -- we
12 had to go through each file, make sure which one was the
13 latest one, you know, do we keep all the drafts, do they all
14 mirror each other, and what file format were they in, were
15 they in a usable formal.
16   We found a number of files that were in non-compliant
17 HTML, and we ended up taking the recommendations, for
18 example, and put them in five-year chunks in design and
19 converting those then to Word -- sorry, converted those into
20 PDF, which are available both in a print and a web version.
21 So we've been capturing all of those recommendations, and we
22 added those to the desktop.
0198
1   As of right now, we're also moving all of the
2 council -- the proceedings from the various council meetings
3 into the outreach area, and I believe we have about four
4 years left to go through.
5   MR. SHULER: Okay.
6   MS. SIEGER: Of those years, most of them are in
7 non-compliant HTML, so we are going through and converting
8 those into PDF documents to put into the file repository.
9 But that does take time. It's very time intensive to go
10 back through all those files. And once we finish that,
11 there are going to be a number of files that we do not know
12 what they are, they're not linked from any page on the
13 legacy desktop, so if we can get council's assistance in
14 identifying what those are and what the home for those are,
15 we can go ahead and close out the -- that portion of the
16 legacy FDLP desktop so that all the council materials are
17 now on FDLP.gov. And from there we can go ahead and start
18 looking into some of these other services, such as does the
19 council page belong underneath about the FDLP, or do we want
20 to go ahead and move that to a different section of the FDLP
21 desktop.
22   One recommendation that GPO has after looking at the
0199

1 material was to put it underneath of outreach, and so we
 2 wanted to get council's opinion about do you feel it's an
 3 appropriate home for the council materials, or is there
 4 another place that we want to go ahead and reexamine its
 5 placement.
 6   MR. SHULER: Okay.
 7   MS. SIEGER: Moving materials within the desktop
 8 is rather easy, it's all controlled by a content management
 9 system, so we can move things relatively easy. It doesn't
10 take a lot of web -- hard coding like it did with the legacy
11 desktop. So based off the feedback that we jointly have on
12 it, we can go ahead and move that to a more appropriate
13 place.
14   There are other things near term that we can work on.
15 For example, there were a number of questions about the
16 search capability of the FDLP desktop. We have been
17 currently testing a new search functionality, which at this
18 point we thought we were ready to release the simple search
19 version of it, however, we just found a bug between that and
20 another one of our components, it actually interferes right
21 now with our forms component. So we've contacted the
22 developer of the forms component, and they're currently
0200
 1 looking into a resolution so that we can get both running in
 2 tandem.
 3   That new search will allow us to search all the content
 4 within the FDLP desk. It will also search within PDF files.
 5 So if you go ahead and you do a search, it will find the
 6 text within the PDF files and include those in your results.
 7   The advance search option of that component, however,
 8 is a little unrefined, and so it would take a little bit
 9 longer to go ahead and refine that. It would require some
10 custom coding either through GPO staff, or we'll have to go
11 ahead and contract those services, and we'd have to evaluate
12 what would be the best path to accomplish that.
13   MR. SHULER: And if one had to put a time --
14 excuse me, John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.
15 If one had to put a timeline on that, would you say much
16 before Buffalo or after Buffalo?
17   MS. SIEGER: I would hope that it would be before
18 Buffalo, because the search is a rather important component
19 of the desktop.
20   MR. SHULER: Okay. So the council, if they
21 understand what you're saying, pretty much have heard that
22 much of the council's legacy documents have been moved over
0201

1 from the old space into the new space, the tabs are
2 available for people to click on there, correct?
3   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. When we say the
4 legacy docs, I would say only about 60 percent have been
5 moved so far.
6   MR. SHULER: Okay.
7   MS. SIEGER: There is a lot of material on there
8 yet that we just don't know what it is.
9   MR. SHULER: And that 40 percent you would want
10 council to look at --
11   MS. SIEGER: Yes.
12   MR. SHULER: -- to help sort out. Okay.
13   In terms of -- this is really beginning to feel like a
14 Congressional hearing. In terms of -- in terms of timeline,
15 do you think if we fashion an efficient process, looking
16 around the table, we could grind through those 40 percent
17 and get it done before Buffalo?
18   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Yes, I would like
19 to go ahead and close out that legacy desktop as quickly as
20 possible, so I would welcome any help. It would be -- Cindy
21 was just saying that she could help, as well.
22   MR. SHULER: Okay.
0202
1   MS. SIEGER: I know other people on the GPO staff
2 would be willing to help as time permits.
3   MR. SHULER: Cindy's reaching.
4   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'm just wondering,
5 these things that aren't linked from anywhere are probably
6 not from this council, and so I'm not -- not that you're not
7 helpful, but I don't know how helpful it would be in this
8 instance. I would like to suggest that perhaps I work with
9 Karen and do one pass-through, at least.
10   MR. SHULER: Council is council. I mean, we're
11 responsible for our council, but we're also responsible for
12 earlier councils, so I -- unless council wants to jump in
13 and correct me, I think it is our legacy as much as it is
14 your legacy. John Shuler, University of Illinois at
15 Chicago.
16   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. It may be worth
17 doing the joint, because even if, say, Cindy and I sit down
18 and make a first run, it may be that council wants to say we
19 don't want this in PDF, we want this in a different file
20 format, so it would at least save us as some time before we
21 do the actual conversion to make sure that we're getting it
22 in a format that works best for council. When we converted
0203

1   the council recommendations, for example, we just did those
2   in straight text. Now reading this recommendation that
3   you'd like something more interactive where you can go ahead
4   and look through previous recommendations, say which ones
5   have been closed out, comment on previous ones, that will
6   require, you know, much more work to enable something like
7   that, but that's something that we hadn't considered as
8   something that council wanted when we converted those
9   documents. So, you know, if we go ahead and look at those
10 legacy files and decide now that, okay, these are fine in
11 PDF, these we want to go ahead and make into different file
12 formats for, you know, additional use down the road, at
13 least we can have that discussion before that work begins.
14   MR. SHULER: Okay. Ann, did you have --
15   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan.
16 I've lived through recently moving most of the regional's
17 website to the community site, and it's probably three
18 quarters of the way done, and I've had some experience
19 working with community and its quirks and what I expected it
20 to do as opposed to what it did and so on. I'd be willing
21 to work on this --
22   MR. SHULER: Okay.
0204
1   MS. SANDERS: -- with Karen because we've
2   already -- she's already been holding my hand through this
3   already, so I'm comfortable with saying I don't recognize
4   this, I need some help and asking, but I would be willing to
5   take --
6   MR. SHULER: John --
7   MS. SANDERS: -- responsibility for it.
8   MR. SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of
9   Illinois at Chicago. How do the rest of the council members
10 feel about Ann taking on that role, and does anybody else
11 want to join her to help out, or just the two of you would
12 be efficient enough? Any responses? Thoughts? Okay.
13 Um --
14   MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. I
15 would help you out because I'd be curious, as a newer member
16 newer to the --
17   MR. SHULER: Okay.
18   MS. TUBBS: -- depository program identifying
19 documents, that might be more useful for the newer
20 generation.
21   MR. SHULER: Thank you. John Shuler, University
22 of Illinois at Chicago. James?
0205

102

```
 1        MR. JACOBS:  James Jacobs, Stanford University.  I
 2  almost said Jim.  That's so funny.
 3      As far as the FDLP.gov recommendations, Karen, are
 4  there -- are there any items on there that you -- that you
 5  would -- that you would see as being potentially difficult
 6  or impossible to do?  I guess I'm thinking specifically of
 7  recommendation 1B, having third-party services on FDLP.gov.
 8  I'm not sure if -- I know that technologically it's probably
 9  okay, having used it before, but socially or
10  administratively I'm not sure if that would be okay.
11        MS. SIEGER:  Karen Sieger, GPO.  Technologically
12  you're correct, it's easy to do, either through plug-ins
13  such as, you know, insert any code into this space or actual
14  supported add-ons for the CMS; however, we would need to sit
15  down and discuss what material and what plug-ins so that we
16  make sure that we vet any of them for security purposes
17  before we go placing any piece of technology onto the site,
18  and also make sure that we -- make sure that library
19  services as well as council are on the same page about the
20  content that's being distributed.
21        MR. SHULER:  John Shuler, University of Illinois
22  at Chicago.  So you would find a powerful thing to have
0206
 1  council say specifically that they want this a priority, to
 2  have this to happen as soon as possible to address, say, the
 3  third-party issues, and that would help in the discussions?
 4        MS. SIEGER:  Karen Sieger, GPO.  Of the ones on
 5  this list regarded to the desktop, I wonder if that is the
 6  one necessarily to focus on first.
 7        MR. SHULER:  Okay.
 8        MS. SEARS:  Would the search be the higher
 9  priority, as well as the navigation, where is the most
10  appropriate place for the council materials on the desktop
11  so that it's easily findable to, you know, various users of
12  the site.
13        MR. SHULER:  John Shuler, University of Illinois
14  at Chicago.  What does council think?
15        MS. SEARS:  Suzanne Sears, University of North
16  Texas.  I don't consider council outreach, but maybe I'm
17  completely off there.  If it's not under the about the FDLP,
18  the first place I would look for it is depository
19  administration, but Karen and I have had the discussion that
20  GPO does not feel it falls under the scope of depository
21  administration, so I think that about the FDLP may be the
22  best place for it.  I certainly do not consider it outreach
0207
```

1 and education.
 2   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. When we were
 3 talking about whether or not it belonged under depository
 4 administration, under its current definition, if you look at
 5 what we scope as depository administration, we do not feel
 6 at this time it fits that scope. If we need to go ahead and
 7 re-scope what depository administration means, it may well
 8 fall underneath depository administration.
 9   MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
10 California State Library. I would suggest that we deal with
11 search and findability before we deal with the placement of
12 widgets and other technology in the text, because I have a
13 great deal of trouble myself finding things on the desktop,
14 and when I use the search function, I get a lot of
15 extraneous stuff that just is totally irrelevant, and it's a
16 little frustrating.
17   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. That search is
18 actually quite powerful. It's just a little finnicky, but
19 we do understand that not everybody understands the way that
20 we do as main users of the widget how it quite works, so
21 we're fully aware that that search needs to go. And I was
22 hoping before council that we could get up this at least
0208
 1 basic new search, we just weren't able to get it in time.
 2 We identified the bug on Friday and said it was better just
 3 to wait than to try and put something out that was
 4 potentially buggy.
 5   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
 6 at Chicago. Other council members?
 7   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I
 8 would agree search is definitely a higher priority than
 9 third-party widgets, and it -- I just wanted to put that in
10 there so that GPO would have that on their radar. So in the
11 future if council decides that they would like to do live
12 blogging or they would like to use Delicious or any of those
13 third-party tools, that they would be able to do that in
14 concert with GPO in dealing with the security issues and
15 those kinds of things.
16   MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. I
17 agree. It sounds like you're really close to getting the
18 search and the navigation down and getting all of the
19 documents uploaded, so I would concentrate on finishing up
20 that project and then work on the third-party widgets and
21 gadgets.
22   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
0209

104

1 Texas. Karen, can I just ask you if we -- when we go back
 2 and we start doing the wordsmithing on the recommendation,
 3 we have council further recommends that GPO work to enhance
 4 the functionality of FDLP.gov and community.FDLP.gov. Is
 5 that good for you? I mean, is there wording we're leaving
 6 out? Is there something you would suggest that we add? How
 7 are you feeling about that?
 8   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. I suppose my one
 9 item to consider would be the other priorities that GPO
10 and -- as well as what we have at the moment, and assigning
11 a rank for the desktop in accordance with the priorities
12 that we get from the director of library services.
13   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
14 at Chicago. Any other questions about the priorities?
15 Obviously we'll be giving a feedback, but it gives us an
16 idea of what you -- what GPO is capable of in the next few
17 months and what needs to be held off. Any other questions
18 for Karen about the technological capabilities?
19   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. I do have one
20 thing to ask before you close that out. With regard to
21 these third-party add-ons, would these necessarily be
22 appropriate for the desktop, or are these also ones that we
0210
 1 may want to use on the community site? So if the community
 2 site is enhanced with the ability to add content based off
 3 of the log-in privileges on the community site, would those
 4 be types of features you'd want included on there, and we
 5 put that on the radar for the community site, as well, or in
 6 lieu of?
 7   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
 8 at Chicago. I believe what is good for the council should
 9 be good for the community. What does the team think?
10   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I
11 would agree with John, that anything that we've said about
12 FDLP.gov searchability, et cetera, third-party tools, should
13 be also enhanced on community.FDLP.gov.
14   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
15 at Chicago. Anybody else from council have any other
16 thoughts about that? Kathy?
17   MS. LOHEIM: Not about that -- Kathy Loheim (sp),
18 San Francisco -- but the email part that's on the community
19 FDLP, it says choice of traffic distribution channels. I
20 think someone said that's going to take a while, and that's
21 part of our communication --
22   MR. SHULER: Yeah.
0211

                             105

1   MS. LOHEIM: So how long -- I mean, is that a long
 2 time or -- because we didn't want to have the emails go from
 3 all these different chairmen, have a central place, so how
 4 long would something like that take?
 5   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. There are a
 6 couple of technological mechanisms we can use on the
 7 community site for sending out messages, so whether it's
 8 email or -- like the forum, for example. The forum is quite
 9 powerful when you -- once you understand how to -- how it
10 really works and all the capabilities that it has, and the
11 forum actually has the ability to have an open, a closed and
12 a hidden forum. So, for example, on an open forum, members
13 of council could be part of the group that moderates the
14 discussions, and then anybody from the community could post
15 their own threads or respond to threads, and so council
16 could have an open communication with the community there.
17   In a closed discussion, council could have its own
18 discussions that are available to the public; however, only
19 members of council would then be able to respond to the
20 messages.
21   There's also the ability to have a hidden forum where
22 unless you are a member of the council group, you would not
0212
 1 know that that category existed, and you could have
 2 discussions in there, as well. And that would be
 3 irregardless of anybody's institution, it would be housed on
 4 community.FDLP.gov. With that system, you're able to watch
 5 categories and threads and say, you know, let me know via
 6 email whenever somebody responds back to this thread.
 7   So there are a lot of powerful tools on there, it's
 8 just a matter of is that something that council would like
 9 to pursue. If council would like to pursue the mechanism of
10 posting material to the desktop in more of a web page type
11 function, there are ways to set up a mailing list so that
12 every time somebody adds something into those, it would
13 be -- everybody in the entire group would be notified that
14 new content went up.
15   So like I said, there are many ways to go about that
16 type of functionality that -- some of them can be done right
17 now. Some of them would just need a couple of conversations
18 with council to say what are your requirements, and
19 depending on those requirements, could say, okay, we could
20 do this in the short term, or this will take a little bit
21 longer. But until I know specifically, you know, how you
22 want that mechanism set up, I really can't answer beyond
0213

1 that at this time.
 2   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Sanford University. I
 3 think on the problem statement two, all of the
 4 recommendations there, R4 community.FDLP.gov, so, for
 5 example, the choice of list traffic, list archives
 6 available, ability for groups to create and coedit pages and
 7 documents, including Excel or spreadsheet kind of things,
 8 all of these functionalities, I think, are things that we
 9 would want to use rather than some third party.
10   MR. SHULER: Okay. And John Shuler, University
11 of Illinois at Chicago. Then as this recommendation
12 evolves, we can give you a better timeline, perhaps, of
13 what -- you know, what happened, how soon after Buffalo it
14 should happen. You can give us -- we can sort of build a
15 better idea of what's going to cost more money. It's going
16 to be next to accomplish in anybody's lifetime. So we'll
17 try to sort out the pieces according to that kind of
18 priority. Is that what you're asking for, is what we wanted
19 done immediately, what would be okay midterm, and then what
20 can wait till what I'm calling after Buffalo.
21   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Yes, a blank
22 order of importance --
0214
 1   MR. SHULER: Okay.
 2   MS. SIEGER: -- would be preferable. Like I said,
 3 a number of these things, for example, looking at the
 4 community site, I know one of the things the council has
 5 asked for is the ability to dynamically provide the editing
 6 of documents, Excel, Word, those types of files. Within the
 7 CMS there are bridges to, for example, like Google docs, and
 8 that could be wrapped into the community site, and that
 9 could be a short-term, you know, solution so that the
10 community site is being used in that collaborative nature.
11 And then down the road we can say, okay, you know, the
12 desktop having that native functionality is definitely going
13 to take longer, it's definitely going to cost more money,
14 you know, GPO doesn't have the money that Google has. But
15 it does it mean that it can't provide us any functionality?
16 It doesn't mean that. It just means it just might take us a
17 little bit more time. We've got to look at other priorities
18 at the same time.
19   So if we know that this is a must have or, you know,
20 can this be wrapped in this current site, and then later on
21 when we get to that capability, we'll move off of it, if we
22 know it from those types of steps, we can make, you know,
0215

107

1 certain strides in -- you know, based on that list.
 2   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
 3 at Chicago. Does the council think that is a reasonable
 4 approach to reshaping its recommendation for its final
 5 delivery? Any objections to that?
 6   UNIDENTIFIED: No, it has to be done.
 7   MR. SHULER: It's got to be done. We have --
 8 while it's being done, we do have the other aspect of this
 9 recommendation, which is to use third-party applications
10 during the interregnum until FDLP is fully capable of
11 handling the full load, so I think we got -- we got two
12 strategies in my estimation. We got something that we can
13 use to work between now and Buffalo, something to work with
14 GPO in upgrading the FDLP, and a long-term plan about making
15 the FDLP desktop much more functional in the end. Does that
16 sound about right? Okay. Any other thoughts?
17   Okay, Karen, thanks. Any last thoughts, Karen?
18   MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Yeah, just one
19 last thing. Up until now we've had very few comments or
20 suggestions about either site, and so this is kind of new to
21 us that -- you know, that people have been saying, hey, you
22 know, we can't do this, we can't do that. At any time we
0216
 1 welcome suggestions and comments. We want to make the site
 2 as best as it can be, so if there are other recommendations
 3 that either council or the community has, we'd love to hear
 4 it because, you know, we want to make sure the site is
 5 successful and give it the tools that the community can
 6 really use.
 7   MR. SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of
 8 Illinois at Chicago. I think what the council is trying to
 9 do is lead by example in this fashion to encourage other
10 members of the community to take full advantage of that kind
11 offer.
12   Yeah. So I think council -- John Shuler University of
13 Illinois at Chicago. I think council is perhaps done
14 discussing this particular recommendation. We know what we
15 want to do with it, how we're going to discuss it tomorrow,
16 okay? We have at least a topic sentence? Okay.
17   Do we think we require Karen's expertise for the other
18 parts of the discussion? Looking around the table, no.
19   Karen, with the council's great thanks and for the
20 effort it took, we really appreciate you come here and
21 having a conversation with us, thank you. I think it's made
22 a lot better recommendation.
0217

1   MS. SIEGER: Thank you. I'm glad I could be here.
 2   MR. SHULER: Thanks. And also a thanks to James,
 3 Suzanne and Chris for taking the initiative on this and
 4 helping us walk through the forest. Appreciate it. John
 5 Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.
 6   Since we do have members in the audience, and we have
 7 this technological pause -- okay, general thumb's, it
 8 appears.
 9   MR. JACOBS: Sorry, I know I have it somewhere.
10 Communication tools, I just had to put it in the right
11 directory. Pardon me. Disorganized librarian, that's my
12 new domain name. Shall I introduce?
13   MR. SHULER: Introduce.
14   MR. JACOBS: Okay. James Jacob, Stanford
15 University. This next one is -- on my title it's called
16 communication tools for council. This is not really a
17 recommendation, but more of a suggestion for council to --
18 to use Google groups for their communication going forward,
19 at least until such time as community.fdlp.gov is of -- on
20 par or better than Google groups. The reason for this
21 primarily, as you'll see at the top paragraph, is that
22 the -- the tradition has been that the lists are what change
0218
 1 to the organization of the current DLC chair, and so there's
 2 no continuation of list, there's no way for current council
 3 to search through past council's communication and work, and
 4 so this discontinue -- discontinuity, pardon me, gets in the
 5 way of council goals and objectives going forward.
 6   So Suzanne Sears, Chris Greer and I looked into some
 7 options for some -- some better ways to provide for the
 8 communication and other things, other tools that council
 9 needs to do their work, including collaborative documents,
10 collaborative spreadsheets, list archives, searchable list
11 archives, multiple ways to receive list traffic, et cetera,
12 and so you'll see that the benefits of a Google group there
13 are that the list archive is available to subscribers,
14 members can receive this traffic; however, they want via
15 web, RSS or email client or all three if they prefer. List
16 ownership can be changed annually to the current chair.
17 Members can upload files and create group pages. Members
18 can collaboratively edit Google documents and Google
19 spreadsheets, and the privacy of the lists can be controlled
20 and maintained.
21   There were a couple of notes there. We do consider
22 this a temporary solution, as I said, until such time as
0219

1 community.FDLP.gov is a viable option, which it sounds like
2 in the near to not so distant future it may be. And the
3 other note is that no cloud option is perfect, there are a
4 growing list of cloud failures.
5   UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, I was about to say that.
6   MR. JACOBS: And so I think on an everyday aspect
7 Google groups will give us tremendous power, communicative
8 power and collaboration power, but that we should also talk
9 about, you know, ways of downloading documents every once in
10 a while, make sure we save our communication on our local
11 machines or at our local institutions and things like that
12 so...
13   MR. SHULER: Thank you, James.
14   MR. JACOBS: You're welcome.
15   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
16 at Chicago. To provide some further information about this
17 recommendation, I did talk to the superintendent of
18 documents, and I asked him about the issue of a public
19 advisory group using this particular tool, and to his way of
20 thinking, he did not have a problem with it. He felt that
21 the -- I'm not going to quote him exactly, but the way he
22 put it, if GPO cannot provide that particular function at
0220
1 the moment, until it can, he is comfortable with council
2 using this tool in order to accomplish its goal and
3 appreciates the opportunity to at least have first shot at
4 it, and if they can't do it, then he's okay with us moving
5 to this temporary solution. So I think in that regard we
6 fulfilled that public record open meeting obligation as an
7 advisory group, that we have checked with our -- I don't
8 want to say hosting agency, but our responsible agency in a
9 good, ethical and proper fashion about that matter.
10   With that being said, I am fully -- since I get to be
11 the next one up in the slot to create a list serve, I gotta
12 tell you, I'm so happy this recommendation came up, because
13 me and list serves, they don't work. So if we can -- you
14 know, it could be that somebody else could create a list
15 serve that would manage it at their institution, but list
16 serves at my institution have a habit of going awry, and
17 especially if I'm in charge of them. So if we want that
18 further backup of these -- as was suggested in the footnote,
19 of these communications being backstopped by list serve at
20 one of the members' institutions, that might be advisable in
21 terms of assuring some kind of continuity in case of
22 disaster. I just put that out there. I mean, I'll work at
0221

1 it, but I think it's time to share.
 2   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.
 3 Let's do it. As long as we understand, we've all been in
 4 the condition, we're temporary. It's a year, two years.
 5 When it becomes five years, it is not temporary. Yeah.
 6   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
 7 at Chicago. I suggest very strongly when we post this
 8 recommendation as final mode, we put a month limit on it,
 9 within 11 months, 10 months, that that's as long as we're
10 going to carry this ball forward until -- in other words, we
11 reauthorize this decision in 10 months, let me put it that
12 way. Okay, is that acceptable? And I think that -- huh?
13   UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible 10:25:07).
14   MR. SHULER: I guess we could try it. We haven't
15 done anything with motions today. I move that the council
16 with that caveat addition, whatever, of putting a timeline
17 in the document, I move that council accept this particular
18 recommendation as it's submitted.
19   MS. MORIEARTY: I second, Jill Moriearty, University
20 of Utah.
21   MR. SHULER: Do we have any further language to
22 be added? No? Good, now we're ready to vote. All those in
0222
 1 favor say, "I."
 2   (Response en masse)
 3   MR. SHULER: All those opposed? Any abstentions?
 4 Hallelujah, brothers and sisters, a step forward. Thank
 5 you.
 6   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I
 7 will -- if John wants, I can get everyone subscribed to the
 8 Google group and --
 9   MR. SHULER: Let --
10   MR. JACOBS: -- move that forward.
11   MR. SHULER: Let it be so, because we're going to
12 have a lot of work to do.
13   Okay. On to the next, I think, recommendation that we
14 can give full blessings to. This is the -- this is the one
15 labeled "council recommendation, background attendance at
16 council meetings/depository conferences is declining." It
17 sounds like -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
18 Chicago. It sounds like a depressing story. Does everybody
19 have that in front of them? All right.
20   UNIDENTIFIED: No.
21   MR. SHULER: Not yet? Okay.
22   UNIDENTIFIED: I got it.
0223

1   MR. SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of
 2 Illinois at Chicago. I open the floor up to discussion.
 3   UNIDENTIFIED: I have a question. How far ahead
 4 are these meetings scheduled? Like, you know, some
 5 associations schedule their meetings five years ahead. How
 6 far ahead are the arrangements made, just one year ahead?
 7   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
 8 at Chicago, looks at Cindy Etkin of GPO, see if she has an
 9 idea. One, two -- oh, Robin, Robin hiding behind -- I
10 didn't see Robin --
11   MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Robin Haun Mohamed, GPO.
12   MR. SHULER: Yes.
13   MS. HAUN MOHAMED: We try and book them out at least
14 two to three years ahead.
15   MR. SHULER: Two to three years.
16   MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Dates, Lance Cummins has
17 proposed dates for the next couple of years. We try not to
18 put them opposite conference and other things that are going
19 on.
20   UNIDENTIFIED: I have gathered that we're kind of
21 booked into this hotel for the fall meeting for the
22 indefinite future but --
0224
 1   MR. SHULER: No, we're not.
 2   UNIDENTIFIED: No? But the spring meeting for
 3 2011, still the location has not been chosen for that yet?
 4   MS. HAUN MOHAMED: It's not been set.
 5   UNIDENTIFIED: Okay, so...
 6   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
 7 at Chicago, that was it has not been set?
 8   MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Has not been set.
 9   MR. SHULER: That is a negatory on being set.
10 Okay.
11   MS. MORIEARTY: Yeah.
12   MR. SHULER: Jill is happy.
13   MS. MORIEARTY: Uh-huh.
14   MR. SHULER: Okay.
15   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State
16 Library. I was the one who drafted this last night at
17 11:30, and it needs work. Dan has already made some very
18 valuable comments to me privately. The intent of this came
19 from an informal discussion that we had last night, and it
20 probably results from the choice of Buffalo. Word on the
21 street that attendance is predicted to be very low in
22 Buffalo in April, and so we were exploring ways of choosing
0225

112

1 locations that are more affordable, easier to get to, more
2 centrally located that would increase attendance at the
3 spring depository meetings, realizing that the fall meetings
4 are almost certainly going to continue to be held in the
5 Washington, D.C. area. So -- is the text up there, John?
6   MR. SHULER: No.
7   UNIDENTIFIED: It's loading.
8   UNIDENTIFIED: This technology is perfect.
9   MR. SHULER: Don't look at the man behind the
10 curtain.
11   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony (ph), Brown University.
12 Just to share with you what I've already shared with David,
13 in the second bullet point, just a friendly suggestion
14 that -- to reaffirm the practice really that GPO has
15 employed over the years to try to geographically distribute
16 the meetings around the country, since often it's the only
17 time that some local folks have an opportunity to encounter
18 one of these kinds of meetings. But as is sort of reflected
19 in the current middle bullet item, maybe give double weight
20 to the middle of the country so that as we move around, we,
21 you know, spend a little more time in the rotation in the
22 middle of the country than the edges. And then the other
0226
1 factor that I suggested was that in choosing cities in any
2 given geographic area, to try to find those areas that have
3 a critical mass or a high density of depository libraries
4 within a, you know, short drive. So not to continually pick
5 on Buffalo but, you know, if you were to draw a six-hour
6 travel circle around Buffalo, the number of depository
7 libraries, and therefore the full advantage of local folks
8 to come to that meeting, might be less than if you drew that
9 same circle around St. Louis or Chicago or pick any other
10 city in the country. So -- so that was, you know, one of
11 the other suggestions.
12   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
13 at Chicago. It was -- Scranton was actually suggested as
14 another possibility.
15   MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair --
16   MR. SHULER: Just kidding, sorry.
17   MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of
18 Hawaii. I feel that I don't really know enough about how
19 GPO makes its decisions about where to hold conferences --
20   UNIDENTIFIED: Lance just walked in.
21   MS. SINCLAIR: -- but Lance just walked in.
22   MR. SHULER: Yo, Lance.
0227

113

1   MS. SINCLAIR: You know, I don't know how we
2 ended up in Buffalo, you know, what goes into that. I
3 understand that GPO has to pay for these things, and that
4 there's -- you know, we come for free, so, you know,
5 obviously there's an economic component that I don't
6 completely understand.
7   MR. CUMMINS: First of all, Buffalo has wings, so
8 we have to go there for those. But we actually started --
9 oh, Lance Cummins, GPO. I broke my own rule.
10   MR. SHULER: It was not a hard and fast
11 recommendation.
12   UNIDENTIFIED: It is now.
13   UNIDENTIFIED: Wings.
14   MR. SHULER: Very good, sir.
15   MR. CUMMINS: We actually had something else in
16 line before Buffalo, and that was unable to be followed
17 through on, so we had to scramble and make a quick curement.
18   Our group is a funny-sized group, and actually going
19 into a lot of cities, there are times they don't want us.
20 We'll get no responses back. We went to San Antonio and
21 went through the CVB in other areas, tried to find
22 locations, and got nothing back from the hotels. We did San
0228
1 Diego, got nothing back from the hotels. So we tend to have
2 to go to second-tier cities. My staff and I look at the
3 fact that a lot of people can't travel, so, you know, when
4 the meeting moves, it's an opportunity for first-time
5 attendees or local people to come. And just because we do
6 D.C. every fall doesn't mean we should ignore the Northeast
7 and the Eastern Coast, which we were in Tampa last year, or
8 April. Pardon, I'm still winded.
9   So when the last one fell through, we started looking
10 to the north, because we haven't been there since Rhode
11 Island, I believe it was, and Buffalo CVB came back, and
12 they offer a great per diem, which is less than $100, I
13 think, at this point, the hotel offered several incentives
14 to get us there, and it's a location we haven't been. But
15 we can start off looking at ten cities and try to get
16 responses back, and if we don't get them, we have to keep
17 moving. I have a short window to procure these so that
18 people can know and make their plans for it. But we have
19 been looking at trying to get the lowest per diem to help
20 those who have to pay out of pocket to be able to attend.
21   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
22 Texas. I like that you're looking at the lowest per diem,
0229

1 but in doing that, we also need to keep in mind that to get
 2 to Buffalo, people are going to have to take more expensive
 3 plane flights, so that's going to balance that back out,
 4 too.
 5   MR. CUMMINS: We looked into that, also -- Lance
 6 Cummins, GPO, looked into that, also, and there are some
 7 issues with West Coast coming in, I mean, but we also -- we
 8 hit issues in a lot of locations, and when we do second-tier
 9 cities, that's going to be a problem all the way around.
10 From somewhere in the country, somebody's going to have
11 problems. So, you know, if we can counter that by them
12 paying less to stay -- I mean, per diem is not the main
13 factor, but it's a good factor. You know, would you rather
14 pay $100 a night or $300 a night out of pocket? Because
15 what we're seeing in attendance is the people who are paid
16 to come and aren't paid anymore aren't coming right now
17 because they're not going to pay out of pocket. The people
18 who always come and pay out of pocket are still coming. So,
19 you know, we want to give those people a break as much as
20 possible.
21   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan.
22 Lance, we seem to have had a conversation once upon a time
0230
 1 about the economic or other advantages of possibly doing the
 2 spring meeting in one place for successive years.
 3   MR. CUMMINS: Uh-huh.
 4   MS. SANDERS: Could you speak to that?
 5   MR. CUMMINS: With an option, if we -- we can do
 6 a three-year option with hotels in our procurement area,
 7 which is what we do locally, so that we don't have to go out
 8 to bid every year, which is traditionally what we have to
 9 do. If we do a three-year contract on the road, you know,
10 for example, Kansas City three years in a row, we can
11 generally get a better rate from that hotel or better
12 incentives from them. It also helps with long-term planning
13 for you all or the attendees to come because they know where
14 they're going years out instead of waiting till fall to find
15 out, and sometimes we don't know at this meeting where we're
16 going the next April because it just hasn't gone through
17 procurement yet. So doing a three-year contract would
18 definitely help. We did get push-back from a lot of people
19 who said, well, we don't want to go to the same place three
20 years in a row. So, you know, we keep bouncing.
21   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State
22 Library. Lance, can you -- do you have any estimate on how
0231

115

1 much savings would be achieved by having a three-year
 2 contract?
 3   MR. CUMMINS: I wouldn't --
 4   MR. CISMOWSKI: What percentage are we talking
 5 about?
 6   MR. CUMMINS: I wouldn't know for sure. The
 7 hotels really -- the size that like us really want us to
 8 keep coming back. So, you know, with being able to
 9 negotiate with that in advance, we may be able to get below
10 per diem, we may be able to get receptions thrown in, we may
11 be able to get more meeting space. You know, it's just not
12 something -- I can't negotiate now because I can't make them
13 think I'm going to do it to try to get a better rate.
14   Another option, if you're looking at meetings, is do we
15 need two a year? Did they need to be in October and April?
16 I mean, there are other options to look at, also.
17   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. One
18 question I'm just wondering about is to not necessarily test
19 the assumption that, you know, traveling around -- having
20 locations around the country attracts or gives the
21 opportunity for local folks to come, because I think
22 intuitively we all believe that, and usually, you know, the
0232
 1 calisthenics in the beginning of each meeting, there's lots
 2 of folks there that raise their hand saying that it's their
 3 first time in attendance. But I just wonder if you all have
 4 any sort of empirical sense of that, do we have numbers in
 5 terms of even attendance over the last three years, and of
 6 that attendance, what proportion are first-time or local
 7 attendees?
 8   MR. CUMMINS: I have the statistics back on my
 9 computer in the office. I do a breakdown at the end of each
10 conference, and there is a margin of error in it because
11 people don't always the check the right boxes when they
12 register, but usually I give the council chair on Wednesday
13 morning the tally quickly of, you know, the final number
14 minus those who didn't show, and I try to give a quick and
15 dirty breakdown by first-time attendees and regionals and
16 such. So I do have that information.
17   I can tell you that similar in Seattle when we were
18 there, we had 76 first-time attendees who had never been
19 before, I mean, and probably haven't been since, so that was
20 a good turnout and we got a lot of thank yous for that, but
21 I can share that out once I get back.
22   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State
0233

1 Library. To follow up on that, do you have any idea how
 2 many of those 76 attendees were from Washington state?
 3   MR. CUMMINS: I would have to go back through the
 4 registrations to pull that together.
 5   MR. CISMOWSKI: Because I think that's what Dan's
 6 really getting at is how -- when you go to a new location,
 7 how many new attendees from that location come because it's
 8 within driving distance?
 9   MR. CUMMINS: I would think that's -- I mean, an
10 assumption on my part is what makes the difference, I mean,
11 that they can drive to it. If they can't -- if they've
12 never been to a fall or spring before, there must be a
13 reason for it, and if we're in a local enough area, then
14 there's ability for them to drive. We have people who come
15 in for one day, based on what the agenda is, when it's
16 local, so not all of those people are staying for all three
17 days.
18   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
19 Texas. I can speak from a standard point of the Oklahoma
20 selectives. I know that the Tulsa library comes every year,
21 the regionals come every year, but the other libraries, when
22 it was in Texas, they drove, when it was in Kansas City,
0234
 1 they drove, when it was in Alabama, they drove for the one
 2 day or even to stay the one hotel night, because they can
 3 get funding for one hotel night and some gas mileage, but
 4 they can't get the funding to fly and to come. So I think
 5 that having it moved geographically is very advantageous.
 6 And if it can't move, if we needed to go to the three years,
 7 I would say if we could do it someplace in the center of the
 8 country to try and maximize -- or Dan was saying last night
 9 about where there are more selectives, if we tried to pick a
10 place where there are -- it's a large concentration of
11 selectives.
12   MR. CUMMINS: I personally like the idea of being
13 in the middle. I mean, Kansas City, which I have to say
14 right up front, I'm from there so -- but as far as being in
15 the middle of the country, and as far as being able to get
16 into the airport from anywhere -- and, you know, the Crown
17 Center area worked out well for us with the shops there and
18 everything else, and per diem was 120 a night. We had a
19 decent turnout for that, and I don't -- I like the idea of
20 the middle just because it's easy.
21   MR. SHULER: James?
22   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
0235

117

1 Washington could have also been -- there's a large library
 2 school there, and I know Cass Hartnet suggested to her
 3 students that they go to DLC, and so a lot of those
 4 students -- so maybe another -- another issue could be
 5 library schools in the area. You know, Rhode Island would
 6 be nice.
 7   MR. CUMMINS: There's one in Buffalo.
 8   MR. JACOBS: There's one in -- oh, that's true.
 9 It's not a library school.
10   MR. SHULER: There you go.
11   MR. JACOBS: It's been absorbed in --
12   MS. MORIEARTY: Quite a large one in Buffalo, Jill
13 Moriearty --
14   MR. JACOBS: It's not a library school anymore, is
15 it?
16   MS. MORIEARTY: -- University of Utah.
17   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. To be
18 fair to the great state of New York, it also is the second
19 largest in terms of number of sheer depositories next to
20 California. Buffalo's probably the furthest away from all
21 of those selectives, but, you know, it is where it is.
22   UNIDENTIFIED: That's right.
0236
 1   MR. CUMMINS: It was unfortunate. We started in
 2 Rochester, which I've been told Buffalo's much better than
 3 Rochester so --
 4   MR. O'MAHONY: Well, I mean, I think we all
 5 appreciate the juggling act that it is to try to nail down
 6 one of these things, and that, you know, no one of these
 7 suggestions or criteria are going to sway the day unless we
 8 go to a three-year set kind of a thing but -- and not that
 9 any single council can forever dictate future things beyond
10 those three years, perhaps, but if we go with a three-year
11 approach, then obviously at the end of that three-year
12 cycle, that would be reevaluated again and see how that
13 played out and whether the next three years was rotated
14 before we then went back into another three-year cycle.
15 So...
16   MR. CUMMINS: At this point I believe the Public
17 Printer would value your input on that, because he's not
18 willing to make that commitment without some sort of polling
19 of the community or direction, and as we know how polling
20 the community goes, I wasn't willing to step on that land
21 mine.
22   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
0237

1 at Chicago. I guess that's what we're supposed to do so --
2 do we have any more questions for Lance before we continue
3 to discuss? It gives us a pretty good idea of the process
4 and form an opinion now.
5   We have some suggested changes to this draft. I don't
6 think we're ready to vote on anything because obviously we'd
7 need to see the changes. Is that acceptable to the group,
8 that we wait for the changes and then take the steps?
9   MS. TUBBS: Yeah. And Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law
10 Library. If we could see some of those previous
11 statistics --
12   MR. SHULER: Thank you.
13   MS. TUBBS: -- posted up to our Google page or
14 something just to get a sense as to attendees and location
15 and depository library participation?
16   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
17 at Chicago. Lance, is that possible?
18   MR. CUMMINS: Yes.
19   MR. SHULER: Thank you. I'll work with Lance to
20 see that that is done expeditiously. I love that term
21 "expeditiously."
22   Okay. We've come to a decision point. The court
0238
1 reporter disappears at 5:30; however, since we still have
2 probably about an hour of discussion, and this seems like a
3 good natural break between that record and the record we
4 would keep after she's gone, may I suggest that we end this
5 portion of the recording of the court reporter, and we would
6 continue on our own devices? Would that be acceptable?
7 With our thanks, of course, we're very thankful this
8 afternoon so -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
9 Chicago.
10   (End of session)

0001
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5   2009 FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE AND
 6   FALL DEPOSITORY COUNCIL MEETING
 7
 8   October 21, 2009
 9
10   DOUBLETREE HOTEL
11   300 Army-Navy Drive
12   Arlington, VIRGINIA 22202
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
0002
 1   P R O C E E D I N G S
 2   MR. SHULER: We're missing -- we don't have a
 3 quorum yet? Okay. Let me try this again.
 4   All right. I call this particular session of
 5 the Council together. And for the members in the
 6 audience, this is a bit of a trick-or-treat. You saw on
 7 the schedule that we're going to be talking about
 8 "Master Teaching," well, not so much. Council still has
 9 unfinished business. And since that particular program
10 was very much in flux, we made an executive decision to
11 occupy this space with a working session.
12   So what you're about to experience -- grab
13 some doughnuts and a coffee and think of this as "cloud
14 council," because we're going to be discussing issues
15 that we're going to be raising in our 10:30 meeting.
16 And we felt we needed this 90 minutes in order to do a
17 good job then. So my apologies to anybody who wanted to
18 be master taught, but we're going to -- we're going to
19 continue on with our meeting from yesterday afternoon.
20   Okay. Council, again, we have the court
21 reporter with us. So, for the record, please say your
22 name and your institution. I have given everybody --

0003
 1 should have in front of them, if you don't let me know,
 2 the working agenda for this session. And I -- I'm going
 3 to use it for the structure of the meeting at 10:30.
 4   John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago.
 5 What I'd like us to do is, your Chair still hasn't had a
 6 full meal since Monday night. And I would like to grab
 7 a chance again to make an attempt to eat before the
 8 10:30 meeting. So I've asked Jill to be our timekeeper
 9 on the issues and try to be as efficient as possible.
 10   And, furthermore, I have gone ahead and
 11 suggested some topic sentences that we can use since we
 12 are not talking about full-blown recommendations, but
 13 rather suggestions of where we're going. And as we look
 14 at A, B, C and D, I would ask, does Council find those
 15 to be worthy topic sentences for the issues involving
 16 those evolving recommendations?
 17   MS. TROTTA: Can we talk?
 18   MR. SHULER: Yes, you can talk.
 19   MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State
 20 University. As a -- these -- this is a great start.
 21 Thanks for putting this together, John.
 22   MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.
0004
 1   MS. TROTTA: I don't think there's enough
 2 about the whole cluster of issues around the
 3 digitization of the legacy, the issue of -- all those --
 4 all those issues. So I would like to figure out a way
 5 to get a broader sentence in to include more.
 6   MR. SHULER: Okay. Does Council have a
 7 suggestion beyond this fragment that needs to be added?
 8 You can tell I included the failure of the Perl System,
 9 and an accounting of what happened. The issue over the
 10 remaining legacy systems, as well as further discussion
 11 about the FD -- FDsys implementation schedule. What
 12 else can we say? John Shuler, University of Illinois,
 13 Chicago. I'll get it right.
 14   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of
 15 Utah. As I recall the whole situation and the Public
 16 Printer's presentation, I think you -- you hit all the
 17 main points that I wanted to carry forward. Now, it's
 18 just a rough draft.
 19   MR. SHULER: Yes.
 20   MS. MORIEARTY: But as long as we keep on
 21 point, these four points, I -- I think this is going to
 22 be a workable recommendation in the future.

0005
1   MR. SHULER: Okay. And, again, still seeking
2 further information we might want to add. Remember that
3 these are topic sentences we're going to use with the
4 community and GPO during the 10:30 meeting.
5   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
6 Texas. So if I'm understanding you, it's an outline,
7 and then these other papers we have would be further
8 discussion points?
9   MR. SHULER: Yes. They will be further --
10 there will be further drafts of those other longer
11 documents we've been using for the last two days. Okay?
12 So that -- we're not going to be wordsmithing those
13 documents at this meeting or the next. Kathy?
14   MS. LAWHUN: John -- Kathy Lawhun, San
15 Francisco. I wonder if we should title --
16   MR. SHULER: Okay. I'll -- late also, the
17 recommendation is leave number -- the letter A should
18 have the title "Technology Issues." That's been
19 suggested. What does the rest of the Council think?
20   MS. SANDERS: I'm seeing heads nod, so I'm --
21 I'm -- Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. I think that
22 we have consensus there.
0006
1   MR. SHULER: Okay. Consensus it is. I'll
2 begin the discussion at 10:30 with the general title
3 "Technology Issues," and that the fragments that I have
4 here speak to the way we want to get the conversation
5 started. Ms. Greek? Dan?
6   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
7 Yeah, yeah. Basically, and I don't want to wordsmith
8 over the -- the caption. Technology Issues, though, is
9 a pretty broad-brush statement.
10   MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.
11   MR. O'MAHONY: And I -- I don't want to false
12 advertise in terms of what the scope and content of this
13 particular recommendation will be, which -- which isn't
14 going to cover all technology issues.
15   MR. SHULER: No.
16   MR. O'MAHONY: So that -- that broad caption
17 statement with the points enumerated in your topic
18 sentence should -- should --
19   MR. SHULER: Okay.
20   MR. O'MAHONY: -- hopefully reign in the scope
21 of it.
22   MR. SHULER: Okay. It will be clear, then,

0007
1 that this will be a guided discussion, that the
2 questions we will be generating from the council to the
3 members in the audience and with GPO will be focused on
4 general issues. That we will then use the court's
5 transcripts, court reporter's transcripts to mine after
6 the meeting and fully flesh out the recommendation.
7 Okay? And that actually will be done with each of these
8 as we go on. Okay? David?
9   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
10 State Library. There -- there is -- there was one
11 request by the Public Printer specifically to us, a
12 charge that I'd like to suggest that we add to the
13 recommendations.
14   MR. SHULER: Okay.
15   MR. CISMOWSKI: And that has to do with the
16 XNL enhanced photo register?
17   MR. SHULER: Oh, yes. That will become H.
18 Thank you. What was I thinking?
19   MR. CISMOWSKI: And in addition, maybe we
20 could add this under C somehow. There -- there was also
21 a request, I believe, from Rick during the opening
22 session for suggestions on a spending plan for the
0008
1 $500,000 digitization allocation?
2   MR. SHULER: That is going to be part of F.
3   MR. CISMOWSKI: F?
4   MR. SHULER: Okay?
5   MR. CISMOWSKI: Okay?
6   MR. SHULER: GPO Funding Issues and Direction.
7 Since there were a number of funding requests, I wanted
8 to have a chance to have a discussion about that. That
9 was just one. Yes?
10   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of
11 Utah. Out of the PAA outreach and assessment
12 presentation that we had, one of the issue that came
13 forward was updating the handbook.
14   MR. SHULER: Okay.
15   MS. MORIEARTY: And I -- I think with the
16 implementation of PAA's now, having an updated and a
17 fully fleshed-out handbook is important. So I would add
18 that as an I.
19   MR. SHULER: Okay. We have now created
20 another recommendation, updating the handbook. Our goal
21 to be as minimal as possible is being challenged, but
22 that's okay. We have a lot of important work to do.

0009
1   So are we done talking about A? Do we have
2   anything to say about B? Yeah?
3   MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State
4   University. In terms of broad subjects, I would suggest
5   we call this "Digitization of the Legacy Collection" --
6   MR. SHULER: All right.
7   MS. TROTTA: -- as a general topic, but it
8   includes much more than what's noted here.
9   MR. SHULER: Yes.
10   MS. TROTTA: So we had some issues. We were
11   asked to advise the Public Printer on what our goals for
12   those projects would be. We identified problems with
13   the registry. We have a lot of ideas about that.
14   So I think it's also useful to have this one
15   focus on digitization of existing collections, whereas
16   D, other cluster of issues around the Borndigital issue.
17   MR. SHULER: Okay.
18   MS. TROTTA: So I support that you separated
19   those two.
20   MR. SHULER: Okay. So to review, we'll slug
21   that one, Digitization of the Legacy Collection.
22   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
0010
1   May I suggest that we discontinue using the term
2   "legacy" and use instead "historic"? I think legacy has
3   some negative connotations, and it -- it kind of bothers
4   me.
5   MR. SHULER: There's "heirloom."
6   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony. Brown
7   University. Could we continue to use that with respect
8   to older online systems? Because I think the negative
9   connotation is useful there? One other slight friendly
10   amendment to when these are presented out?
11   MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.
12   MR. O'MAHONY: Just a suggestion that perhaps
13   A come after the other two technology digitization ones.
14   Because I think it can underscore if we talk first about
15   the important work needed to do to digitize collections
16   and to -- you know, the infrastructure with FDsys, then
17   that helps underscore the need for the -- the validity,
18   the reliability, the -- the need for that all that
19   rather than sort of start off with that.
20   MR. SHULER: So if the Chair understands what
21   was just requested, we would like A to become D in terms
22   of how to discuss? Okay. Understood. Accepted? Okay.

0011
1   Let me -- let me do this. I'm channelling
2 James here. I'm trying to learn this -- this heirloom
3 librarian is trying to learn Google doc crap, you know?
4 Hang on. I'm sure if I was using an Apple, this would
5 go much faster.
6   Okay. So we have discussed what is now C.
7 And now, we're -- we're now at the report, a Borndigital
8 report, "Ingestion of Agency Documents in the Fedsys,"
9 that issue. What do we have to say about that?
10   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
11   MR. SHULER: James, thank you.
12   MR. JACOBS: Sorry. It's FDsys, not Fedsys.
13   MR. SHULER: Oh.
14   MR. JACOBS: Sorry for the wordsmithing.
15   MR. SHULER: That's okay. You'd think after
16 26 years in the business I'd get these initialisms.
17 Anything else on that one? Do we want to slug it with
18 anything? Okay.
19   All right. Can we then declare closed the
20 discussion on the rough draft recommendations?
21   MS. LAWHUN: Can we go back to C then, Report
22 of Borndigital? Are we saying -- Kathy Lawhun, San
0012
1 Francisco -- retention or catching, or I can't think of
2 words of the Borndigital -- management? Something about
3 what are we trying to get on the digitally born?
4 Because we have two report reports.
5   MR. SHULER: Okay. Why don't we -- if --
6 report of managing Borndigital reports? A managing --
7   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think what she's
8 trying to say --
9   MR. SHULER: Oh. Take one of the reports out?
10   MS. LAWHUN: And substitute a more -- a more
11 descriptive term.
12   MR. SHULER: Okay. Then somebody suggest that
13 more descriptive term.
14   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
15 State Library. Content?
16   MR. SHULER: Content. Digital content? Am I
17 going in the right direction? Digital content? Okay.
18 "Semicolon, Ingestion of Agency Documents into FDsys."
19 Is that right?
20   Okay. I am having a senior moment. Let's go
21 back to the heirloom legacy historical. Did we agree
22 that it was historical, and we're changing it to that?

0013
1 Okay. Thank you. No? Okay. That's what -- that's
2 what I thought.
3   MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State
4 University. To me the historical collection is the
5 pre-'76. The stuff, we have a lot of print that's not
6 -- it's just -- it's not current, but it's not
7 historical. It's just in print. So why don't we. I
8 could go with that.
9   MR. SHULER: Print?
10   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears. University of
11 North Texas. Can we say tangible so we include fish?
12   MR. SHULER: Okay. On the table now is
13 digitization of tangible collections. Going once?
14 Twice? Sold. Corporal -- no, tangible. There he is
15 typing away. Can spell tangible.
16   All right. Any -- any remaining discussion
17 with these four points? Audience? Fascinating, right?
18 I think it's better than watching paint dry, personally.
19   Okay. Onto the new recommendations that have
20 yet been drafted by any soul on earth. These are
21 suggestions of where we can go. And I have some
22 preambles on each.
0014
1   With E, "Structure and Purpose of Consultant's
2 Work through Various Means and Devices," GPO has asked
3 the Council to give them direction on what does
4 consultants want, should do, or ought to do. That's
5 what this phrase contains.
6   MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State
7 University. The consultant's report vis-a-vis the
8 reengineering of the FDLP?
9   MR. SHULER: Yes. That -- that money -- help
10 me, GPO folk. How much money was set aside for the
11 consultant? Hundred thousand? Okay.
12   Yes, it's -- it's to advise them how to use
13 the hundred thousand and what to ask the consultant. I
14 will make the observation that this same request was
15 made to the regionals last night at their meeting. So I
16 think we see a parallel action here that the Council's
17 looking at it, and the regionals, and I imagine GPO in
18 its own way might be asking other groups for advice and
19 counsel. So we'll be one of several. Yes?
20   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
21 State Library. I'd like to ask a question of Cindy.
22 What kind of time constraints are we under here? How --

0015
1 how soon do you need this input from Council?
2   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin --
3   MR. SHULER: Is it on?
4   MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The sooner the
5 better.
6   MR. SHULER: Sooner the better. Can you make
7 that a simpler phrase? Sooner? Never mind. Okay. I'm
8 going to write in "sooner the better."
9   MS. ETKIN: Before Buffalo.
10   MR. SHULER: All right. I have also --
11   MS. ETKIN: (Inaudible).
12   MR. SHULER: I've also added the requested
13 phrase to "The Structure and Purpose of Consultant's
14 Work and Spending Plan," sooner the better. I like
15 that. Stephen King's got nothing on us.
16   Okay. Any other questions about E?
17 Discussion? Going onto F. What? I think somebody's
18 turned off the lights. It's like Christmas trees. No,
19 I think this one's disconnected the end. Christmas tree
20 lights. I can't believe that was censored. We will not
21 stop talking about the issues. All right. Gwen?
22   MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of
0016
1 Hawaii. Because the amount of money for the consultants
2 is so small --
3   MR. SHULER: Yeah?
4   MS. SINCLAIR: -- I am just wondering if we
5 should say something in there about this -- should we
6 throw in the scope of the work? Since I -- I'm doubtful
7 that $100,000 would really cover what we originally
8 intended in our recommendation?
9   MR. SHULER: Scope of the work to reflect size
10 of budget. All right. Done. All right. Anything else
11 on E? Moving onto F.
12   MS. SANDERS: John?
13   MR. SHULER: Yes? Ann?
14   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
15 Michigan. Are we assigning people to these various new
16 ones or not?
17   MR. SHULER: Nope.
18   MS. SANDERS: Okay.
19   MR. SHULER: As we move along, and, in fact,
20 we're just coming to that. Yes?
21   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
22   MR. SHULER: So -- and we'll work out the -- we have --

0017
 1 in our previous conversations from yesterday, we're --
 2 we're starting to sort ourselves out. I'm going to have
 3 the suggestion for the next one, and we'll work it out
 4 that way. Okay?
 5   F, GPO Funding and Direction. I love that it
 6 -- it's nice and universal. I have one specific chair
 7 directive, and that is I'm asking that myself and
 8 Suzanne take the lead on this. But where I'm going with
 9 this is that GPO specifically asked Council for
10 information on their budget priorities for FY '10 and FY
11 '11. And that is, of course, all the other stuff
12 outside of the consultant's report naturally and other
13 smaller issues.
14   But I -- I'm trying to suggest a way that
15 Council can efficiently organize itself over the next
16 four weeks because the if I understand the request
17 correctly -- and maybe GPO folk can correct me -- but I
18 think they need this sooner than later; is that correct?
19   MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Just one slight
20 clarification on that one, John?
21   MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.
22   MR. PRIEBE: So the FY 2010 budget's been
0018
 1 approved?
 2   MR. SHULER: Yeah.
 3   MR. PRIEBE: So the input we were seeking from
 4 Council was more in terms of the spending plans and how
 5 we could prioritize that money for 2010?
 6   MR. SHULER: Yes. Yeah.
 7   MR. PRIEBE: And then 2011 what we can
 8 request, specific to that, we need to get a preliminary
 9 2011 budget submission in in November. But I can follow
10 back up and reaffirm a hard date with you on when we
11 absolutely have to have that '11 or fiscal year '11
12 number in. Thank you.
13   MR. SHULER: Okay. And I -- I predict that
14 this will be one of those documents that will be very
15 heavily used on Google docs because Suzanne and I will
16 be reporting back to you much as a response to keep you
17 apace of what the discussion is. Okay? Suzanne?
18   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
19 Texas. So I'm looking down here at the finished
20 recommendations about the desktop and community. So are
21 we then putting the funding for --
22   MR. SHULER: No.

0019
 1   MS. SEARS: -- or the priority for that up
 2 under F? Or --
 3   MR. SHULER: No. I think we've already
 4 launched. We've already had the conversation with GPO
 5 about that yesterday. And I believe that the group that
 6 is already working on that, you three, should follow
 7 through with the funding issues.
 8   MS. SEARS: The only issue there is that we
 9 have been requested to make it a formal recommendation
10 so that it was a priority for budget.
11   MR. SHULER: That is correct. And you would
12 -- I think -- and Council can be corrected if Council --
13 Chair is wrong. God, I'm being influenced by GPO here.
14   I -- I think Council would be fully accepting
15 that if you break down the budget structures in your
16 recommendation, it does not take away from what we're
17 trying to do in F. It's just a small part of the
18 universe, just as we separated out the funding issue
19 from the consultant's report.
20   I don't see any reason why we have to stop the
21 good work you've been doing for the last two months on
22 the communications issues just because we suddenly
0020
 1 created a topic for larger funding issues for FY '10 and
 2 FY '11. Is that okay? Okay.
 3   Well, thank you. Jill was very good. She
 4 suggested I missed a word there, and that should be --
 5 even though this may sound like a riddle, these are
 6 finished draft recommendations. So pardon me. It was a
 7 missing word there that gives everything context. Yes,
 8 the Council is only as strong as the weakest link.
 9 Thank you. All right.
10   MS. LAWHUN: John?
11   MR. SHULER: Yes?
12   MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco. But
13 I think back to Suzanne's point, yes, we finished part
14 of the recommendation, but we don't want to get the
15 budget things lost in the finished recommendations.
16   MR. SHULER: No.
17   MS. LAWHUN: We need to pull that out and put
18 it up to F, correct?
19   MR. SHULER: Yes.
20   MS. LAWHUN: Okay.
21   MR. SHULER: And so, that's where using the
22 Google docs application I hope gives -- this heirloom

0021
 1 librarian hopes it will be of great assistance to us to
 2 keep it all in track. Okay?
 3   All right. My timekeeper reminds me that we
 4 are now at zero minutes, so I'm going to borrow from the
 5 minutes we saved in the earlier section. And we are now
 6 at "Regional Issues."
 7   And I -- here, I simply am -- coming out of
 8 the meeting from the regional meeting yesterday, it was
 9 clear that there were still some issues remaining about
10 item numbers and selection that I have asked David,
11 Gwen, and Ann to look further into on behalf of the
12 Council and on behalf of the regional librarians, and
13 they will be working with GPO and will have a report
14 between the meetings and a report, hopefully, for
15 Buffalo to resolve these questions. Okay?
16   And these are specifically questions revolving
17 around item numbers, selection, and classification. And
18 rather than filling up the time at this meeting, I -- I
19 feel that we should just let them do the work so we -- I
20 have as much facts -- it's good language there -- as
21 many facts as we have before we could discuss it fully.
22   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: John, you meant to
0022
 1 include "disposal" in there, didn't you?
 2   MR. SHULER: Yes.
 3   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.
 4   MR. SHULER: Shotgun approach, yes. So let me
 5 get that in there. Disposal and selection. We'll just
 6 cover it with those two words. Covers a multitude of
 7 sins, I suppose.
 8   Okay. And as I was reminded, the XML database
 9 issue, we do -- the team that was responsible for the
10 recommendation number one, has agreed to be the group to
11 work on that. And I hope you all still want to work on
12 it. You still excited about that? Good. That's --
13 that's what I like to see. Yes.
14   And that is -- that is, again, to remind
15 ourselves is from the specific request from the Public
16 Printer of the Council come up with effective ways to
17 evaluate and help plan for how a depository library's
18 may use this downloading opportunity in an effective
19 fashion. Any other issues about that?
20   I, updating handbook. I think -- Jill, did
21 you -- just -- updating handbook's enough?
22   MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

0023
1   MR. SHULER: Okay.
2   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
3   Texas. Evaluating the handbook for discrepancies, I
4   think.
5   MR. SHULER: Updating, evaluating for --
6   discrepancies. It's in there. All right.
7   Okay. Any other discussion regarding E
8   through I? We're copacetic? Okay. I don't know how
9   much we have to talk about "Finish Recommendations."
10 These are here as place markers to remind ourselves that
11 this is what we worked on yesterday. Yes? Jill.
12   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of
13 Utah. "Finish Draft Recommendations." So people know
14 what we're talking about.
15   MR. SHULER: How do you guys put up with me?
16 Finish draft recommendations.
17   MS. SANDERS: John, hang on a second.
18   MR. SHULER: Yeah.
19   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
20 Michigan. Evaluate and Update the Handbook, is that
21 Jill and Suzanne --
22   MR. SHULER: Oh, excuse me. Yeah. If you
0024
1   want to -- same group want to continue on, follow up on
2   that? Yeah.
3   MS. SANDERS: So that's Jill, Suzanne, and
4   Colleen. Thank you.
5   MR. SHULER: Yeah. I'm sorry. The asumption
6   being that if these come from the former
7   recommendations, then the same people continue to work
8   on it. Sorry.
9   Okay. Now, these sentences I took directly
10 from the documents themselves, probably the first
11 sentence or first fragments. The only thing we acted
12 upon yesterday to remind us is that we agreed to use
13 collaborative web tools between now and the Spring
14 meeting in order to accomplish our tasks.
15   And we agreed on what we called the "pragmatic
16 approach to the necessary record-keeping and posting of
17 relevant documents to the FDLP desktop from Council's
18 deliberations." I was -- I think that's out of the
19 Soviet Union somewhere.
20   And we've agreed Camilla -- Dan? Dan, you
21 were going to find the missing documents, right? Yeah.
22 So that Camilla and I would form a team, and I think

0025
1 this would be an example of the -- of the detailed
2 agenda I would provide her. Correct? And that she
3 would work from those notes. And that you agree, too,
4 then to also post the documents to our web space on
5 community desktop. Not bad, huh? Okay.
6   All the rest of it, I believe, is in process.
7 We have not come to terms on the exact wording of those
8 drafts. And, obviously, we have some more questions to
9 ask of GPO and ourselves before those can be finished.
10   Am I missing anything from what we discussed
11 yesterday? Okay. And to review and practice a little
12 bit, we are going to be letting the community know at
13 the 10:30 slot that we are working with GPO to enhance
14 the FDLP desktop with more effective web tools and to
15 seek a priority and other issues to make sure it happens
16 expeditiously.
17   All right. Now, this is the part I like.
18 We're down to the Spring, 2009 recommendations, and I
19 would really, really hope we could bring some closure on
20 this and actually say before the community that these
21 are done. Not all of them, but a couple of them. And I
22 made a guess here on which ones I think we completed, so
0026
1 the first recommendation, let's start with that. Did we
2 meet that recommendation?
3   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: John?
4   MR. SHULER: Yeah.
5   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess a narrow
6 reading that the recommendation from the Spring said
7 "secure funding" or "GPO should secure funding" has been
8 done, but I feel real uncomfortable saying that
9 recommendation is done because nothing's been done
10 except getting some money which, as Gwen points out, may
11 not really be enough for what we thought.
12   So I would be okay if we put down that some
13 funding has been secured, but I -- I don't feel
14 comfortable saying it's done because what's done?
15 Nothing. Right?
16   MR. SHULER: Council?
17   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan -- Dan O'Mahony, Brown
18 University. And that directly relates to item E on the
19 previous page.
20   MR. SHULER: Yes.
21   MR. O'MAHONY: So it -- it implies that we're
22 not completely done if -- if there is the necessary

0027
1 implementation and next steps involved there.
2   MR. SHULER: Okay. So anybody else? Somebody
3 --
4   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right, John, I
5 don't want to burst your bubble, but --
6   MR. SHULER: That's okay. My poor heart. Is
7 it the stance of the Council then that we maybe tag this
8 with further action from Fall, 2009? Would that be more
9 appropriate? Oh, man.
10   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of
11 Utah. Just "Further Action Needed."
12   MR. SHULER: That's what -- okay. That's what
13 that -- further action from. Okay.
14   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
15 State Library. I think that we might be able to bring
16 closure to this recommendation as it is written
17 literally. And then we can simply open up the -- the
18 other earlier draft to include a statement that we want
19 something delivered at the end of the process so we can
20 bring closure to that first recommendation.
21   MR. SHULER: So what you're recommending is we
22 can have our cake and eat it, too? We can declare --
0028
1 that technically we accomplished that, but by further
2 study, we've opened up another agenda item based on
3 this. I like that.
4   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski. I -- I don't
5 mean open up another -- another letter --
6   MR. SHULER: No.
7   MR. CISMOWSKI: -- in the draft here.
8   MR. SHULER: No.
9   MR. CISMOWSKI: But simply expand that word --
10   MR. SHULER: Simply refer to -- yeah. Refer
11 to B.
12   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
13 I guess I would just suggest that in the spirit of the
14 Chair's initial advice that, you know, the
15 recommendations are means to an end and a part of an
16 ongoing conversation with GPO. On this point, the
17 conversation continues.
18   MR. SHULER: Okay. Second and third
19 recommendations, I think, we can treat as one, since
20 they were treated as one here at the Council meeting. I
21 recommended that we are still working on those two.
22 Would that be about right? Okay.

0029
1   The fourth and fifth recommendations
2   technically are still being worked on as well. Okay? I
3   mean, there was some closure on a couple of issues in
4   that we had specifically asked that a session be offered
5   on the process that happened, but there were other
6   issues that opened up and are continuing and
7   specifically related to the other group involving the
8   regionals' questions. Okay? So we'll label those as
9   continuing. Okay?
10   Okay. Here's -- here's another shot for John.
11   The sixth recommendation, did we finish that?
12   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of
13   Utah. Yes. Done.
14   MR. SHULER: Hallelujah. Everybody agree?
15   Let it stand here today that Council finished a
16   recommendation.
17   Of course, go back to our regularly scheduled
18   program, the seventh recommendation we didn't even -- we
19   addressed this indirectly at a smaller operations
20   meeting that GPO hosted yesterday afternoon. But I have
21   a funny feeling that we're not done talking about this.
22   Okay?
0030
1   Okay. Now, in terms of how we handle this at
2   the 10:30 meeting, I suggest we start off in almost the
3   reverse order. We started off with the recommendations
4   from the Tampa meeting. We wrap those up, and then we
5   move in to discussing the new items, agreed? Okay.
6   Any other comments from Council about all
7   those previous items?
8   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
9   Texas. John, can we just go back to the recommendation
10   on the report -- let me find it again -- Recommendation
11   Four says that we just recommend that they report on the
12   disposal, which they did.
13   MR. SHULER: Uh-huh.
14   MS. SEARS: We've got the new recommendation
15   on the front where we're talking about disposal under
16   regional issues.
17   MR. SHULER: Uh-huh.
18   MS. SEARS: I -- I -- I'm just thinking. I
19   mean, if our original recommendation was that they
20   report at this meeting, that's done.
21   MR. SHULER: Get out. Really? Thank you,
22   Suzanne. Can we get away with that? Number four?

1 Declare it done? Hallelujah. Thank you, sister. Wow.
2 David? You going to break my heart?
3   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
4 Texas. I mean, as long as we're still -- I mean, the
5 disposal is still in issue, but we've got that on the
6 front page under the regional issues, correct?
7   MR. SHULER: Okay. So unless David --
8 unless -- this will be big for the team, David.
9   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
10 State Library. Well, once again, if we just take the
11 literal words that are in the Tampa recommendation, we
12 have completed this. However, during the report
13 session, there were a number of -- well, the -- the
14 entire thrust, I think, of the session that we had on
15 that recommendation was to engage the audience in
16 brainstorming on how to improve the disposal process and
17 also to automate the needs and offers process. And that
18 is an ongoing discussion.
19   And so if we close out this recommendation,
20 then I think we need to insert a new recommendation in
21 the earlier ones that deals with this ongoing process.
22   MR. SHULER: Okay. Can I ask the three of you
1 that have been tasked with the regional issue to include
2 that as part of the portfolio to help continue the
3 conversation on so that we can close this one off? Is
4 that acceptable?
5   Yes. That's two done. Yes, we can raise our
6 heads and be proud. All right. Anything else on the
7 seven heirloom recommendations?
8   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Standford University.
9 John, I notice -- sorry to go back to number three -- I
10 thought that I was working on number two and number
11 three?
12   MR. SHULER: (Inaudible). I may have pulled
13 this from --
14   MR. JACOBS: I don't --
15   MR. SHULER: -- this is not authenticated
16 anyway. I just ripped this off what I thought was the
17 latest one.
18   MR. JACOBS: So I only -- I only see Tori and
19 you listed as the third recommendation?
20   MR. SHULER: Okay. I would -- I would use
21 these names as suggestive. If you know you're missing,
22 go ahead and reassert yourself. This is -- sorry. This

0033
1 is like that movie, the movie "Sixth Sense." I see
2 council people. You know? You just don't know they're
3 missing.
4   Go ahead and -- this is taken from an earlier
5 draft of those documents we have been exchanging, so go
6 ahead and put yourself back in the picture if you're
7 missing. Thank God we're not doing this in front of
8 anybody in the public, you know?
9   All right. Third call on the seven heirloom
10 recommendations. Any further discussion? All right.
11 So at the 10:30 show, we'll be discussing what we've
12 completed with these heirloom collections. We'll be
13 discussing our next set of recommendations with the --
14 with the GPO and the public. Do we need to add anything
15 else to the 10:30 meeting? Take a moment.
16   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
17 As we work to implement some of the new community-based
18 communications enhancements for Council, since a good
19 bit of our work will be done in between meetings, I
20 think maybe just some assurance to the community that we
21 will be communicating between -- you know, that Buffalo
22 won't be the next time that they necessarily hear some
0034
1 of the progress toward -- toward the end.
2   Since we don't have definitive statements here
3 or even, in some cases, the full scope of what, you
4 know, we're going to be moving forward with, so it would
5 be nice if we can also, then, sort of have a interim
6 plan for communication, if you will?
7   MR. SHULER: Okay. What I'll say -- what I'll
8 say at 10:30 as we said at different times during our
9 gatherings, is that we all agree that we're going to
10 fill the time between Buffalo and here with this -- what
11 we -- what I'm calling the long meeting, which is going
12 to use the interactive tools of both the desktop, as
13 well as those other tools that we'll use, to communicate
14 with GPO, with ourselves, and with the community to keep
15 them posted on our progress. And if we feel risky, to
16 even at -- ask for their further questions through those
17 means.
18   So though we will physically adjourn from this
19 meeting in a short while, I fully expect if we stay true
20 to these purposes, we will be -- this will be an ongoing
21 conversation for the months between meetings. That's my
22 -- that is what my intention is as Chair. Yes. And I

0035
1 will say as much as 10:30.
2   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
3 Texas. Do we have a timeline for when our formal
4 recommendations are going to be presented to GPO?
5   MR. SHULER: As Chair, I would like to have
6 the recommendations done that we want to move forward on
7 quickly by early November.
8   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
9 Did I miss something yesterday, or did we discuss
10 law.gov?
11   MR. SHULER: Yeah, I'll throw that -- that we
12 can discuss -- okay. James --
13   MR. JACOBS: Or is that just a new
14 recommendation going forward or --
15   MR. SHULER: I don't know if we have had --
16 can we throw it in as a discussion item, rather than a
17 recommendation, since we really haven't had a chance to
18 talk with about it with everything else going on?
19   Okay. So I'll throw that out and then maybe
20 look to you to lead the discussion or just to guide
21 people what the issues are? Okay. So I'll add that to
22 the possible -- okay. What else?
0036
1   MS. LAWHUN: John? Kathy Lawhun, San
2 Francisco.
3   MR. SHULER: Yes.
4   MS. LAWHUN: The -- on the first page, then,
5 you've got "Rough Draft Recommendations," and then
6 you've got "New Recommendations," but both of those are
7 mixtures of continuing issues from the Fall
8 recommendations --
9   MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.
10   MS. LAWHUN: -- with a few new ones.
11   MR. SHULER: With a few new ones, correct.
12   MS. LAWHUN: So do we want to just say "all
13 recommendations?" Or do we want to make it clear
14 there's some new ones, and then there's some continuing
15 ones?
16   MR. SHULER: It may be -- may be between now
17 -- I'm beginning to think that since we're really trying
18 to engage the community on a continuous basis,
19 distinguishing between new and old is going to become
20 rather meaningless. So we'll just call this the stream
21 of recommendations. And this is what we're fishing from
22 it today. Okay? We'll just go with that.

0037
 1   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
 2 State Library. What about the strategic plan draft?
 3 Because we have spent a lot of time over the last two
 4 Council meetings discussing the wording of that draft,
 5 and also the Public Printer made reference to
 6 assumptions that are in that draft and brand-new goals.
 7 And I believe that he was implying that Council should
 8 do some work on those assumptions and goals, and perhaps
 9 move along the draft of the strategic plan.
10   MR. SHULER: What do people think?
11   MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair,
12 University of Hawaii. I -- I think we should ask the
13 Public Printer what he -- what his intention is for
14 that.
15   MR. SHULER: Maybe -- maybe "to carve a path"
16 is what I could say at the 10:30 meeting is that the
17 Chair will ask specifically the public prayer -- the
18 Public Printer to tell us what he wants us to do with
19 this strategic draft. That will be our action, David,
20 and that will guide our further -- any other further
21 activity once we get more information. How does that
22 sound?
0038
 1   MR. CISMOWSKI: For the record, since this is
 2 being recorded, and you asked a question, yes. That
 3 sounds fine.
 4   MR. SHULER: Thank you, David. Chair will ask
 5 Public Printer. Okay.
 6   Let's see. Of course, there's always the
 7 tradition, I think, that has been in the past, but at
 8 different times I've been reviewing -- I've been
 9 reviewing recommendations of yore, as well as
10 transcripts from previous time space continuums.
11   And I notice there's always a formal moment in
12 the process about the 10:30 meeting where there is a
13 formal recommendation, where the Council thanks GPO for
14 the wonderful job it did in organizing the meeting. I
15 suggest that I just say that in a formal way, rather
16 than putting together a recommendation. I think they'll
17 understand. Okay? Anything else?
18   I think the only other thing we might --
19 whether or not we want to discuss this at all is perhaps
20 get some feedback on the arrangements that the Council
21 hear. I think, most of what I heard, it was positive,
22 and I hope that will continue. But perhaps we should,

0039
1 maybe not today, but in our future discussions between
2 meetings, further implement the changes we made and the
3 arrangements of how we discussed things and the
4 furniture for Buffalo to make sure it's as effective as
5 possible.
6   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
7 Texas. John, I think maybe in the 10:30 meeting, if you
8 could remind people to fill out their evaluations --
9   MR. SHULER: Yes. Yes.
10   MS. SEARS: -- and to turn them in, that it's
11 very important that we know how it went from the
12 audience's point of view.
13   MR. SHULER: I have a handwritten note from
14 Lance with exactly that directive, so I am -- I'll --
15 I'll properly do my job. You're welcome. Okay.
16 Buffalo meeting arrangements. All right. Anything
17 else? Gosh. Yes?
18   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
19 Texas. If we're finishing early at this meeting,
20 perhaps we should go ahead and discuss law.gov because
21 the next meeting's going to be pretty full, and I think
22 that discussion is going to be pretty lengthy.
0040
1   MR. SHULER: We got 35 minutes everybody --
2 okay with that? Let's get that discussed and
3 under the belt and get it into the recommendation
4 screen. James, lead us.
5   MR. JACOBS: Okay. James Jacobs, Stanford
6 University. So what I had suggested was that law.gov,
7 which is at public.resource.org/law.gov. It's a
8 proposed registry and repository of all primary legal
9 materials of the United States. And they will be coming
10 out with a report sometime in the first quarter of 2010.
11   That report will be -- and I'm reading from
12 their web page -- documenting exactly what it would take
13 to create a distributed registry and repository of all
14 primary legal materials of the United States.
15   And so my suggestion was that DLC request from
16 the co-conveners of this proposed registry and
17 repository that we request a copy of that report. And
18 that was -- that was all of the -- the -- that was all
19 that I was asking for.
20   MR. SHULER: Okay.
21   MR. JACOBS: So, you know, when we get the
22 report, then we can decide whether we need to -- whether

0041
1 we need to comment or anything like that. But I think
2 since they have already gotten a registry of responses
3 from several groups that want the report, including the
4 senate committee on Homeland Security and Governmental
5 Affairs, that it would be -- it would be a nice show to
6 have Depository Library Council on that list as well.
7   MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair,
8 University of Hawaii. That sounds great to me. Is this
9 something that we would want to have a council session
10 on in Buffalo?
11   MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.
12 I would prefer that it -- if -- if this is something
13 that we're going to take seriously, we need more
14 information than what is on that website and the report,
15 and I would ask that we have some sort of subcommittee
16 within the Council group.
17   Just because there's information, there's
18 other press releases out there that are indicating that
19 this is more than what is just on the -- the website or
20 the press release. So I would like more information
21 before Council makes any sort of recommendation or
22 considers this as an option.
0042
1   MR. SHULER: Does anybody want to volunteer
2 for that group? James, obviously. Do enough -- okay.
3 So we got -- so four. So we got Justin, James, Sally
4 and Camilla, right?
5   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
6 And I wanted to make it clear that I'm just requesting
7 the report. I -- I wasn't suggesting that -- that DLC,
8 you know, put their stamp of approval on this or
9 anything like that. I just would like to get an
10 official report.
11   MR. SHULER: Okay. So you four will birddog
12 that for us and then -- okay.
13   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
14 Just a dumb question for clarification, despite the name
15 of this thing, law.gov, did -- am I correct in that this
16 is not a government enterprise?
17   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs. I believe it is not
18 an official government enterprise. It is a suggestion
19 for having the domain "law.gov." But if you look at the
20 co-conveners, you'll see that they are largely
21 academics; Pam Samuelson from Berkley Law, John Pedesta
22 (ph) used to be a government official. Tim Woo -- and

0043
1 so these are mostly legal scholars that are interested
2 in this, as well as some commercial entities like
3 O'Reilly Media -- yeah.
4   MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff. Val Po
5 Law. From reading this though, they're seeking enabling
6 legislation, so they want it to be a government entity.
7 And there's some very misleading information in just
8 this paper that James gave us that, I think, is
9 contradicted by some of the things they're posting
10 online.
11   MR. SHULER: Is Council still comfortable
12 then? We have got -- you got four people that want to
13 work on it. It's currently in issue.
14   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
15 Well, certainly, it's good to stay apprised of
16 activities in this field. And as James said, requesting
17 a report is seeking additional information, and we'll
18 take a look at it and see what happens. So, sounds
19 good.
20   MR. SHULER: I did forget to mention that
21 Sally and I are a team looking at our by-laws. I need
22 to add that.
0044
1   And there is another one I want to bring up.
2 It's something I've been hearing about during the
3 conference at different times, and that is the issue
4 over the American Public Health Reports and access to
5 that database and whether or not it truly meets the
6 standards of depository access by the public.
7   And that opens up a general issue of how these
8 databases are -- might be restricted in other ways.
9 What does -- what is Council's thinking on that?
10   MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of
11 Utah. I guess I need more definition. Were you
12 thinking of that as a -- a rough draft recommendation?
13   MR. SHULER: I'm just bringing it up as an
14 issue. It's not even reached the recommendation. I'm
15 just talking about chatter that I've heard around the
16 conference that people are concerned about this. That's
17 certainly been the topic amongst (inaudible) people, as
18 well as others.
19   And there seems to be differing information
20 about what is allowed, who's allowed to access it, and
21 who isn't. And I think it is of such importance
22 considering we're moving into a digital environment

1 where it's not just access to actual documents, but
2 databases. It might behoove the Council to raise this
3 on its radar a little bit, at least to give it some
4 focus. Perhaps by buffalo. Perhaps sooner.
5   Would anybody be willing to work on this?
6 Jill? Anybody else? David? Okay. Anybody else?
7 Thank you. We can report to the community then at 10:30
8 that we're going to be looking into that. I think that
9 will offer some assurance that we're not letting it go
10 unnoticed.
11   Yes. Okay. All right. Any other issues? Is
12 it the sense of Council that we have used this 14th
13 session effectively, and we have no other things to add
14 to our 10:30 show? Looking around the table. John
15 Shuler from the University of Illinois in Chicago sees
16 none. I -- I hear -- I seek a motion to adjourn?
17   MS. SEARS: So moved, Suzanne Sears,
18 University of North Texas.
19   MR. SHULER: Shall we have a vote?
20   MS. MORIEARTY: Second, Jill Moriearty,
21 University of Utah.
22   MR. SHULER: Let it be. How do we vote?

1 Let's get out of here. See everybody at 10:30. Thank
2 you, audience, for being patient.
3   (Brief recess)
4   MR. SHULER: We're going to start the program.
5 No, no. That's okay. I'm trying to remember what I was
6 about to do. No, something else. Something else.
7 That's okay. There it is.
8   We'll get started here in a moment. I'm
9 tweeting out to the community here where I am and what
10 I'm doing. I'll be done in a moment. You can blame
11 James really.
12   Okay. If I could ask -- almost there. We're
13 missing a council member. Hate to start without her.
14 Well -- all right. Here we go. Yes, that's better. I
15 call to session the last plenary meeting of the Fall,
16 2009 Depository Library Council Meeting. Hallelujah.
17   And I have, again, by law -- by GPO law, I'm
18 required to announce things, so I'm going to do my best
19 here. And I got to say this with capital letters with
20 an exclamation point, please do evaluations of your
21 sessions. Turn them in. GPO values your input and
22 wants to hear what you have to say.

1   If you are being certified by any of these
2   sessions, and you need to have demonstrated proof of
3   that, they will be available at the 10:00 o'clock break
4   if request -- if you had requested it while you -- when
5   you registered. So obviously, it's 10:30, so if you
6   haven't done that, get -- get to it.
7   Thanks Lance. Okay. The other thing I should
8   say by law is if you have something to say, come to the
9   mike. You know the routine. Name, rank, serial number.
10 Okay? And to stand as a perfect example, John Shuler,
11 University of Illinois in Chicago.
12   We are going to do something that we started
13 doing in Tampa, which is to talk about the
14 recommendations rather than giving you full-blown
15 recommendations. We want you to help guide us, if you
16 will, through the process. And we're going to have some
17 specific ways to do that.
18   And what we intend to do because this work is
19 important to us, we intend to continue the conversation
20 through other means primarily through the Federal
21 Documents Desktop, community desktop, seeking to get
22 input from you, but also to give you the recommendations
1   when we're done writing them. And hopefully, not soon
2   after that or at the same time, responses from GPO.
3   We view this time, the six months between the
4   Spring and Fall meeting to be part of these meetings.
5   It's what we call our "long meeting strategy." So I
6   started -- I -- I've been making different parts of --
7   about -- being Chair of Council is like being the mayor
8   of Brigadoon except it lasts five and a half -- five
9   days instead of one. And I'm hoping to extend that
10 feeling of power a little bit longer before I have to
11 give it up completely.
12   So we fully intend to use a number of
13 opportunities and tools to work with you and communicate
14 with you during those six months when we don't see each
15 other. Okay?
16   So what I'd like to do, then, is begin our
17 discussion with the -- bringing some closure. What the
18 Council was very interested in was bringing some closure
19 on what we have done. And we want to review the seven
20 recommendations, five of which were the subject of the
21 break-out sessions that Council managed over the last
22 two and a half days. And we're going to tell you how we

0049
1 did with that.
2   And on the first recommendation which was "To
3 meet the goals of providing no-fee permanent public
4 access to government information, Council recommends
5 that GPO seek funding to hire an outside consultant to
6 deliver a range of models." That's the opening
7 statement.
8   The Council feels that work continues on this
9 even though funding has been acquired, and one of our
10 new agendas will be new recommendations will be focusing
11 on the work that needs to be done further on that.
12   The second and third recommendations which
13 looked at the digitization possibilities of cooperation
14 and collaboration among depository libraries and with
15 GPO, specifically speaking to seeking funding sources to
16 support that effort. We feel that some of that was
17 acquired in the sense that we had a discussion about it,
18 but we have further work to do on them.
19   The fifth recommendation and the sixth
20 recommendation with -- excuse me -- the fourth and fifth
21 recommendations which spoke to Disposal and Selection
22 Process, we are going to continue part of that
0050
1 discussion. There were questions that were raised in
2 the regionals' meeting that had some specific issues
3 that we needed to gather more information.
4   So Council has designated three of its
5 members, all of whom are regional librarians, who will
6 work on those issues with GPO and come back and report
7 to us when we have more and, hopefully, better
8 information to resolve those issues. So until we can
9 close that, we cannot particularly close those two
10 recommendations.
11   Now, Council, help me out here. I think -- I
12 think I'm using an old document, so I'm going to be a
13 little embarrassed here for a moment. The sixth
14 recommendation I think we declared done. Correct? Yes.
15   And that recommendation was "Council further
16 recommends that GPO continue the implementation of the
17 new model of public access assessments, including site
18 visits, et cetera." And we feel that the conversation
19 we had at this conference has accomplished what the
20 spirit of the recommendation has done, though we did
21 notice there was a couple of other things we wanted to
22 follow up on.

0051
1   The seventh recommendation which involves
2   control -- quality control issues in three areas;
3   classification, cataloging, and tangible distribution.
4   There was a session hosted by GPO that addressed aspects
5   of that, but Council feels that it is something we need
6   to pursue.
7   Now, Council help me here because this
8   document is not helping me. We had another done item.
9   Which one was that? Was it the fifth? Was it?
10 Recommendation Four? Okay. Good. Thank you.
11   We did close out Recommendation Number Four
12 which spoke to the best practices of streamlining the
13 disposal process and specifically having a long session
14 about that, about the details and best practices.
15 Though there are other aspects, as I said earlier, that
16 are being taken up by the regionals.
17   So as a new tradition, Council wants to begin
18 by saying what it's completed. Not bad, huh? No, I
19 guess, there's still work to be done. Now, does Council
20 have any further remarks, observations they want to make
21 about that? Those points? Yes?
22   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
0052
1   State Library. Even though the fourth recommendation on
2   the disposal process is declared closed, we're doing
3   this because the recommendation was that GPO deliver a
4   report at this meeting. That is the extent of the
5   closure of this.
6   As you know if you attended that session,
7   there are going to be ongoing -- there's going to be
8   ongoing work on this. So the -- the closure is just
9   about that report that was delivered.
10   MR. SHULER: Any other comments from Council?
11 Okay. We are now going to open up the -- where
12 Council's going with ongoing recommendations that stem
13 from the 2009 recommendations. And these are really
14 going to be what are simply called "topic sentences" of
15 the work that is really ongoing.
16   Council only met to work on these issues for
17 about -- amongst the two and a half days, probably four
18 hours total. And a lot of what is going on required a
19 lot of other information we felt we should acquire
20 before we really flesh out these recommendations and
21 share them with GPO and then share them with the
22 community.

1   So what we want to do is introduce each of
2 these topic sentences, if you will, and the Council is
3 going discuss them. We're going to open it up for
4 conversation with GPO and then with the audience.
5   So I'm going to begin first with the --
6 actually three issues that address the digitization
7 recommendations, in that Council is recommending that in
8 order to achieve some kind of coordination and
9 collaboration amongst depository libraries to
10 effectively digitize what we call "the tangible
11 collections," we're seeking to have GPO work closely
12 with the depository library so that there is a
13 coordinated push.
14   Instead of people doing what they think other
15 people aren't doing, there's going to be more
16 information brought in to the conversation. And this --
17 this -- part of this will also include some kind of
18 listing of which libraries want to do what digitization.
19 That's the -- the first topic that we're going to be
20 looking at. So I open that up to Council.
21   MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State
22 University. Actually the task force, the Council task

1 force that looked at the cluster of issues around
2 digitization of the tangible collections was broader
3 than the collaboration effort. It's just one aspect.
4   For example, there -- we like to revisit the
5 registry and have -- we have some ideas about how that
6 might be improved, what kind of information could be
7 there. There's a host of issues around the
8 digitization, so it's not just the collaboration is one
9 aspect of this topic.
10   MR. SHULER: Anybody else from Council? GPO?
11   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. It helped me in
12 hearing Tori's clarification on that because one of the
13 things I mentioned in my speech is, now that we move
14 onto this next phase and given the fact that we have
15 funding associated with digitization, we're going to
16 need to work closely with Council to create a
17 broad-based plan on what we're going to do.
18   And I think as part of that plan, it needs to
19 be very comprehensive. It needs to look at aspects of
20 coordination. It also needs to look at what can be done
21 with the registry to certainly promote it more, make it
22 more inviting, do more to encourage people to come to

0055
 1 it, and also look at it through a gap analysis. Look at
 2 what's missing from it.
 3   I've heard some of the comments that you guys
 4 have heard about things that we can do to enhance it.
 5 And I think we need to look at it from that broad
 6 perspective, associate it with doing the spend plan,
 7 associate it with digitization.
 8   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
 9 Texas. James Jacobss and Tori Trotta and Chris Greer and
10 myself are all part of that particular recommendation,
11 and we have a whole list of -- that we've already
12 started to try and get that a little more comprehensive
13 for you, Rick. I just want to assure you that we -- we
14 have been working on that and hope to get that finalized
15 out for you as quickly as possible.
16   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of
17 Illinois in Chicago. I should emphasize that these are
18 topics rather than the full-fleshed proposals. And what
19 we are seeking to do here is to get questions and ideas
20 from the audience so that when we continue to work on
21 the recommendations, we can use the court reporter's
22 transcripts to harvest those ideas and make sure that
0056
 1 they're part of the recommendations when we're done
 2 here. And that the funding issues, too, Rick, will be
 3 addressed and other recommendations we'll be talking
 4 about shortly.
 5   Anything else from GPO? Members of the
 6 audience, do you want to offer observations? We're
 7 looking for just general input.
 8   MS. SMITH: You never should have put speaker
 9 on my name tag because I can't shut up now. Lori Smith
10 of Southeastern Louisiana University. I'm hoping, but I
11 thought I better mention anyway, that somewhere along
12 the line there will be maybe recommended technical
13 specifications for those doing the digitization
14 projects.
15   I think, if not, those should maybe be created
16 so people will have some guidelines if they want to
17 start one. It's like here's some basic minimum
18 standards you may want to shoot for.
19   And in terms of tracking digitization, I'm --
20 I'm envisioning sort of a digitization map using, like,
21 a list of classes that would highlight for, you know, a
22 SuDoc range what institution had digitized anything in

0057
 1 that range. And you might have, you know, several
 2 institutions for one range and none for another. And
 3 that might help us start to get a feel for what had been
 4 done and where duplication had happened. So if that's
 5 useful, there you go.
 6   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
 7 Texas. I assure you that we took great pains to put as
 8 much as we could from the discussion on digitization. I
 9 do like -- the list of classes is new, so I just jotted
10 that down. But we do have most of those that you were
11 just talking about. They came out of that session. And
12 if you'd like to look over it and see if there's
13 something that's missing, you can see me after the
14 meeting.
15   MR. SHULER: Geoff?
16   MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern
17 University. Since I'm part of the implementation team
18 and the planning team for the CIC digitization effort, I
19 just wanted to know, are you going to be looking at
20 issues around ingest into FD sys of efforts in the
21 community? Is that part of the mandate? I'm little
22 unclear on what -- the kind of things you'll be looking
0058
 1 at?
 2   MR. SHULER: Yes. We can classify these three
 3 topics about recommendations that will be forthcoming
 4 under "Digitization of the Tangible Collections." And
 5 that will include an aspect of ingestion into the Fed
 6 Sys system, so yes.
 7   MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. I -- and I just want to
 8 -- I'll -- I'll extend the invitation now. If you guys
 9 would like to sort of talk to the folks planning the CIC
10 thing, even though it's not in many ways fleshed out
11 yet, feel free to contact me or other members of the
12 team.
13   MR. SHULER: Thank you.
14   MR. SWINDELLS: Thanks.
15   MR. SHULER: So noted. Dan Barkley.
16   MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of
17 Mexico or New Mexico. I forget what my tag says. But I
18 do live in New Mexico, New Mexico. Just to kind of echo
19 echo what Geoff said, I would hope that, you know, John
20 Phillips and I and a couple other people are here from
21 GLOWA (ph). And we're doing, you know, the scientific
22 and technical stuff right now. We've got quite a bit

0059
1 done, and we're going to do quite a bit more. So
2 networking, I think, is real important, so that even if
3 there is overlap, we know what the overlap is and where
4 it's coming from. And we kind of try to make sure we're
5 all on the same page, particularly with standards, so
6 that we can make sure that the whole community shares
7 all these different efforts that are ongoing.
8   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears from University of
9 North Texas. Dan and Geoff, we were looking at doing at
10 least one session, if not two, in Buffalo on ingest into
11 FDsys and digitization. Can I see if both of you were
12 going to be there? Would you be willing to help us out
13 with that?
14   MR. SWINDELLS: I'll be there.
15   MR. BARKLEY: Speaking for Geoff, he'll be
16 there.
17   MS. SEARS: Suzanne. And you, Dan?
18   MR. BARKLEY: Why would I miss Buffalo? I'll
19 be there.
20   MR. SHULER: Yes?
21   MR. RAGAINS: Pat Ragains, University of
22 Nevada, Reno. And what I have to say may -- may be
0060
1 obvious, but I -- I'd kind of like these ideas to be
2 represented in the record of what's been said at the
3 conference. And for all the digitization projects, I
4 think it's important that there be an evaluation phrase
5 to look at what's produced and look at the quality to --
6 to understand what we have once a project's been done.
7   And I think it's -- that's important, in part,
8 because we want to be able to represent what's been done
9 and discuss this in our home libraries properly.
10   And the way I see it is this: It's that
11 digitization does not replace print collections. It --
12 it may replace the need for selective libraries to hold
13 print collections, but as we -- we've seen with the
14 Trails Project and the -- the projects that have been
15 working -- the libraries have been working with the
16 Google Books Project, they're not giving up their last
17 copies. They're giving up duplicate copies, and they're
18 retaining depository copies in their collections.
19   And I think that there's -- there's good
20 reason for that. Once the digitization projects have
21 been completed, these will be new and very useful
22 resources for the entire user community. But I don't

0061
1 think we're at the stage yet where they necessarily
2 replace the need for any print collections.
3   And, again, that may go without saying, but I
4 think it's important that that be in the record. And we
5 can reflect back on that once more work has been done.
6 Thank you.
7   MR. SHULER: Thanks, Pat. So noted.
8   MS. TROTTA: John, can I say something? Tori
9 Trotta, Arizona state University. I'm glad you brought
10 that up. One conversation that we started yesterday was
11 the issue of permanent public access preservation copies
12 versus access copies. And I don't think there's clarity
13 yet, at least for me, about what the GPO role in that
14 is. And I -- I think as a -- we need more input from
15 the community and more dialogue with GPO so that we can
16 be all clear on that arrangement because it speaks to
17 what some of the speakers have been talking about.
18   And so to me that's -- that's like a macro
19 issue that needs to be discussed. And once that has
20 clarified, then the priorities for helping all these
21 other sub-issues in the digitization cluster will -- I
22 think will be easier to articulate and decide on and
0062
1 plan for.
2   MR. SHULER: Also under this topic
3 "Digitization of Tangible Collections," we've included a
4 further recommendation "looking at requests for
5 state-based grant program to encourage collaborative
6 digital projects amongst libraries." And to speak to
7 the issue that Geoff raised, that we look at digital
8 content that is going to be ingested from -- of agency
9 documents into Fedsys through these various digitization
10 initiatives and efforts.
11   So you can think of those three
12 recommendations as covering -- trying to cover the map
13 about this whole vast entangled challenge of
14 digitization. Now that the RFP has gone away, we are
15 going to have to figure out how to do this as a
16 community of librarians and libraries working with GPO,
17 an effect a partnership and collaboration.
18   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
19 Texas. I do want to mention to the community that a lot
20 of what we're looking at where digitization
21 collaboration is concerned is to put that onto the FDLP
22 community website, which we are also recommending be

0063
1 upgraded. So if you're not a member of the FDLP
2 community, you might want to think about becoming one.
3   Because we are talking about maybe the best
4 practices that we heard from that session that you would
5 like if -- if you're starting a digitization project,
6 you'd like to be able to contact somebody who's already
7 done one. How did they face the copyright issues? Is
8 this really worth doing? And all of that, we're looking
9 at using community as the tool for that kind of
10 collaboration.
11   MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana
12 University. One aspect of the digitization world that I
13 think is being missed is usage statistics. In the
14 operational forum yesterday I talked to Ted Priebe about
15 the possibility of FDsys being able to run some reports
16 to give us the one hundred most popular used titles, you
17 know, based on Perl usage. And I've come up with a
18 whole lot of specifications, which I will be emailing
19 him. I came up with four reports I want.
20   But in these other digitization projects, if
21 there's any way for us to get, like a title, level,
22 usage information of some sort. Because with the
0064
1 digital documents, we don't really have the kind of
2 circulation information that we've always had with the
3 print. So I'm finding it very hard to do collection
4 development for digital documents because I'm not seeing
5 what gets used.
6   With the print world, I always saw on the "to
7 be shelved" truck what people had been using, and I knew
8 what my patrons found useful. We're not getting that
9 usage information with the digital documents. So that's
10 just another aspect to keep in mind with all these
11 projects is it would be good to have that.
12   MS. SEARS: I'm sorry. Can you stay at the
13 mike for just one moment? Suzanne Sears, University of
14 North Texas. Just -- I need a little more clarification
15 because I mean, for each university, like the University
16 of North Texas, we have an enormous set of digital
17 collections. I can run you the top ten used from my
18 collection.
19   MS. SMITH: Mm-hmm.
20   MS. SEARS: But -- so are you wanting, like, a
21 page where each institution would put their top ten? I
22 -- I'm just trying to see --

0065
 1   MS. SMITH: Or some sort of summary. I don't
 2 know how that would be done. But I -- I've tried to get
 3 this locally with our integrated library software. And
 4 the vendor does not give me much hope that we'll have
 5 local data.
 6   So I'm just looking for some sort of national
 7 data of what are the most popular digital publications,
 8 and if it can be, you know, just based on the GPO Perl
 9 server, that's fine. But if we can get something more
10 comprehensive from the other digital collections, that
11 would be great. Maybe that would be something that the
12 people who have those collections would report to GPO
13 somehow like in the biennial survey or something.
14   MS. SEARS: Are you talking about just the
15 digital publications or also the websites? I mean, it
16 almost sound like -- because I know we had a session
17 here that was put on about getting the statistics from
18 your OPAC if those hot links are being used.
19   I'm not sure that it's technically -- and
20 maybe this is why James is sitting here --
21 -- technically going to be possible for -- I
22 mean, I don't know -- I can't see in my head how we
0066
 1 would be able to get all of that data into one -- I
 2 don't know, James. You have a --
 3   MR. JACOBS: Chris Brown? Is Chris still in the --
 4 yeah. Chris Brown with his hand up had a -- had a very
 5 good presentation yesterday about how to -- how to get
 6 those statistics into your catalog.
 7   MS. SMITH: Right. Well, we get the hot link
 8 statistics. We have statistical information. What I
 9 want is the title level information so I know what is
10 being used. And I get the URL's that have been used,
11 but to know what that is, I have to scan it and, you
12 know, put it in my browser to see what title that
13 actually is. I'm not getting that title and subject
14 usage level information like I can with the print just
15 by looking at the returned truck.
16   MR. JACOBS: Right.
17   MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of
18 Illinois Chicago. May I suggest that we make note of
19 that? That we put that aspect of title into what we're
20 looking through.
21   MR. JACOBS: I think Chris might have something
22 to say on that.

0067
1   MR. BROWN: Yeah. Chris Brown, University of
2 Denver. The proceedings will be -- the PowerPoint from
3 our six presentations will be up there, but I can get
4 title level statistics for everything. I know Shane can
5 get them for his and Liza and San Jose state, Suzanne
6 Kendall. And I know -- I'm not sure what Louisiana's
7 Lewis system. Stephanie is -- Bronstein, is she still
8 here?
9   MS. SMITH: No, we can't.
10   MR. BROWN: You can't get title level? Okay.
11 Well, talk to me later offline, and I can show you how
12 we do it. But it's very easy to do. I can get SuDoc
13 level. I can analyze by stem. I can do any kind of
14 analysis. So --
15   MR. SHULER: But that will be so noted by the
16 Council and make sure that that thread of conversation
17 isn't lost. Thanks. All right. Nope. Dave?
18   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
19 State Library. I almost hate to bring this up, but I
20 will anyway because I brought it up during the opening
21 session. The RFP that failed, these disbursed
22 digitization projects are obviously very important and
0068
1 are going to be an absolutely essential contribution to
2 permanent public access to digitized information.
3   However, Tori's questions about preservation
4 standards versus access copies is very troubling to me
5 because I suspect that some of these projects are not
6 going to be to the standards of preservation. And also
7 because of that, they're not going to be able to be
8 ingested into FDsys, which means that we will not have
9 one-stop shopping for this digitized content.
10   So once again, I'm -- maybe I'm crying in the
11 wilderness here, but I'm wondering if it might be
12 possible for GPO to retool the -- the RFP to make it
13 more attractive. To try to get some kind of process
14 going where we can get a -- a very standardized
15 digitization process going that we were told was going
16 to happen in Tampa.
17   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One of the
18 things that I mentioned during my opening speech was
19 that as the next step of this, we need to develop a plan
20 working with Council. And a lot of that that David
21 mentioned is policy, and I think some of it is
22 assumption that we need to validate about where we go.

0069
1 And where I think we need to go is we need to
2 do another industry day, and from the industry day move
3 on and do another RFP. I think the assumption that
4 because content may not meet a certain standard, it may
5 not be available in FDsys is something we need to talk
6 about. Because I do think it's important, as many of
7 you do and you expressed during the conference, that
8 there be preservation level copy held at GPO from which
9 access level derivatives are produced.
10 But I think as part of the discussion in the
11 planning process, we need to talk about whether or not
12 for the purposes of immediately expanding access having
13 a rendition or some access derivative while we're
14 working towards preservation copy is something that we,
15 as a community, find acceptable for the purposes of
16 near-term expansion of access.
17 So I -- I look forward to talking about this
18 as we go through the planning process. But I think we
19 need to validate some of those issues, and I think
20 that's what's going to make a sound industry day. And
21 it's going to lead to what makes it attractive or not
22 attractive for potential bidders.
0070
1 MR. SHULER: In the interest of moving on,
2 this will be the last question. Okay.
3 MS. RHODES: Actually -- can you hear me?
4 MR. SHULER: Yes.
5 MS. RHODES: Okay. It's kind of a
6 recommendation to the Council. This is Sarah Rhodes,
7 Georgetown Law Library. The University of North Texas
8 has this "web at-risk program" and has an amazing
9 collection plan template that's used by the different
10 partners who participate in that effort. They complete
11 this collection plan, and it's posted on a website.
12 This template was useful for my library in our
13 digital preservation effort. We actually took it down
14 and adapted it for our project. I think one thing, if
15 my library were to participate in a collaborative
16 government document digitization effort, I would need to
17 have a plan that I defended in front of our Digitization
18 Initiatives Committee.
19 So a plan template that was developed by
20 Council or by GPO and posted, made available, that I
21 would complete. That would have, you know, I mean,
22 like, a standards information could be there. But also,

0071
 1 I mean, evaluation information could be included. There
 2 are a number of things that would be very helpful for me
 3 to kind of make an argument at my institution. So
 4 that's my comment.
 5   MR. SHULER: Thank you. I think these
 6 recommendations are working towards that idea that we
 7 would have shared resources of that type in this issue
 8 of coordination and collaboration.
 9   Okay. I'd like to close off the conversation
10 then on what we would call "The Digitization of the
11 Tangible Collections" and move on to what we classify,
12 this would be our next recommendation topic, the
13 wonderful inclusive title of "Technology Issues."
14   And Council will be addressing in this
15 particular recommendation, the -- in particular, it
16 shall be part of this, the failure of the Perl System.
17 Council is in unanimity about it was unacceptable and
18 that we were -- we are looking to GPO as a result of
19 this recommendation to give us an accounting of what
20 happened.
21   And further, with the remarks from GPO
22 personnel in different parts of the conference,
0072
 1 mentioning that this Perl System was one of several
 2 legacy systems still in place, we want to work with GPO
 3 with all expeditious speed to get us out of the legacy
 4 world. Well, maybe we could call it the heirloom world
 5 and into the -- this current century.
 6   And this also would include a specific request
 7 that we desire a FDsys that will happen within two years
 8 and not four to six years. Something that would happen
 9 within our lifetimes. That was John speaking actually.
10 Sorry about that.
11   So I -- I leave this -- I open this to the
12 Council discussion and then the rounds. So, Council?
13   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
14 I -- I think the essence of the focus here is one of
15 information gathering and wanting -- seeking
16 clarification and some information and in the spirit of
17 lessons learned and moving forward.
18   And with respect to -- just to elaborate a
19 little bit on John's enumeration of the points with
20 respect to the FDsys, I think a lot of the conversation
21 was around wondering about and seeking clarification on
22 the need for reliable and redundant systems. You know,

0073
1 all of our institutions have probably experienced
2 something like the Perl failure, you know. And it's --
3 it's always good to take advantage of that awful
4 opportunity when it -- when it occurs to learn from it.
5 Do our best to make sure it doesn't happen again and to
6 -- so it's a -- it's a information-seeking request.
7   MR. SHULER: Any other folks from the Council
8 want to speak to the issue? GPO folk?
9   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I want to
10 reiterate that I, too, am extremely disappointed in what
11 happened with the Perl process as I know others at GPO
12 are.
13   Let me elaborate a little bit on what we've
14 done since then without revealing too much in the way of
15 procurement-sensitive information. In the library unit
16 we define our requirements on behalf of you guys as
17 customers to our ITN S staff, and they're responsible
18 for implementing technology strategies.
19   I think that as a customer and as our partner
20 in the process, our IT staff has agreed that we are
21 certainly having some trouble supporting this Perl
22 process. And the way we're having trouble is not from
0074
1 the hardware side, it's from the software side.
2   And I -- I think GPO did a very good job
3 getting the hardware up and running again, but there was
4 definitely a problem with finding quick turn-around on
5 application support associated with the scripting
6 process need today run Pearls.
7   And as a result of that, I've made the
8 recommendation that we also examine potential
9 outsourcing options for what I'm calling "a bridge of
10 stability" until persistent identification requirements
11 are fully addressed by FDsys.
12   I do not think we can run the risk of having
13 something like this happen again with this system or any
14 of the other public facing systems. And for that
15 reason, I've asked this to be opened up to all options.
16   I requested and have received funding
17 associated with doing this as part of the FY '10 budget.
18 And we're going to move ahead with either another
19 internal option, or if we can't do it, an immediate
20 outsource. So that that's where we are right now, and
21 we'll have certainly more to report along the way.
22   MR. SHULER: David.

0075
 1   MR. CISMOWSKI: Ric -- David Cismowski,
 2 California State Library. I think it was a week ago or
 3 a week and a half ago there was an hour or two failure
 4 again or inaccessability. Could you -- my -- my sense
 5 of that is very unclear. Was that related to the
 6 previous, or what -- what caused that? Could you inform
 7 us on that?
 8   MR. DAVIS: I don't want to butcher this in my
 9 comments because I'm not the -- the -- certainly the
10 most technical person in the room. But what occurred a
11 week ago for approximately an hour was that there was a
12 -- a problem again on the primary server. It failed
13 over to the backup, and there was an issue with the IP
14 address thinking that the primary and the backup server
15 were using the same IP address.
16   That was corrected, so it was a completely
17 different situation than what occurred during the period
18 it was down. But it further eliminates that even being
19 down for an hour, to me as a customer, is unacceptable.
20 I think it's unacceptable to you as a library community.
21   The words that I used, and I think it's words
22 that our predecessors have used, is that in the digital
0076
 1 environment when you can't access Pearls, it's
 2 equivalent to having a padlock on the door of a library.
 3 And that's the way I'm couching it.
 4   MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. I think those
 5 sentiments are very much appreciated. Members -- sorry.
 6 James.
 7   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
 8 Rick, would -- would the GPO also be interested not only
 9 in outsourcing options but partnership options?
10   MR. DAVIS: I know we're meeting at 12:00, and
11 I'm open to those discussions as well.
12   MR. JACOBS: Thank you.
13   MR. SHULER: Anybody else on the Council?
14 Audience members? Do you want to contribute? Are you
15 satisfied that GPO and the Council are making positive
16 steps to make sure we understand what happened and steps
17 toward resolution, that it doesn't happen again? Okay.
18   (Applause.)
19   MR. SHULER: Thank you. Okay. Those four
20 recommendations are the -- what we would call rough --
21 rough recommendations that are basically in process.
22   We are now moving to five further

0077
1 recommendations that are even more rough. And it
2 reminds me of that famous phrase we use as government
3 documents librarians, there's two things you don't want
4 to see, how they make sausage and how a Council makes
5 recommendations.
6   So we're going to give you a bit of the
7 seasoning we're using in fashioning these food stuffs.
8 Yeah. I've been a vegetarian for the last day and a
9 half. I think something's happening to my meat brain.
10   All right. First one states that "The
11 structure and purpose of the -- Council is seeking to
12 work with GPO to inform the structure and purpose of the
13 consultant." Okay?
14   And we realize that with $100,000 is a lot of
15 money to a lot of people, but obviously for the
16 challenges we have, it ain't much. Therefore, we would
17 like the scope of the work to reflect the size of the
18 budget, that we set priorities on what this consultant
19 should or should not do. Council wants to work with GPO
20 on that. And further that it be sooner than later. So
21 we're interested in a very quick speed dating. Council
22 members?
0078
1   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
2 I'll just state the obvious, in that since right up
3 front, you all invited our participation in this and saw
4 that quickly after the meeting since you have a fair --
5 as I understood it, a fairly quick turnaround or how you
6 want to spend that $100,000, this is one of our ways of
7 saying we stand ready to work with you in that regard.
8   MR. SHULER: For the members of the audience
9 and the community out here, this will be one more thing
10 for you to go to the that Federal Depository Library
11 Community Desktop because the conversation will not stop
12 here. It will be going on. Rick?
13   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I greatly
14 appreciate Council's willingness to work with us on
15 that. As you probably heard during the meeting, the
16 omnibus dollars that we received back in June, we had to
17 award all of that money by September 30th.
18   And, you know, thanks particularly to the work
19 of the staff that we have at GPO, in both of the library
20 side and in procurement, the last one was awarded at
21 4:00 p.m. on the last day. Very quick turnaround when
22 you -- you get a significant budget increase, and you've

0079
1 got two months to execute all of the contracts.
2   Obviously we have more time on this, but I --
3 I don't want to wait six months. I want to do it more
4 in three months. The first thing that we need to do
5 immediately after this meeting is start creating spend
6 plans for all of the appropriated items that we've
7 received approval on in FY '10, and I want to work hand
8 in hand with Council on each of those. And certainly
9 the consultant one.
10   I think as John mentioned, it seems like in
11 some ways a lot of money, but with the task, it's
12 probably not a lot of money. I think we really need to
13 focus on an outcomes-based effort as well. What are we
14 looking for in terms of results from working with a
15 consultant and also thinking about what does it lead to?
16 What do we actually want to do with it in terms of what
17 we get?
18   MR. SHULER: Thank you. Members of the
19 audience? Do I take that as somewhat of an assent that
20 you approve of the direction we're taking on this? Your
21 Council working on your behalf? How do you like this
22 feedback thing going here, huh? Kind of cool, I think.
0080
1   Okay. Second item, "Seasoning Level. GPO
2 Funding Issues and Direction." Council has designated
3 two of its members to be take -- to lead a small task
4 force to work directly with GPO, taking in input from
5 Council as well as from members of the audience and the
6 community on how GPO can best organize its work for the
7 community, the Federal Depository Library community, in
8 regards to the funding requests for '10 and '11.
9   And some of this will happen sooner than
10 later. Obviously there was a greater demand in the next
11 three or four weeks, which is the reason why we're
12 making it a small working group so they can move faster.
13   This will involve a series of phone calls and
14 other communication devices to take advantage of the web
15 technologies to make sure this happens very quickly.
16 Council members? Rick?
17   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I do want to
18 reemphasize the priority on that one. We're looking at
19 a date of November 15th to have not a tremendous amount
20 of detail, but line items and associated justifications
21 for the items were looking for for FY '11.
22   And I think the thing we need to think about

0081
1 is we're working together to finalize the wording on the
2 recommendations. We need to look at the amount of money
3 we've received from the FY '10 appropriations that maps
4 to things like legacy system replacement. I have it for
5 pearls. I have it for DETUS (ph), but we have other
6 legacy systems, item list or shipping list or the system
7 that runs our distribution line and powers that others.
8   We need to think about prioritization of those
9 things for additional funding requests for FY '11, as
10 well as other Council recommendations whenever the word
11 "money" comes up. And we need to map it to it by
12 mid-November.
13   MR. SHULER: Thank you. Suzanne and I will be
14 taking the lead on this, and I know right now Suzanne's
15 going to cancel her flight home, this afternoon, and
16 stay here and work with us for the next two days.
17   MS. SEARS: Seeing as how the -- the weather
18 in Dallas is so bad, that may not be a bad idea.
19   MR. SHULER: We'll work on that. Audience
20 members? My goodness. I think we should come up with
21 something contentious. I'm kind of missing the old
22 days. Okay. Oh, my God. Regionals are up next. What
0082
1 was I thinking?
2   Then -- Mary Alice. Thank you very much.
3   MS. BAISH: Mary Alice Baish, American
4 Association of Law Libraries. And, Ric, what can we do
5 to help you? You know, we worked hard over the year --
6 past two years, specifically, to get money earmarked for
7 the federal digital system which is so crucial, as we
8 all know, to the future of your agency.
9   And what can we do to help you, for example,
10 justify a line item request annually to fund the federal
11 digital system, particularly, as we talk about ingesting
12 materials that are digitized by all of our partner
13 libraries?
14   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Speaking on
15 behalf of GPO, we certainly appreciate your support and
16 the testimony that you guys have given on behalf of our
17 appropriations and, specifically, FDsys. I wonder if
18 Celine is in the audience? No.
19   I need to speak with her about what their
20 request will be for FY '11 because, of course, FDsys is
21 a separate activity from what we do in the library unit.
22 But I know, certainly, we're appreciative of the fact

0083
1 that for the first time that was funded in FY '10 as a
2 separate line item.
3   And I think that in -- in mapping to the
4 request about the need for -- for speed associated with
5 the continued rollout of FDsys, we need to work with
6 Council about prioritization and look at what funding is
7 going to be needed associated with that. And I know
8 certainly, we'd appreciate that support in the future.
9 So that's something we need to dialogue about.
10   MR. SHULER: Anybody else from the audience?
11 All right. Moving on to the third one. "Regional
12 Issues" we call it. And, again, I mentioned this
13 earlier, it involves the aspects -- particular aspects
14 of disposal and selection that came up as a result of
15 the two sessions we held and at the regionals' meeting
16 last night.
17   And as I said, Gwen, Ann and David, who are
18 regionals and on the Council, have been asked by
19 regionals themselves to form a task force on behalf of
20 Council and the regional people to look at this, work
21 with GPO and report back to us in the course of the next
22 few months to resolve what are some questions of issues
0084
1 that seem to be unclear. Council members, any comments?
2 GPO?
3   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think it's
4 important to do that. I think that when GPO came up
5 with a list of items, the list of items that we came up
6 with associated with what John is referring to is things
7 that we saw as actionable items from the -- the regional
8 reports from last summer.
9   What ended up occurring in the interim is some
10 of those things have clearly overlapped -- council
11 recommendations from Tampa. I think there is a bit of
12 overlap with some of the things I'm hearing about today.
13 And I think we need to look at where we have overlap,
14 where we have other prioritizations associated with
15 regionals that need action that, perhaps, extend beyond
16 the Council recommendations, but have Council
17 involvement with GPO.
18   MR. SHULER: Thank you. Rick. Members of the
19 audience?
20   MS. HORNE-POPP: Laura Horne-Popp, University
21 of Richmond. Could you clarify what these issues are?
22 As a selective, I'm -- I'm -- you know, many of us

0085
1 didn't participate, and I'm assuming in the meeting that
2 happened yesterday where some of this came up. So if
3 this could be articulated a little more clearly for the
4 sake of --
5   MR. SHULER: Well, the best I can do it
6 because a lot of the issues, a lot of discussions
7 focuses on just what the hell we're talking about. So
8 people are debating back and forth about what the hell
9 they're talking about.
10   So rather than recreate -- don't -- don't get
11 me wrong, guys. We got time. We've got about an hour
12 left. We can recreate the "what the hell you talking
13 about" speech, but I strongly suggest, rather than try
14 to recreate that very difficult moment and maybe add one
15 more dimension to that hell, I -- I strongly suggest
16 that these three people are very capable. They will
17 work with GPO, and I think when their work is done, we
18 won't have to worry about that more difficult discussion
19 we had. Okay?
20   And if you have any questions, go ahead and
21 submit them to the Council, and they'll make sure it is
22 part of their discussion. Yes?
0086
1   MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana
2 University. Related to disposal, I had mentioned an
3 idea to Rick yesterday, but just to get it in the
4 written record, during yesterday morning's presentation
5 on the Ithaca report, this idea sprang into my head of
6 creating, like, a GPO used book store.
7   Where, after a major set has gone through the
8 entire disposal process, prior to throwing it in the
9 Dumpster, which we all hate to do, we would put it in a
10 box and mail it to the GPO used book store where they
11 would then sell it. They would reimburse us for
12 postage.
13   They would have, you know, the online site
14 like the Ebay. They might have a store front where they
15 could sell these, and they could do print on demand. If
16 people are doing digitization projects, if they find one
17 in this used book store, it's a depository. They get
18 that copy for free. Everyone else would have to pay.
19   So that was just my thinking outside the box
20 of how to not throw things in the Dumpster that might be
21 important, and there might actually be a market for out
22 there. I don't know if it's reasonable or possible but

0087
1 there was my idea.
2   MR. SHULER: Thank you.
3   (Applause.)
4   MR. SHULER: We could -- we could bring back
5 the old grange cooperative idea, huh? I like that. A
6 food co-op.
7   Okay. Anything else from the audience? Going
8 on to the next one then. Two weeks ago, three weeks
9 ago. Doesn't note. Chair time is becoming immaterial
10 right now. But the Public Printer issued a news release
11 about a cooperative effort with the White House to be
12 able to access massive data sources and download raw
13 data and manipulate it to your heart's content.
14   And, specifically, he asked Council to work on
15 the effectiveness of this initiative and to report back
16 to him on how depository libraries can do this.
17   I think you saw from sessions from yesterday,
18 there are aspects of this being deployed by depository
19 libraries as we speak, but the Public Printer considers
20 this as part of one of his initiatives, and so he wants
21 us to take a look at it.
22   We've appointed a team to look at that, and
0088
1 they will be reporting on it during the long meeting in
2 preparation for Buffalo, but have some fairly good turn
3 around on this. Does Council have any expansive
4 remarks?
5   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
6 Only two. Enlist the cooperation and support of all the
7 folks out there using this kind of stuff. That if you
8 know of or have ideas about how -- how various products
9 or services might take advantage of XML GPO-supplied
10 data or government information on XML generally, you
11 know, just share those instances or ideas with us so we
12 can, you know, take a look at them and track them.
13 Thanks.
14   MS. HOLTERHOFF: And us would be Dan and
15 Camilla and myself.
16   MR. SHULER: Thank you.
17   MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso
18 Law.
19   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think that
20 both GPO and the Office of the Federal Register have
21 been pleased thus far with the reaction to the
22 availability of the FR data in XML. I know we're --

0089
1 we're looking at going back prior to 1990. There were
2 discussions about public papers of the President, so
3 also the Code of Federal Regulations has on the horizon.
4   I think in doing this with Council, something
5 that would also help and benefit GPO and the library
6 community is Mike Wash and I have been appointed to
7 serve on this cross-agency team as a result of the
8 language that came out in the CRS report about bulk data
9 working with the Library of Congress, working with the
10 house and senate staff, looking at definitions
11 associated with bulk data and what it means for the
12 future from a governmental perspective.
13   I think having a Council member involvement in
14 that to a degree would benefit as we're sharing
15 information.
16   MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso
17 Law. I also wanted to say we were really pleased to see
18 the disclaimer that was added to that on Fed Reg XML
19 announcement or the -- and hope that future things that
20 if more files are made available in that way, that there
21 would be that disclaimer that this is not the official
22 authenticated version. It's just data that -- that --
0090
1 and that FDsys is the place to go for the official.
2   MR. DAVIS: Thanks for pointing that out as
3 well. I think that certainly there is a long-term plan
4 to provide authentication with that data. The
5 technology certainly is not there yet. So that -- thank
6 you forgetting that on the record because the -- the
7 official repository is still associated with the FDsys
8 information.
9   MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre
10 Dame. The only thing I would put in there, being the
11 person who the cup is half empty, and it's leaking,
12 harkens me back to census when this did this wonderful
13 thing and gave us this data in dBASE, so that we could
14 do all sorts of wonderful things for ourselves.
15   So in -- in this addition, and that's -- how
16 we have to characterise it. This is an additional
17 opportunity to have information useful to the community.
18 Does not act as a substitute or allow the agencies to
19 go, well, we've given you the raw data, we no longer do
20 any processing, any enhancement, anything else. That
21 all goes to, you know, thou shalt not compete with the
22 private sector nor, you know, the opportunity for the

0091
 1 library to do it all themselves.
 2   So I -- I think we want to make sure we're
 3 balancing this and not giving them the opportunity to
 4 shift everything into, well, you have got all the data.
 5 If you wish to make a workable product, you may do all
 6 the manipulation, and the agency no longer has to do
 7 such.
 8   So it's an additional opportunity. It's not a
 9 substitute to give a -- a reduction in their costs.
10   MS. BAISH: Mary Alice Baish, American
11 Association of Law Libraries. Thank you, Steve. You
12 took the words right out of my mouth.
13   We were delighted to see the disclaimer go up.
14 And one of the nice things about it, it does at the end
15 of it provide a link to Fed Sys, noting that Fed Sys has
16 the official authentic version of the online Federal
17 Register.
18   I also want to point out to those of you
19 potential users on data.gov, to use the XML you have to
20 download the entire year of the Federal Register. But
21 if you go to Fed Sys, you can download a daily edition.
22   And beyond that, I just wanted to say for the
0092
 1 subcommittee working on this with Council, yes, it's
 2 important to get the feedback of how depository
 3 librarians are using it, but a lot of other people are
 4 going to be using it, both non-depository libraries,
 5 non-profits, the commercial sector.
 6   So I think it's very important that the task
 7 force look beyond just our community in terms of
 8 potential benefits of usage for developing new tools.
 9 Thank you.
10   MR. SHULER: Thanks. Okay. Last one in this
11 group. It's called "Updating/Evaluating for
12 Discrepancies in the Handbook, Depository Library
13 Handbook." This came out of the discussions on the --
14 the PAA which escapes me right now. What's the -- thank
15 you. Public Access Assessments and making sure that the
16 most up-to-date information is correct and in there and
17 available for libraries that will be submitted to public
18 assessments. Council?
19   MS. MORIEARTY: I want to let the community
20 know that we'd like any feedback. By we, I mean Suzanne
21 Sears and myself on the handbook. Please send any
22 comments, any inquiries, any pertinent bits of

0093
1 information to us.
2   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
3 Texas. Just to echo what Jill said, if you know of a
4 discrepancy, if you found a discrepancy and you see one,
5 let us know about that. I mean, if you -- if you have
6 issues with something in the handbook, we'd really --
7 because we've been hearing, oh, there's discrepancies.
8   We'd like some specifics, if possible, so that
9 we know what it is the scope of this project needs to
10 be. And I know several times today we've asked you for
11 feedback, different members of Council.
12   If you're not sure how to get ahold of us, in
13 your handouts, you got -- you have every one of our
14 emails. Also on the FDLP desktop there is a Council
15 page, and there is a contact form on that for each of
16 us. And we are also on the FDLP community where you can
17 reach us that way.
18   MS. MORIEARTY: I -- I urge everyone to take a
19 serious look at the handbook. We have PAA's coming up,
20 and this will help it go much easier we all know what's
21 going on. Good. Good.
22   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. If memory serves
0094
1 me on the handbook, I think the Public Access Assessment
2 chapter is chapter seven. And there certainly may be
3 some discrepancies right now, and I'll tell you why.
4   One of the things that staff in the library
5 unit did, I think, a week and a half, two weeks prior to
6 this event was relaunch some new information off of the
7 PAA web page under "Outreach" off the FDLP desktop. And
8 an action that we have going back into the red brick
9 building is to take that information and that plan and
10 map it to chapter seven in the handbook. Of course,
11 that's a process that will be worked with Council.
12   Just as a reminder to the community, I think
13 the -- it should be pointed out that the handbook was
14 not this time a GPO document. It was written with
15 liaisons in the community through a collaborative
16 process. And as John and others have pointed out, any
17 errors or corrections that need to be made should be
18 continued through that collaborative process. It's very
19 much a living document.
20   MR. SHULER: Thank you, Rick. Members from
21 the community, want to weigh in?
22   Okay. If you've been keeping count, this is

0095
1 nine recommendations that are in various versions of
2 being prepared. And oddly enough, when we started this,
3 we said we were going to be very serious about being
4 very focused and, obviously, we need to work on that.
5   So I imagine you might see some mash-ups in
6 the end, but in the interest of time, I'm going to skip
7 ahead to other things that have come up on our radar
8 that we will be discussing, if not directing the full
9 recommendation muscle at.
10   One of them is -- and we have said this
11 several times during the conference and during this
12 particular session, we are moving to Federal Depository
13 Library Community Desktop. We're setting up. You guys
14 can follow us, you can ignore us, but if you really want
15 to pay attention to us because we're important people
16 here, you got to follow us to the community.
17   That means you got to register. That means
18 you got to get used to it. As part of this bargain, we
19 are going to work with GPO to upgrade that community to
20 take advantage of tools that are already there that may
21 not be clear -- organizational issues, finding issues,
22 searching issues.
0096
1   And what our goal is is to make that where our
2 business takes place for the future. And that includes
3 stuff that we have done so we don't lose our memory. So
4 you don't have to scratch your head two weeks before a
5 meeting and say, what the hell was -- where -- where was
6 that document?
7   Our goal is to make it as rich an environment
8 as possible to facilitate that long meeting between our
9 physical meetings.
10   Council? I don't know if we're looking for
11 GPO responses, and I just want to let you know what
12 we're thinking about.
13   Members of the community, you want us to stop
14 that and just go back to the old ways? Anybody? Last
15 chance? Okay.
16   MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
17   MR. SHULER: Damn it, James.
18   MR. JACOBS: Sorry. I did want to let folks
19 know that -- that we have a list of items to make
20 community.FDLP.gov better. But if you out there know of
21 any that -- that you would love to see, if you -- you
22 know, if you're a Google docs person or some other -- if

 1 you're a Facebook person, and you have a particular hat
 2 that you really love and think it would be useful for
 3 the community, do let us know. And we'll -- we'll see
 4 that that gets added to the growing list.
 5   MR. SHULER: Okay. Thanks, James. The other
 6 issue that we have put on our radar involves a proposed
 7 registry and repository of all primary legal materials
 8 of the United States. A report of this is going to be
 9 issued sometime in early next year. GPO -- not GPO.
10 Council has decided to take a look at it and report back
11 on what Council thinks.
12   And it is not in any sense an endorsement. It
13 is merely an examination of an interesting project that
14 we should probably be aware of. James, Justin, Sally,
15 and Camilla have agreed to be the group looking after
16 this.
17   Not to leave the old strategic plan out of the
18 discussion, it is clear from the Public Printer's
19 remarks the strategic plan is still dear to our hearts.
20 So Council has asked the Chair to ask the Public
21 Printer, what are the next steps that we need to do in
22 partnership in regards to the strategic plan?

 1   There has been a number of interesting
 2 discussions about the upcoming meeting in Buffalo. And
 3 what it interesting is that it engendered a discussion
 4 on Council about how the Spring meetings are organized
 5 and chosen, and I expect you'll see some more
 6 developments coming out of that discussion.
 7   The American Health -- American Public Health
 8 reports -- am I getting that right? Public Health?
 9 Okay. Whatever they said's the right way to say it.
10   Obviously, that has come up as an issue on
11 gov. (inaudible) and other formums, and the Council
12 feels that this is serious enough that we're putting it
13 on our proto agenda to begin to explore these
14 restrictions that may be involved when we move from
15 single publications to databases. And whether or not
16 these trends actually restrict the public's use of these
17 databases as opposed to expanding them.
18   We're not sure where that conversation's going
19 to go, but it seems important enough to us to put it on
20 our radar screen. Council? I sort of ran through
21 those. Forgive me, I -- GPO? Audience members? Dan?
22   MR. BARKLEY: Good job. I approve.

 1   MR. SHULER: All right. It's Dan-approved.
 2 All right. Now, there is another set of recommendations
 3 that are much further along and probably close to being
 4 served. And I'm just going to run through these
 5 quickly.
 6   As part of our effort to build the -- to
 7 continue to build our life in the community desktop, we
 8 have allowed ourselves, as Council members, to take
 9 advantage of social networking tools ourselves, and this
 10 will be pretty much invested in our life between here
 11 and Spring.
 12   And that will include the ability to work on
 13 documents together online. It would include more
 14 telephone conversations and other direct interventions
 15 in order to stay on top of the many issues we're
 16 involved in.
 17   Let's see. We have -- we're looking at some
 18 bylaw issues and how the Council works as an
 19 organization. And though it's probably endlessly
 20 interesting to us, we'll just -- we'll just put this
 21 under housekeeping responsibilities, and we're being
 22 responsible. How's that?
 1   That pretty much takes care of the agenda as
 2 we have laid it out here, except for what's going to be
 3 pointed out to me in a moment. Ah. Thank you. Thank
 4 you.
 5   There -- there was a further recommendation
 6 that comes under "almost served" that is attempting to
 7 have a better conversation and implementation ideas of
 8 how to use social networking tools at the physical
 9 conferences -- blogs, streaming. Thank you. Being an
 10 heirloom librarian, I'm really challenged by some of
 11 this. So I'm -- I'm sort of mimicking. But taking
 12 advantage of all that fancy tool stuff. That James
 13 talks about all the time and could speak to better.
 14   MR. JACOBS: Ad nauseum?
 15   MR. SHULER: Ad nauseum. But we want to be
 16 part of that utopia that the rest of the 19-year-olds
 17 seem to share. Or maybe that's a mid-life crisis for
 18 Council. I don't know.
 19   But we want to work -- we're setting up
 20 different means and task forces with GPO on how we might
 21 be able to do that. That conversation started
 22 yesterday. And I got to tell you, GPO was really

 1 enthusiastic about it. They were really looking forward
 2 to take care of those advantages.
 3   MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
 4 Texas. I just want the community to know that GPO wants
 5 to help us do this as much as we want to do this. It's
 6 not a matter of, you know, yes, the technology is there,
 7 and we can do it. It's a matter of cost. It's
 8 extremely expensive.
 9   So we're -- we're looking at what is most
10 cost-effective and can involve the most participation
11 from our community. Because we do want feedback from
12 people who don't get travel funds and want them to be
13 able to submit questions and be able to be involved in
14 the conversations.
15   MR. SHULER: It's -- it was -- it's really
16 different. I've been doing this for 26 years. And I
17 remember some seasons where we just got a flat-out, no.
18 Drop dead. What are you asking us for? And I got to
19 tell you, it was very refreshing to actually get a
20 positive response and really an engaged discussion.
21 This is a good thing. This is a good thing.
22   MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

 1 In addition to using some of the new technologies, in
 2 the past we've had kind of a comments bucket where
 3 people could write on note cards and submit comments to
 4 Council during the meeting. If that is something that
 5 you're interested in seeing started up again, please let
 6 the Council know. It doesn't all have to be fancy
 7 technology if you don't want, John.
 8   MR. SHULER: I think -- I remember Brigadoon
 9 only is so many days. I don't know how much more brain
10 I have here. Especially if I stay on this vegetarian
11 diet.
12   Okay. So that is what Council wanted to talk
13 about. That leaves us, I note, 15 minutes for anything
14 you want to talk about that is important to you. That
15 is Dan-approved. David? Wait a minute, Dan. Don't go
16 there yet.
17   MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski from
18 the California State Library. One -- one of the
19 recommendations that is coming that we didn't ask for
20 audience input on is this Spring meeting location issue.
21 And I would be very interested if any of you have any
22 comments about the direction or some of the questions

0103
1 that we're discussing on Council, which I don't think
2 are out there in your consciousness yet.
3   The first is the possibility of weighting
4 locations to the central portions of the country. Not
5 to the exclusion of the two coasts or the extreme north
6 and the south, but more Spring meetings would occur in
7 the central part of the country than in the others. The
8 theory being that it would make it easier for people in
9 those coastal areas and far north and south to travel to
10 a central location more often than not.
11   The second is the possibility of having -- of
12 identifying one location for a number of years, up to
13 three, which would save GPO some money and would also
14 provide some stability for planning for you so that you
15 know that next year it's going to be in the same place.
16   The disadvantage, of course, is that selective
17 depositories with limited travel funds would not have
18 the opportunity to travel to the various locations,
19 which happens when, you know, we get people -- you know,
20 in that location who have no money who are able to drive
21 there because we've decided to locate it in Buffalo.
22   And I -- I'd be interested in your -- if you
0104
1 have any thoughts about that. Would -- would those two
2 directions be -- make it easier for you to attend the
3 Spring meeting?
4   MR. SHULER: My bad. That was on my list of
5 things to read out here. So thank you, David. Rick?
6   MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The one thing I
7 want you to factor into the thought process on that as
8 well, and I know -- see, Lance is here, and I don't know
9 if he wants to address this. Sometimes when we approach
10 various cities given the size of the conference, the
11 average attendance size, we're told to go away. We
12 don't want to bother with you. You -- you need a
13 thousand people. You need 2000 people. And that
14 sometimes makes it challenging.
15   We have had a comment made before by GPO about
16 the, perhaps, central location of the United States,
17 too, as being a possible preference if we could get that
18 to work to try to make it easy on travelers as best we
19 can. So I -- we welcome all comments and thoughts on
20 that as we go forward.
21   MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.
22 Related to you all sending us your comments as to the

 1 decisions that -- the reasons why you decide to come to
 2 the Spring meeting, if you could go ahead and ask the
 3 people that you know, the depository librarians that
 4 could not make it to these sessions, what are the --
 5 what are the factors that they consider when deciding
 6 whether or not to attend a conference.
 7   MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
 8 And also just in the spirit of -- you know, nothing
 9 sacred, and everything's under discussion, the -- the
10 point was raised, do we need to continue to have two
11 meetings? Is the most -- is a better, effective use of
12 both GPO's dollars and travel dollars from the community
13 that are concentrated on a single meeting where --
14 wherever that may be.
15   So, you know, input on these and other
16 questions regarding the meetings, the locations, the
17 logistics would be very much appreciated.
18   MR. SHULER: I'm sure nobody has any ideas
19 about this, but --
20   MS. MC KNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University
21 of Wisconsin River Falls, and I would like to come up
22 and speak briefly about other technical considerations.
 1 I heard a lot about the digitization efforts, and I'd
 2 like to go back and request, kindly request, that the
 3 Council find partners to assist the GPO in the capture
 4 of Borndigital items.
 5   Our future legacy collection is disappearing.
 6 And I -- someone agrees. And part of the reason I'm
 7 thinking about this is a question that James Jacobss
 8 asked me just a week or two ago about looking for, you
 9 know, lost docs and capturing materials.
10   We've had some efforts on the part -- you
11 know, on this area in the past and hearing about the XML
12 and the data.gov, okay. We can send it out, but we have
13 got to get this material back in before we can send it
14 out to the public again.
15   The other -- the other point I'd like to make
16 about these digitization efforts is that we need to
17 encourage our partners to include the underlying
18 metadata to make these work with virtually every system,
19 particularly with serials for capture or for discovery.
20   There are a lot of new discovery material --
21 new discovery systems launching, and we need to make
22 this go in and come out very effectively, so that

1 libraries within this program and libraries outside of
2 this program can make this material move to the public
3 in a seamless fashion.
4   And finally, my third and last point is Public
5 Health Reports. I would like to harken us back to the
6 Schizophrenia Bulletin and think about that, when that
7 was kept in the program and let you know about a little
8 experience I've had negotiating a license with Oxford
9 University Press. Where they were attempting to charge
10 my institution more money because they could find
11 Schizophrenia Bulletin sitting in our OPAC through
12 WorldCat that was a FDLP product and a depository item.
13   We ceased that publication once it completely
14 went to Oxford, but you all need to be aware as these
15 things creep out to the private sector that they're
16 going to come back and try to charge you yet again in
17 another way to access this material. That's all. Thank
18 you.
19   MR. SHULER: Thank you.
20   (Applause.)
21   MR. SHULER: Steve?
22   MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. Thank
1 you, Michelle. Going back to the topic just before
2 Michelle, I would rather have Council working on
3 something other than the location of the meetings.
4   You're going to get who you're going to get
5 because they can afford to get there. You know, I have
6 people that if it's not within the greater South Bend
7 area, it's too expensive to go anywhere else. You've
8 got a lot on your plates. Skip that one. I mean, you
9 know, you can get a lot of wonderful little things in
10 there. It's -- you know, it should be a major airport.
11   We all have major associations have who been
12 very successful at always picking locations that please
13 us all. You know, I have a favorite slogan of, you
14 know, Death Valley was not available for annual, so
15 we're going to go to New Orleans instead. And Nome,
16 Alaska was all booked, so we're going to go to Boston in
17 the Winter.
18   I understand. It's wonderful. You're very
19 conscious of trying to maximize your attendance. You
20 have better, more important things to do.
21   Final, if the Public Printer says, I want to
22 go to here, who is Council or even us to say we don't

0109
1 want to go there? We want to go here because of all
2 these recommendations.
3   So, you know, you're busy. Protect your time.
4 Work on something that really, really is important, not
5 the locations.
6   MR. SHULER: Thanks, Yoda.
7   MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
8 Michigan. With all due respect and affection, Steve,
9 what we're really concerned about here is not so much
10 the -- the attendance. It's the input we're not
11 getting. It's the fact that an increasingly small
12 number of voices are being heard, and that's why we're
13 also talking about all the other technology actions.
14 Really, we're not obsessed with location. Honest.
15   MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
16 State Library. Again, with all due respect, it's not --
17 it's not just the quantity of input, but who is giving
18 the input. Because the well-funded institutions are
19 able to send people to Nome, Alaska, but it's the other
20 voices that we're not hearing.
21   MR. SHULER: Go.
22   MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, San Bernardino County
0110
1 Law Library, and I'm sure I'm going to get some all due
2 respects, too. But I want to agree with what Steve just
3 said, and also put a plug in for Death Valley, since a
4 good chunk of Death Valley is in San Bernardino County.
5 Well, it's not necessarily driveable. Keep in mind, San
6 Bernardino County is the largest county in the United
7 States, and it's bigger than many states.
8   I -- I just wanted to point out a couple
9 things. First of all, I think there's a -- there's a --
10 some people in the audience are getting the idea that
11 Council is maybe down-talking Buffalo for lack of a
12 better term. And, you know, I -- I -- I don't
13 necessarily go to Council because of where the location
14 is. I don't have a problem coming from Southern
15 California going to Buffalo in the Spring. I -- I mean,
16 that's just the way it is.
17   And I will also point out that two of the off
18 -- outside of D.C. conferences I have gone to, which one
19 would think would be in good locations, Newport,
20 Rhode Island and Clearwater Beach, Florida were two of
21 the worse attended Spring conferences I have seen. And
22 one of the reasons we moved around the country is to get

0111
 1 input from people from that area.
 2   In the years I've been going, I don't remember
 3 going to that section of the country. Newport Beach and
 4 D.C. are the two closest areas we've gone to that area
 5 of the country. And maybe they should be represented at
 6 Council, and we should look at moving Council around
 7 with the standpoint of, let's get input from other parts
 8 of the country. Thank you.
 9   MR. SHULER: Thank you. Dan?
10   MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of
11 New Mexico. There are a lot of factors coming into
12 this. I agree with Steve fundmentally that I -- I don't
13 think this is an issue that Council needs to spend a lot
14 of time on. Because you guys do have full plates, and
15 there are a lot more important things than whether we're
16 shuffling to Buffalo or grazing somewhere in the middle
17 of Crib Death, Kansas or something like that.
18   That being said, David's point that trying to
19 get voices heard from other places, it doesn't matter
20 where you are. People are either going to participate,
21 or they're not. And with the technology tools being the
22 way they are, it's a lot easier for people to provide
0112
 1 input through whatever social networking venue they
 2 choose to do. So it doesn't matter whether you're here,
 3 there, or someplace else.
 4   I find it kind of interesting that barroom
 5 talk from 12 years ago now makes its way to Council
 6 trying to determine where we're going to go next.
 7 Frankly, I'm looking forward to Buffalo for a number of
 8 reasons. They have a baseball team, okay? So, I mean,
 9 I do have alternative reasons for going there. But --
10 they -- they have hockey in April.
11   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Actually, they will be
12 playing in April.
13   MR. BARKLEY: But -- but the point being here
14 is that if -- if you want to solicit input from those
15 who are seldom heard, it's not a matter of where you
16 are. It's how you reach out to them and get their
17 input. Okay? So we could be on the moon shooting
18 things back at Earth, and if -- you're either going to
19 hear from folks or you're not.
20   Now, the idea that Dan broached about maybe
21 meeting once, that's kind of interesting. And we've had
22 discussions about that back and forth over the years

0113
 1 about having one big meeting. My only concern is that
 2 there's so much happening, that to have one big meeting
 3 and then to try and maybe have smaller meetings through
 4 whatever the technology is available at the time, still
 5 precludes a lot of people from participating. So --
 6   MR. SHULER: Thank you, Dan. I think we'll
 7 hear more on this issue, and Council will take it under
 8 advisement. It is now 10:56.
 9   MS. WALSH: Come on. You got to hear from the
10 survivor of the blizzard of '77?
11   MR. SHULER: You're right.
12   MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate
13 University. Dan, we play in April in the International
14 League. I -- I iterate, yes, but say if you're going to
15 consider anything in deciding location, it's not the
16 matter of a major airport, it's the cost of flying out
17 of a major airport. From Syracuse, New York I can fly
18 cheaper to Death Valley than I can to Washington D.C.
19 So that would be my only consideration if you're really
20 worried about people being able to afford to come. But
21 Buffalo, fortunately, blizzard of '77 was in
22 February-ish. It was 1993 we got hit with four feet of
0114
 1 snow in April.
 2   MR. SHULER: And -- and the Chair remembers
 3 that event. Okay. It's 10:56. In the interest of
 4 closing on time, I close the questions. Council, any
 5 last remarks? GPO, any last remarks? What? What are
 6 you going to do? Huh? Stupid computers. Rick? Rick?
 7   MR. DAVIS: Yeah, just one more comment.
 8 Sorry. I'm standing between people in lunch here. Ric
 9 Davis, GPO. I want to close out by thanking Council for
10 all -- all the hard work. All the work that you see up
11 here today, as many of you know who served on Council, a
12 lot goes in to making this happen.
13   I also want to thank Lance Cummins and his
14 staff for all the logistical work.
15   (Applause.)
16   MR. SHULER: Absolutely.
17   MR. DAVIS: Trust me, without them we would
18 not be here, so thank you all.
19   MR. SHULER: Exactly. No matter where we are,
20 we're nowhere without them. All right. In the interest
21 of time, I close this Council in the ancient country
22 song, how can we miss you if you won't go away? See you

0115
1   guys in the Spring. Oh, wait a minute. Wait a minute
2   let me hit the gavel. Dismissed.
3   (End of session)